

Revisiting Early Modern Female History Writing

Lucy Hutchinson's History of the English Civil War and Restoration
in the *Memoirs of the Life of Colonel Hutchinson*

Roxan Dewaele

Student number: 02107858

Supervisor: Dr. Geertje Bol

Co-supervisor: Prof. Dr. Steven Vanden Broecke

Reading committee: Prof. Dr. Frederik Buylaert

A dissertation submitted for the degree of Master in History

Word count: 28 333

Academic Year: 2024-2025

PREFACE

When I started my academic journey four years ago, I did not expect to end up here, immersed into the seventeenth-century English past and the enthralling figure of Lucy Hutchinson. I would like to thank some people for guiding me through these past four years and to motivate me to explore my interests. They introduced me to the mesmerizing women authors of the early modern era.

First of all, thanks to Doctor Zoë Van Cauwenberg for sparking my interest in women's writing and your personal guidance the past three years. Your encouragement is vital to make myself believe in my own academic abilities.

Next up, thanks to my co-promotor Professor Doctor Steven Vanden Broecke for your expertise and feedback, and for granting me such freedom in the topics I wanted to explore since the first year. I very much enjoyed our conversations and brainstorm-sessions on the different themes I touched upon in this master's thesis.

Special thanks to my supervisor Doctor Geertje Bol for your dedicated involvement in my research. I could not have wished for better counsel and feedback. I deeply admire how passionate you are about the women you study, which in turn reinforced my own excitement. I particularly felt this when I was invited to your conference, when I was able to talk to leading enthusiasts in the field and share my own small contribution to do justice to all these underexplored past female thinkers. This was definitely one of the best experiences in my academic development, and even more motivated me to pour my heart and soul into this research, as it is a subject that deeply resonates with me on a personal level.

I would also like to thank Lucy Hutchinson's biggest academic fan, I would dare to say, Professor David Norbrook. I appreciated our private correspondence and your advice.

Lastly, thanks to Professor Doctor Frederik Buylaert for showing interest in my research and for providing me with valuable feedback. I hope you enjoy the result!

Besides these academic inspirations, I would like to express my gratitude for my personal circle. Thanks to Heike and Chiara. It was really fun to go through these past two years together. I learned a lot from you both. Thanks to Anna, Astrid, Babs, Isolde, Marthe, and Gloria, for the support and trustworthy friendship this year. To my Desselgem-friends: thanks for listening to my rants and hopefully, we can soon spend more time together.

Without my supporting family, full of powerful women, I would not be writing down these words of gratitude. Even without necessarily knowing what I wrote in this thesis, you all played an undeniable role in helping me complete it.

A final thanks to Wende, the girl I'm lucky to love even more than Lucy Hutchinson. I cannot count the hours we have worked together on our master's theses in our living room. Having you by my side throughout the entire process was incredibly soothing. After meeting each other at the introduction day of the history degree four years ago, I am extremely joyful to complete this journey with you. It will be weird not to sit next to you in class anymore every day, but we will go our own ways, separately yet together.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction.....	1
Marked by the Civil War: Lucy Hutchinson's oeuvre and life.....	1
The English Civil War	2
Historiographical overview of women as historical writers: <i>herstory</i> or <i>history</i> ?	4
Research objectives	9
Source material.....	11
Methodology and structure	13
1. The <i>Memoirs of the Life of Colonel Hutchinson</i>: structure and purpose	15
1.1 <i>To My Children</i>	15
1.2 <i>The Life of Colonel Hutchinson</i>	15
1.3 Autobiographical Fragment.....	18
1.4 Purpose and historiographical context	18
1.5 Conclusion	23
2. The private and the public in Hutchinson's <i>Memoirs</i>.....	24
2.1 The <i>herstory</i> -inheritance: family and political history in modern scholarship on Hutchinson	24
2.2 The public-private paradigm.....	27
2.3 Hutchinson subverting the public-private dichotomy.....	29
2.3.1 Modern scholarship on Hutchinson as a challenge of the public-private paradigm	29
2.3.2 Hutchinson's family-oriented passages	33
2.3.3 Historicizing public and private in the <i>Memoirs</i>	36
2.3.4 The house(hold) as a background of the war	38
2.3.5 Circulation of the manuscript.....	40
2.3.6 Socio-economic context: gentry, manors, estate, and lordship	42
2.4 Conclusion	45
3. "The winds of passion" in Hutchinson's historical and providential narrative.....	46
3.1 The early modern female emotional historian in <i>herstory</i> -research.....	46
3.2. Passions in the seventeenth century	48
3.2.1 Terminology	48
3.2.2 The role of passions in human nature	49
3.3 The <i>Memoirs</i> : a history centred on human passions	52
3.3.1 Hutchinson's understanding of the passions: Thomism and Augustinianism	52
3.3.2 Divine providence	55
3.3.3 Civil War factionalism.....	57

3.3.4 Nottingham	58
3.3.5 Cromwell	63
3.3.6 Monarchy	64
3.3.7 Parliament	68
3.3.8 Moral history $\leftrightarrow$ political history $\leftrightarrow$ providential history	70
3.3.9 Hutchinson's hope for a future republican England	71
3.4 Conclusion	73
4. Conclusion	75
4.1 Recap	75
4.2 Limitations and further research	76
4.3 Epilogue	76
5. Bibliography	77
6. Appendix: Dutch summary	83

INTRODUCTION

MARKED BY THE CIVIL WAR: LUCY HUTCHINSON'S OEUVRE AND LIFE

Yett about the yeare 1639 the thunder was heard afarre of ratling in the troubled ayre, and even the most obscured woods were penetrated with some flashes, the forerunners of the dreadfull storme which the next yeare was more apparent.¹

In the mid-1660's, the Puritan and republican historian Lucy Hutchinson (1621-1681) wrote this striking passage, looking back on the period when the English Civil War (1642-1651) was looming, the series of conflicts that resulted in the execution of Charles I (1600-1649).² At the time of writing, the Stuart Restoration (1660) had taken place, the monarchy had been reinstalled after a Commonwealth under Oliver Cromwell (1599-1658), and Hutchinson's dream for a republican England had been ruined.³

Hutchinson's textual oeuvre is considerable. She is known as the first to translate Lucretius' *De Rerum Natura* into English. Besides her role as translator, she was also a prolific poet, for example in her biblical epic *Order & Disorder*, a versification of the Book of Genesis. She also translated parts from the Puritan theologian John Owen (1616-1683), and even had her own religious tract; *On the Principles of the Christian Religion*. She additionally wrote two commonplace books. However, she is most famous for her *Memoirs of the Life of Colonel Hutchinson* (henceforth: *Memoirs*), in which she wrote the above passage. As the title suggests, these *Memoirs* offer an account of the Civil War and the Restoration centred around the life-story of John Hutchinson (1615-1664), Hutchinson's husband.⁴

But let us first sketch out the life of the protagonist of this thesis. Lucy Hutchinson was born Lucy Apsley in 1620 to Lucy St. John and Allen Apsley.⁵ She had an exceptionally educational youth. Her

¹ Lucy Hutchinson, *Memoirs of the Life of Colonel Hutchinson* (c. 1664), ed. James Sutherland (London: Oxford University Press, 1973), 36; During this research process, I sometimes made use of ChatGPT to improve my English writing, since I am no native speaker. However, I have always continued critical thinking and combined it with other online-tools such as Reverso and Deepl. I would like to clarify that all analyses in this research are mine and mine only.

² Jonathan Gibson, "Making the *Memoirs* : Missing Leaves in the Manuscript of Lucy Hutchinson's Life of John Hutchinson," *The Seventeenth Century* 38, no. 3 (2023): 404; Sean Kelsey, "The Death of Charles I," *The Historical Journal*, 45, no. 4 (2002): 727.

³ Erica Longfellow, *Women and Religious Writing* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 197.

⁴ Robert Mayer, "Lucy Hutchinson: A Life of Writing," *The Seventeenth Century* 22, no. 2 (2007): 305; Rebecca Nesvet, "Missing persons: Lucy Hutchinson, Feminist Biography, and the Digital Archive," in *The Invention of Female Biography*, ed. Gina Luria Walker (London: Routledge, 2017), 74.

⁵ Mayer, "Lucy Hutchinson," 305.

parents hired several tutors who taught her in Greek, Hebrew, Latin, and French.⁶ She was not modest about this humanist education: “My father would have me learne Latin, and I was so apt that I outstript my brothers who were at schoole.”⁷ Her curriculum presumably corresponded with that of the contemporary male gentry, including authors like Sallust, Tacitus, Livy, Polybius, Caesar, Cicero, Plutarch and Seneca as study-objects.⁸ When she was eighteen years old, she married John Hutchinson. They had several children together, and moved to the family estate at “Owthorpe, about that time when the Irish Massacre was acted, and finding humors begin to be very stirring.”⁹ In this passage, she refers to the Irish Rebellion of 1641, a Catholic uprising against the English Protestant King and government. As an ardent Puritan, Hutchinson despised these events. Puritanism was a Protestant reform movement within the Church of England. They wanted to reform it on a truly Calvinist basis and rejected what they saw as remnants of Catholicism. They criticized the Anglican Church and the King for maintaining perceived episcopal, popish uses.¹⁰

THE ENGLISH CIVIL WAR

The Irish Rebellion of 1641 was one of the links in the chain of events that led to the English Civil War. The Civil War was part of a broader series of conflicts, named The Wars of the Three Kingdoms (1639-1653) which concerned Ireland, Scotland and England, all ruled by Charles I. The Bishop’s Wars (1639-1640) in Scotland was the first conflict of this series, when Charles I wanted to reform the Scottish Presbyterian church and impose the English prayer book on the Scottish people. This catalysed The Irish Confederate Wars (1641-1653) that started with the 1641 Irish Rebellion. This conflict mainly revolved around the colonial relationship between English Protestants and Irish Catholics. From 1649 to 1653, the Cromwellian Conquest of Ireland took place, also considered part of the War of the Three Kingdoms. Cromwell campaigned to reconquer Ireland and militarily suppressed Irish opposition against the Commonwealth.¹¹

While Hutchinson’s *Memoirs* also address these wider conflicts, her main focus lies on the English Civil War, driven by political and religious opposition between Royalists (Cavaliers) and

⁶ Gordon Campbell, “Lucy Hutchinson,” in *The Renaissance (1550-1660)*. Macmillan Anthologies of English Literature, ed. Gordon Campbell (Palgrave: London, 1989), 359.

⁷ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 288.

⁸ Claire Gheeraert-Graffeuille, *Lucy Hutchinson and the English Revolution: Gender, Genre, and History Writing* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2022), 29.

⁹ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 53.

¹⁰ Martyn Bennett, *The English Civil War: A Historical Companion* (Brimscombe: Tempus, 2004), 146, 202; Sarah C.E. Ross and Elizabeth Scott-Baumann, *Women Poets of the English Civil War* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2017), 3-6.

¹¹ Eamon Darcy, *The Irish Rebellion of 1641 and the Wars of the Three Kingdoms* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2013), 1-8; Mark Charles Fissel, *The Bishops’ Wars: Charles I’s Campaigns Against Scotland, 1638-1640* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 14.

Parliamentarians (Roundheads).¹² The Civil War is subdivided in a First Civil War (1642-1646), a Second Civil War (1648), and a Third Civil War or Anglo-Scottish War (1650-1652).¹³

Charles I considered Parliament a weakening factor of his power, and consequently disbanded it several times. In 1640, when he needed money and support — among other things for his military campaigns in Scotland — he re-summoned Parliament, known as the Long Parliament, in which Hutchinson's husband served. Parliament did not support his war with Scotland, and eventually became a body of opposition against the King. Many Parliamentarians professed the Puritan religion, like John. The Parliamentary opposition against Charles I was consequently built on both a political and religious basis.¹⁴

In 1649, the Long Parliament was disbanded due to growing power struggles between the Parliament and the New Model Army, created in 1645 with Thomas Fairfax (1612-1671) and Cromwell as its leading figures. The Long Parliament was purged and renamed the Rump Parliament, which only consisted of members supportive of the Army's plan to bring the King to the trial that eventually resulted in his execution in the same year.¹⁵

The road to power for Cromwell was open, and in 1653, he became Lord Protector of the Commonwealth of England, Scotland, and Ireland (1653-1659), whose territories were joined together. This form of state is also often referred to as the Protectorate. When Cromwell was succeeded by his less charismatic son Richard Cromwell (1626-1712), chaos in the Commonwealth increased and Parliament voted for the enthronement of Charles' I son Charles II, ushering the Stuart Restoration (1660).¹⁶ At the Restoration, Charles II promulgated the *Act of Indemnity and Oblivion*. This act gave a general pardon to people involved in Parliamentary misconducts during the Civil War and the Commonwealth. There were some exceptions, who could not receive protection of life and property when the monarchy was restored. The act was also an attempt at altering historical memory concerning the latest wars. It was illegal to mention "any name or names, or other words of reproach tending to revive the memory of the late differences or the occasions thereof."¹⁷

The English Civil War stands as one of the most traumatic episodes in the nation's history, leaving behind a profound collective trauma. The death rate reached the same percentage of the national population as during World War I.¹⁸ Apart from the many casualties in battle, the region was

¹² Bennett, *The English Civil War*, 202.

¹³ Bennett, *The English Civil War*, 226; Barry Coward and Peter Gaunt, *The Stuart Age: England 1603-1714, Fifth Edition* (New York: Routledge, 2017), 223, 257.

¹⁴ Bennett, *The English Civil War*, 146, 202; Ross and Scott-Baumann, *Women Poets*, 3-6.

¹⁵ Bennett, *The English Civil War*, 171; Coward and Gaunt, *The Stuart Age*, 275.

¹⁶ Ross and Scott-Baumann, *Women Poets*, 3-6.

¹⁷ Paulina Kewes, "Acts of Remembrance, Acts of Oblivion: Rhetoric, Law, and National Memory in Early Restoration England," in *Ritual, Routine, and Regime: Repetition in Early Modern British and European Cultures*, ed. Lorna Clymer (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2006), 113.

¹⁸ Peter Gaunt, *The English Civil War: A Military History* (London: I.B. Tauris, 2014), 13.

ravaged by widespread plundering of houses, rape, and disease. Everyone who lived on the British Isles in the seventeenth century was involved in the war in one way or another.¹⁹

Both Hutchinson and her husband played significant parts during the English Civil War. John served as Governor of Nottingham Castle as he fought on the Parliamentary side as a radical republican.²⁰ Hutchinson herself nursed soldiers in the castle: “having some excellent balsoms and plaisters in her closett with the assistance of a gentleman that had some skill, drest all their wounds.”²¹ Archival evidence moreover proves that she was largely involved in the administration of the Nottingham garrison.²² The *Memoirs* make clear that the war placed a heavy burden on the lives of the Hutchinsons. This is reinforced by John’s growing ambiguous position in this conflict, as he signed the King’s death warrant. When Cromwell was appointed Lord Protector of the Protectorate in 1653, John turned against him since he was dissatisfied with how Cromwell’s tyrannous behavior ruined his only hope for a republican alternative to monarchy. As an opponent of both the King and Cromwell, he held a dubious, renegade position. Although John was included in the *Act of Indemnity and Oblivion* which granted him general pardon, he was later arrested on suspicion of complicity in a plot to restore the old Long Parliament.²³ He was imprisoned in the Tower of London and afterwards in Sandown Castle in Kent, where he died in 1664.²⁴

It is highly intriguing that Hutchinson wrote her *Memoirs* exactly in this period, a text with an undeniably polemical and dissenting voice in the contemporary political climate. Hutchinson carries a sharp rebellious anti-Royalist sentiment and does absolutely not conceal that she still dreams of a republican England based on the Puritan religion. Consequently, it would have been risky for her to publish the *Memoirs* during her own lifetime.²⁵

HISTORIOGRAPHICAL OVERVIEW OF WOMEN AS HISTORICAL WRITERS: *HERSTORY* OR *HISTORY*?

Due to resistance of the Royalist branch of the family, the *Memoirs* were only published in 1806 by descendant Julius Hutchinson. They became a best-seller during the nineteenth century, and Hutchinson became an established name and national treasure of England’s literary history. In this century alone, four editions were published. Hutchinson was one of the few women writers

¹⁹ Erin Peters, “Trauma Narratives of the English Civil War,” *Journal for Early Modern Cultural Studies* 16, no. 1 (2016): 79-80.

²⁰ Gheeraert-Graffeuille, *Lucy Hutchinson and the English Revolution*, 1.

²¹ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 99.

²² Ann Hughes, “‘The Governor’s wife’: Women and Garrisons in the English Civil War,” *The Seventeenth Century* 38, no. 3 (2023): 470.

²³ David Norbrook, “Memoirs and Oblivion: Lucy Hutchinson and the Restoration,” *Huntington Library Quarterly* 75, no. 2 (2012): 242.

²⁴ Devoney Looser, *British Women Writers and the Writing of History, 1670-1820* (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 2000), 37.

²⁵ Gheeraert-Graffeuille, *Lucy Hutchinson and the English Revolution*, 1.

that was not entirely forgotten. She is known to a wider public as a Civil War chronicler, especially in her own Nottingham. Additionally, she is well-known by scholars of the Civil War and of seventeenth-century women writers.²⁶

However, she is little known to historians of history. Scholars have mainly been interested in the *Memoirs*' novelistic qualities. However, they are more than a literary enterprise. What makes them so fascinating is its "generic hybridity": it oscillates between romance, life-writing, satire, portraits, and history, its most often downplayed dimension.²⁷ These historiographical aspects were minimized by nineteenth- and twentieth-century historians due to transformations of history between the seventeenth and nineteenth century. History became a professional, academic discipline where partisan, subjective accounts of the past in the form of memoirs or other forms of life-writing were ill-suited.²⁸ These were relegated to the realm of literature, poetry, and fiction. The strong association between the novel and a female reader- and authorship rendered the historiographical aspects of women's writing like the *Memoirs* even more secondary to the literary.²⁹

Like Anne Fanshawe (1625-1680), Margaret Cavendish (1623-1673), and Anne Clifford (1590-1676), Hutchinson was one of many women whose historical ambitions did not survive the test of time.³⁰ Research on early modern history writing has until the second half of the twentieth century almost exclusively focused on male historians, such as Edward Hyde of Clarendon (1609-1674) and David Hume (1711-1776).³¹

During the 1970's, a movement rooted in the second feminist wave emerged which aimed to illustrate that women were just as important in history as men. This not only refers to women being historical agents, but also creators of history.³² Instead of *his*-story, a field gendered as masculine, these feminist scholars coined the term *her*-story, which proposes an alternative, female perspective on the past. *Herstory*-scholarship started a search for histories "for women, told by women about women, which was meant to fill in the gaps of male history."³³ In its early

²⁶ Gheeraert-Graffeuille, *Lucy Hutchinson and the English Revolution*, 1-2; Looser, *British Women Writers*, 28; David Norbrook, "Lucy Hutchinson in her Fifth Century," *The Seventeenth Century* 38, no. 3 (2023): 369.

²⁷ Gheeraert-Graffeuille, *Lucy Hutchinson and the English Revolution* 35; Looser, *British Women Writers*, 30.

²⁸ Robert Mayer, *History and the Early English Novel: Matters of Fact from Bacon to Defoe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 76.

²⁹ Looser, *British Women Writers*, 29-30, 46-47, 60.

³⁰ Looser, *British Women Writers*, 15, 27; Katharine Hodgkin, "Women, Memory and Family History in Seventeenth-Century England," in *Memory before modernity*, eds. Erika Kuijpers, Judith Pollmann, Johannes Müller, and Jasper van der Steen (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 300.

³¹ A look at James Thompson's work *A History of Historical Writing* shows that male figures receive significant attention, while there are few references to female historians; James Thompson, *A History of Historical Writing, Volume 1: From the Earliest Times to the End of the Seventeenth Century* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1942), 626, 647, 676; Similar findings in Eduard Fueter and Emile Jeanmaire, *Histoire de l'historiographie moderne* (Paris: Félix Alcan, 1914), 759-74.

³² Looser, *British Women Writers*, 1.

³³ Gheeraert-Graffeuille, *Lucy Hutchinson and the English Revolution*, 23.

stages, *herstory*-scholarship mainly focused on the period from the nineteenth century onward, since they assumed that women had no voice in the recording of the past before then.³⁴

However, since the 1980's scholars started to explore female authors from the early modern period which revealed that these women engaged with the past through often overlooked genres such as memoirs, biographies, and diaries—forms not typically associated with mainstream historiography.³⁵ This scholarship still relied on the *herstory*-search for women who wrote about women, to increase female perspectives on the past. Classic examples of such scholars are Gerda Lerner and Mary Spongberg, who revise the history of historiography arguing that women have written history as long as men.³⁶ However, Lerner limits her enterprise to women historians who covered the history of women and Spongberg observes that women's engagement with the past cannot be separated from a growing feminist consciousness and the strife for women's rights.³⁷ They both exclude women who did not write a proto-feminist history.

The term proto-feminism is controversial in feminist scholarship, but generally refers to works that address themes such as gender equality or women's education, which can be regarded as anticipating modern feminism.³⁸ Proto-feminist historical writers would place women at the centre of their narrative rather than men, which resulted in a deviation from mainstream historical accounts.³⁹ Although *féminisme* was only coined by Charles Fourier in 1837, women had engaged with such ideas long before. The prefix *proto* signals an anticipation of twentieth-century feminism, though not necessarily recognizable as contemporary feminism.

This thesis focuses on the second aspect of *herstory*: it not only opened the search for early modern proto-feminist writings, but evolved into the idea that there was a distinctly *feminine* way of doing history, emphasizing the particularity of the female pen: women would approach the past in female terms.⁴⁰ Nathalie Zemon Davis was one of the first scholars to address the question

³⁴ The focus on nineteenth-century women has remained dominant. In *The Gender of History* (2000), for instance, Bonnie Smith demonstrates that women between 1800 and 1940 played an active role in historical writing. Despite Smith's commendable attempt to establish a theoretical foundation for women's historiography, her study remains confined to the modern period and thereby continues to obscure the contributions of early modern women to the writing of history. Looser, *British Women Writers*, 1-7; Bonnie Smith, *The Gender of History: Men, Women, and Historical Practice* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2000), 13.

³⁵ Gheeraert-Graffeuille, *Lucy Hutchinson and the English Revolution*, 23; Looser, *British Women Writers*, 10.

³⁶ Mary Spongberg, *Writing Women's History since the Renaissance* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002), X.

³⁷ Gerda Lerner, *The Creation of Feminist Consciousness: from the Middle Ages to eighteen-seventy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993), 247-9; Looser, *British women writers*, 6; Spongberg, *Writing Women's History*, 8.

³⁸ Oxford English Dictionary, lemma "feminism (n.)," sense 3, accessed 21.04.2025, <https://doi.org/10.1093/OED/6092042326>.

³⁹ It is important to note here that the concept of feminism itself is subject to a great deal of debate and complexity; Karen Offen, "Defining feminism: a comparative historical approach," *Signs* 14, no. 1 (1988): 126, 131; Looser, *British women writers*, 3-6, 24.

⁴⁰ Looser, *British Women Writers*, 1-27.

whether early modern women had distinctive voices in historical writing, in other words whether their histories differed from those written by men. In her contribution to the book *Beyond their sex: Learned women of the European past*, she argues that early modern women historians tended to focus on topics concerning their own environment and sphere, such as the family.⁴¹

This perceived binary opposition between early modern masculine and feminine histories left its mark on later scholarship of the 1990's and 2000's. A classic example of this inheritance is Joan Thirsk's view on history writing. In her 1995 article "The History Women," Thirsk argues that men and women write different histories, with "the men clustering at one end, and the women at the other end of a spectrum."⁴² She identifies the first signs of this divide in the nineteenth century, but perceives the same tendency in her own time. According to Thirsk, the distinction lies in men's focus on public and constitutional histories, as opposed to women's emphasis on the private lives of individuals.⁴³ While Thirsk's 1995 study concentrates on nineteenth-century historians, her contribution to the *Oxford Companion to Local and Family History* extends this thesis to the seventeenth century, the period of the present research. Thirsk writes that women's "different lives make for different viewpoints and yield different insights; hence, in practice, they frequently choose distinctive themes for investigation, have their own styles in research and presentation, and rank their objectives and priorities differently."⁴⁴

Daniel Woolf, too, considered a clear distinction between early modern male and female interactions with the past. He pointed out that "female concerns" such as the family coloured women's conceptualizations of the past in domestic and familial terms.⁴⁵

Roger Hudson similarly reads a tendency to themes such as dowries, births, infant mortality, diseases, and incomes of fathers and husbands in six female accounts of the Civil War.⁴⁶

This overview shows that the *herstory*-opposition between masculine and feminine histories is accompanied by another assumption: women wrote private, family histories; men wrote public, political histories.⁴⁷ This reflects the embedded gendered public-private dichotomy.

Another assumption that stems from the *herstory*-focus on the difference between men and women is that women would write in a more emotional, affective manner. Hudson also

⁴¹ Nathalie Zemon Davis, "Gender and Genre: Women as Historical Writers, 1400-1820," in *Beyond their Sex: Learned Women of the European Past*, ed. Patricia H. Labalme (New York: New York University Press, 1980), 154.

⁴² Joan Thirsk, "The History Women," in *Chattel, Servant or Citizen*, eds. Mary O'Dowd and Sabine Wichert (Belfast: The Institute of Irish Studies, The Queen's University of Belfast, 1995), 5.

⁴³ Thirsk, "The History Women," 1-11.

⁴⁴ Joan Thirsk, "Women Local and Family Historians," in *The Oxford Companion to Local and Family History*, ed. David Hey (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 100.

⁴⁵ Daniel Woolf, "A Feminine Past? Gender, Genre, and Historical Knowledge in England, 1500-1800," *The American Historical Review* 102, no. 3 (1997): 650-51.

⁴⁶ Roger Hudson, *The Grand Quarrel* (London: The Folio Society, 1993), XVIII.

⁴⁷ Daniel Woolf, "A Feminine Past?," 646; Davis, "Gender and Genre," 157.

considers his studied female Civil War accounts a deviation from the male accounts because of their concern with the human passions.⁴⁸ Megan Matchinske similarly emphasized women's more emotional and affective histories.⁴⁹

Since the beginning of this century, scholars began to criticize the essentialist idea of a distinctly *feminine* perspective on the past that comes forth from *herstory*-scholarship.⁵⁰ Devoney Looser for example acknowledges that women played a major part in creating historical discourses apart from the typically female themes:

I argue here that though British women writers of the long eighteenth century contributed significantly to the period's historiographical developments, it was rarely in the uncomplicated, foremotherly, and protofeminist ways that many of us hoped to discover.... It is difficult and dangerous to make sweeping generalizations about women writers' engagements with history, particularly before we have given sufficient attention to the myriad individual authors and texts.⁵¹

In that light, she criticizes that Hutchinson became one of the embodiments of *herstory*-scholarship, which resulted in a reading of Hutchinson's history writing as typically feminine and apolitical. She showed that Hutchinson in fact interacts with more conventional, mainstream themes such as national politics and military history, which scholars that inherited *herstory*-ideas associate with male historians.⁵² She meticulously investigates how Hutchinson lost her status as a historian because of growing gendered associations with the genres of history and fiction, which explains why the *Memoirs* were read as a novel and appreciated for Hutchinson's patriarchal submission and idealized domesticity.⁵³ Looser shows that the *Memoirs* are on the contrary a highly political texts full of descriptions of battles and political machinations between friends and enemies: "Hutchinson wrote history on a larger scale than many of her [male] contemporaries."⁵⁴ She additionally shows that the romantic elements in the *Memoirs* should not be interpreted as a deviation from mainstream, male, political histories. By showing the interconnectedness of romance and history, she blurs the separation between female romance and male history.

⁴⁸ Hudson, *The Grand Quarrel*, XVIII.

⁴⁹ Megan Matchinske, "History's 'Silent Whispers': Representing the Past through Feeling and Form," *Attending to Early Modern Women: Conflict and Concord*, ed. Karen Nelson (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2013), 60.

⁵⁰ Longfellow, *Women and Religious Writing*, 180-208; Looser, *British Women Writers*, 3, 8.

⁵¹ Looser, *British Women Writers*, 3, 8.

⁵² Looser, *British Women Writers*, 38.

⁵³ Looser, *British Women Writers*, 47.

⁵⁴ Looser, *British Women Writers*, 38.

In 2022, the first monograph on the *Memoirs* appeared: *Lucy Hutchinson and the English Revolution: Gender, Genre, and History Writing* by Claire Gheeraert-Graffeuille. She took Looser's call to heart and delivered a less generalized approach to women's historiography which does not draw a strict line between masculine and feminine historiography. In her introduction, she also criticizes the *herstory*-approach on female history-writing and is the most recent voice in this debate.⁵⁵ She rejects that women were excluded from main-stream historiography and had "specifically female historiographical practices and forms to be discovered in the margins of 'male' history."⁵⁶ To include women in the history of historiography, she states that they should be submitted to the same analysis as male-authored histories.⁵⁷ She argues that there is more gender fluidity in political history writing than is often assumed. The purpose of her monograph is consequently to juxtapose the *Memoirs* to other Restoration histories "to show why and how the *Memoirs* may qualify as an important piece of Restoration historiography."⁵⁸

The conversation between *herstory*-inheritors and scholars like Looser and Gheeraert-Graffeuille follows the general tendencies of gender-studies. In 1988, Joan Scott introduced gender as a category of analysis in historical research. She described how women's history evolved into gender history during the 1980's. She was aware of the risk within women's history, the tendency in this approach to think in terms of strong dichotomies between men and women.⁵⁹ Scholars like Davis, Woolf, Thirsk, Hudson, and Matchinske fail to overcome this risk, since they perceive a strict boundary between male mainstream history and female deviating historical writings, which they inherited from the *herstory*-movement. In conclusion, research on early modern female history writing for a long time followed the tendencies of women's history. Looser and Gheeraert-Graffeuille, however, employ gender as an analytical category. Gender history, in contrast to women's history, rather focuses on relationships *between* the genders instead of one of the genders. Both Looser and Gheeraert-Graffeuille demonstrate Hutchinson's interaction with genres and topics generally associated with the male gender.

RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

Herstory led scholars to search for characteristics of Hutchinson's writings that proved her feminine, private and emotional perspective on the past.⁶⁰ Although *herstory*-inspired research was a necessary and valuable step in recovering Hutchinson as a history writer worthy of study, I do support Looser's and Gheeraert-Graffeuille's attempt to leave the *herstory*-approach behind.

⁵⁵ Gheeraert-Graffeuille, *Lucy Hutchinson and the English Revolution*, 23-5.

⁵⁶ Gheeraert-Graffeuille, *Lucy Hutchinson and the English Revolution*, 23.

⁵⁷ Gheeraert-Graffeuille, *Lucy Hutchinson and the English Revolution*, 25.

⁵⁸ Gheeraert-Graffeuille, *Lucy Hutchinson and the English Revolution*, 28.

⁵⁹ Joan Scott, *Gender and the Politics of History* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1988), 20-1.

⁶⁰ For example Matchinske, "History's "Silent Whispers," 60; Thirsk, "Women," 100.

The fact that Hutchinson wrote as a woman undeniably deeply informed her writing, but only focusing on that aspect may contribute to the isolation of Hutchinson from the broader canon of history writing and neglect her interaction with conventional historiography.⁶¹ Historians of history have a long way to go to adequately include women in their theories. To do this, a revision of these frameworks is required, because the old ones tend towards essentialism.

The case-study of Lucy Hutchinson is a step in this revisiting of early modern women's histories. As shown, the *herstory*-dichotomy between masculine and feminine histories is accompanied by other embedded assumptions that still influence how contemporary scholars approach early modern women's history writings. I will show how these assumptions concretely influence scholarship on Hutchinson: *Herstory* made the *Memoirs* a typically feminine historian who wrote a local, private family history, with an emotionally charged style. My research asks the following question: **How do Lucy Hutchinson's *Memoirs of the Life of Colonel Hutchinson* concretely subvert the *herstory*-paradigm?** This question is supported by three sub-questions, each corresponding to one of the three main chapters of this thesis: (1) How do the *Memoirs* relate to the seventeenth-century historiographical landscape? (2) How do the *Memoirs* transcend the opposition between family history and political history and the accompanied gendered public-private dichotomy? (3) How do the *Memoirs* refute the assumption that Hutchinson expressed a feminine, affective, emotional voice when writing about the Civil War?

This approach is innovating, since the *Memoirs* have never been extensively researched on the basis of the intertwinement of these binary categories. Looser and Gheeraert-Graffeuille have spent some attention to them, but they were not yet thoroughly addressed. My research demonstrates that upholding binary assumptions obscures important content of Hutchinson's work. I will show that the perseverance of these premises casts a shadow over her own analysis of the Civil War. It conceals Hutchinson's own aims with her *Memoirs*, which was not necessarily to feminize the recent English past.⁶² There is so much more to be discovered on Hutchinson, an underexplored historian who gives a complex account of the English Civil War from a unique position between the national state affairs and their outrun in her own locality and family. I offer a novel perspective on female historiography that takes the complexity of Hutchinson's enterprise into account, by stepping over embedded prejudices and generalizations of what is deemed feminine and masculine. Only this revision of her history writing allows to fully grasp her project.

Although it may appear that I seek to remove gender from analyses of the *Memoirs*, I believe that this research contributes meaningfully to a gender history of historiography. Rather than

⁶¹ Gheeraert-Graffeuille, *Lucy Hutchinson and the English Revolution*, 28.

⁶² Gheeraert-Graffeuille, *Lucy Hutchinson and the English Revolution*, 28.

approaching the text by posing gender-specific questions, I argue that a gender history also involves approaching women's texts in a nuanced and complex way.

This does not imply that I claim women wrote under identical conditions as men, or that their historical narratives were indistinguishable. The issue is not that they differ, but the way in which *herstory*-scholarship defined these differences. By deconstructing the binary oppositions that underpin *herstory*'s arguments, this thesis aims to open the historiographical field for women's inclusion as integral participants in the writing of history, and not just as bearers of alternative, *feminine* histories.

With this individual case study, I hope to inspire others to work together to develop a more complex history of historiography. My research prompts us to rethink the terms we, modern scholars, project on past female historical thinkers such as Hutchinson, because if we don't, the content of women's histories will stay misinterpreted and oversimplified.

SOURCE MATERIAL

The original manuscript of the *Memoirs* is conserved in the castle of Nottingham. Consequently, I had to draw on an alternative edition to conduct my research. Every edition has its own flaws; editors did not always pay attention to what the author had in mind. The first editor was Julius Hutchinson in 1806, a descendant of John. He omitted more than 9000 words and modified sentences, although according to himself, he was faithful to the original editions. He likewise changed the spelling of some words to make it look more authentic.⁶³

David Norbrook hypothesizes that his modifications are due to a sense of caution about publishing a highly politicized text from a woman. The 1806 edition focuses on passages that show Hutchinson's subordination to her husband and takes the attention away from her more political outlooks. This does not mean, however, that Julius Hutchinson opposed Hutchinson's political ideas. After his death, the original manuscript went missing.⁶⁴

The distance between the original manuscript and the editions grew further with Henry George Bohn's edition in 1846. He smoothed out the polemical and radical edges of the narrative, portraying Hutchinson as a more conventional author. C.H. Firth edited the following edition in 1885 which was rather based on Julius Hutchinson's than on Bohn's edition. Julius Hutchinson came to be regarded an authoritative voice on the text, instead of Lucy Hutchinson herself. In 1904, Harrold Child published a new edition, which carried on this trend. In 1908 an edition by Everyman's Library followed.⁶⁵

⁶³ David Norbrook, "'But a copie': Textual Authority and Gender in Editions of The life of John Hutchinson," in *Ashgate Critical Essays on Women Writers in England, 1550-1770 volume 5*, ed. Mihoko Suzuki (Surrey: Ashgate Publishing, 2009), 281-2.

⁶⁴ Norbrook, "'But a copie'," 282-7.

⁶⁵ Norbrook, "'But a copie'," 284-8.

The tendency to edit the text in favour of its patriarchal and submissive elements continued, even when the original manuscript resurfaced in 1918. Syndey Race tried to highlight the importance of this manuscript, but following editions still relied mostly on Julius Hutchinson's and Bohn's editions. In 1973, James Sutherland overcame the editorial dominance of Julius Hutchinson and Bohn, and returned to the original manuscript. However, he kept the legacy of Julius Hutchinson alive, for example by taking over the title he had given to the manuscript in 1806, the *Memoirs of the Life of Colonel Hutchinson*. Like Julius Hutchinson, he also omitted an epilogue, which did appear in Neill Keeble's 1995 edition.⁶⁶

Norbrook points out how all editions up until now still heavily rely on Julius Hutchinson's and Bohn's edition. Norbrook himself is now creating a new edition that retains the language of the original manuscript and restores the voice of Hutchinson herself, although he acknowledges that he will also "face the problem of some kind of negotiation between the physical artefact of the manuscript and different conventions of the printed word."⁶⁷

I will make use of the 1973-edition from Sutherland, which in general stays closer to the original manuscript than Keeble's. Sutherland even added some passages that were omitted by Julius Hutchinson and with his edition appear in print for the first time. Sutherland modernized the spelling, added punctuation marks and split up long paragraphs to make the text more legible for the modern reader.⁶⁸ Just like Sutherland, I will keep using Julius Hutchinson's title the *Memoirs of the Life of Colonel Hutchinson*, instead of the *Life of Colonel Hutchinson*, the title Hutchinson gave to a part of her manuscript. First of all, this is due to the fact that using the *Life of Colonel Hutchinson* might cause confusion. The *Memoirs* are a three-part corpus of sources, of which the middle one is called the *Life*. The *Memoirs* function as an umbrella term for the three parts. In addition, the title *Memoirs*, chosen by her first publisher, was a well-established term since the 1680's for the historiographical genre that combines historical and biographical narratives.⁶⁹ Gheeraert-Graffeuille states that memoirs is anything but an anachronistic term, but adequately grasps the historiographical value.⁷⁰

⁶⁶ Norbrook, "'But a copie'," 289-91.

⁶⁷ Norbrook, "'But a copie'," 291.

⁶⁸ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, XXV; private correspondence with David Norbrook.

⁶⁹ Neill Keeble, "Lucy Hutchinson and the Business of Memoirs," *The Review of English Studies* 73, no. 311 (2022): 705.

⁷⁰ Gheeraert-Graffeuille, *Lucy Hutchinson and the English Revolution*, 14.

METHODOLOGY AND STRUCTURE

I will perform a close and contextual reading of the *Memoirs*, of which I have a searchable OCR version to more easily navigate the dense 292-page text.⁷¹

Since this research refutes the established theoretical framework, it is difficult to rely on a clear-cut, existing methodology, since I am creating one myself. I take inspiration from the Cambridge school of contextualism in the field of intellectual history, with Quentin Skinner as the leading figure. Concretely, this means that I take into account the socio-political circumstances in which Hutchinson operates during the writing process, and the events she recalls.⁷² I am also inspired by Hayden White's theory of narrativism in historiography, specifically the concept of *explanation by emplotment*, since I will address how Hutchinson constructs a specific plot to make sense of the past. I am critical of White's structuralist plot structures of tragedy, comedy, romance, and satire. However, I do think it is fruitful to trace "the "meaning" of a story by identifying the *kind of story* that has been told."⁷³ To support my argument, I rely on theoretical frameworks from diverse historical fields, as this research finds itself at the crossover of the history of historiography, intellectual history, the history of political thought, the history of philosophy, and gender history.

In the first chapter, I will offer a comprehensive overview of the content of the *Memoirs*. Afterwards, I will show how the *Memoirs* respond to contemporary historiographical practices. To do this, it is important to consider Hutchinson's complex purpose of writing the *Memoirs*, which is at the same time a counter-history of the Civil War and an attempt to restore her husband's reputation.

The second chapter deconstructs the often implied separation between a feminine, private, family history and a masculine, public, political history. I will demonstrate how scholars projected this binary on Hutchinson's *Memoirs* and how this is embedded in the gendered assumption that the private and the public are two separated realms, which a considerable amount of scholars have refuted. I join this research field on the basis of an analysis of the *Memoirs*, which offers considerable proof for the deconstruction of the dichotomies of family and politics, and private and public. To support this, the chapter is divided into five sections. (1) A first part will look into how the *Memoirs'* family-oriented passages are interwoven with a broader political message, which puts the assumed dichotomy between family and political history on edge. (2) Secondly, I look into how the categories of private and public function in the *Memoirs*. How does she define

⁷¹ OCR = optical character recognition.

⁷² Darrin McMahon and Samuel Moyn, "Introduction: Interim Intellectual History," in *Rethinking Modern European Intellectual History*, eds. Darrin McMahon and Samuel Moyn (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), 7.

⁷³ Hayden White, *The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Europe* (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1993), 7.

these categories herself, and how does this correspond to or deviate from our contemporary conceptions of the public and the private? (3) Then, I look into how Hutchinson relies on the domestic, the household as a background for political events. For the last two sub-questions, I will consider the broader context in which the *Memoirs* and Hutchinson's ideas circulated, which supports the hypothesis that Hutchinson does not perceive a strict boundary between the public and the private. (4) I reflect on the circulation of Hutchinson's manuscript in her own time and argue that a non-published text also has public features. (5) In the final part, I will argue that Hutchinson, and consequently the *Memoirs*, should be situated within the contemporary English socio-economical manorial system, which entailed public rights. This also challenges the rigid dichotomy between the public and the private.

The third chapter of this research is dedicated to the assertion that women's histories focus more on affect, emotion, and passions. Hutchinson indeed strongly emphasizes that human passions are the cause of the failed republican and Puritan cause. However, I show that Hutchinson's conceptualization of the destructive role of passions in the history of the war is way more complex than just an emotional touch to her narrative. (1) After an overview of scholars that connected Hutchinson's focus on passions to her gender, (2) I point out that the passions were central to contemporary philosophical thought. I outline how Stoicism, Augustinianism, and Thomism influenced seventeenth-century theories of the passions. (3) Relying on the insights of the previous sections, I offer an exhaustive analysis of the anthropological role of the passions in Hutchinson's history of the war, in which she relies on Thomism and especially Augustinianism. I show how Hutchinson's history of the war revolves around excessive passions and factionalism of local Nottingham men as well as Cromwell, the King and Parliament. Moreover, I will demonstrate how she connects these passions of individuals to her broader political analysis of the war, and how she fits this in in a theological framework centred around Divine grace and providence.

1. THE *MEMOIRS OF THE LIFE OF COLONEL HUTCHINSON*: STRUCTURE AND PURPOSE

1.1 *TO MY CHILDREN*

The *Memoirs* were originally divided into several parts, the structure of which Sutherland has retained in the text. A first part is called *To my children*, of which Hutchinson made two versions, one of which stops abruptly and was presumably never finished. Sutherland included the other more complete version.¹

To my Children consists of a dedication, in which Hutchinson informs her eight surviving children about why she is undertaking this enterprise.² She will trace their father's path, in order to attempt to continue his goal to "instruct the children of this erring generation," referring to the Restoration.³ The text mainly consists of an apology of her late husband, in which she puts herself in a vulnerable position and claims that "her unskillfull pen" will never be able to describe the virtues of her husband so adequately, an often recurring formulation of female writers who wish to avoid the suspicion of writing for their own ends.⁴ However, she states that the "world's weak eies" needs "this medium."⁵ After this, she compares John to God and points out that John is just a "Copie" of His excellence.⁶ She adds a strongly Calvinist flavour to her humble stance as a woman writer.⁷ After this spiritual note, she addresses two chapters to "His Description" and "His Vertues," in which she recounts his looks, his health, his interests, and his other good qualities.⁸

1.2 THE *LIFE OF COLONEL HUTCHINSON*

The second part consists of the *Life of Colonel Hutchinson* (henceforth: the *Life*). It is important to note that Hutchinson based this on an earlier version, which Sutherland refers to as the Notebook, a more detailed draft of the final version. There is evidence that the Notebook was written sometime after the events she describes, though not years later as was the case with the final

¹ Lucy Hutchinson, *Memoirs of the Life of Colonel Hutchinson* (c. 1664), ed. James Sutherland (London: Oxford University Press, 1973), XXII.

² Susan Cook, "'The story I most particularly intend': the narrative style of Lucy Hutchinson," *Critical Survey* 5, no. 3 (1993): 271.

³ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 1.

⁴ Claire Gheeraert-Graffeuille, *Lucy Hutchinson and the English Revolution: Gender, Genre, and History Writing* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2022), 73.

⁵ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 1.

⁶ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 2.

⁷ David Norbrook, "'But a copie': Textual Authority and Gender in Editions of The life of John Hutchinson," in *Ashgate Critical Essays on Women Writers in England, 1550-1770 volume 5*, ed. Mihoko Suzuki (Surrey: Ashgate Publishing, 2009), 278.

⁸ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 3-14.

version, *The Life*.⁹ The manuscript of the *Life* is clearly a working-document; while largely legible, it contains sections that are crossed out and moved. According to Sutherland, most of these edits were made by Lucy Hutchinson herself, although some revisions are presumably attributable to Julius Hutchinson.¹⁰ Hutchinson did not split up the *Life* in several sections like she did in *To my children*, she writes it as a continuous text. I will now provide a chronological summary concerning the most important themes she touches upon. I am aware that Hutchinson's account of the events is shaped by her own experience. My goal is not to check the accuracy, but rather examining how she builds her historical narrative.

Hutchinson begins with an account of John's family, especially John's parents. She highlights their virtuous lifestyle.¹¹ She then moves on to John's birth, childhood, university career in Cambridge, and how they met.¹² She recounts how they got married and had children, some of which died at a young age. At this time, around 1640, John is educating himself in "the doctrines of the Lord."¹³ She ends this part of the narrative with the observation that the war is looming, the political situation being destabilized at the time because of the Bishop's War.¹⁴

She then delves into English history, starting with Protestantism reaching the British Isles: "When the dawne of the Gospell began to breake upon this Isle after the darke midnight of Papacy..."¹⁵ She moves from Henry VIII, over Queen Elisabeth I, to Mary Queen of Scots and Mary's son James I, to end her story with the political tumult under Charles I. In this chapter, she offers her view of the English history from the late middle ages until her times, in which she analyses both the religious and political policies of the different Kings and Queens. Hutchinson includes the beginning of the War of the Three Kingdoms, with the Bishops' War and the Irish Catholic rebellion. Her emphasis throughout these pages lies on how court became more and more corrupt over time. Another common thread throughout this part is the starting and growing suppression of Puritans.¹⁶

She consequently moves back to John's story, around the time the Irish rebellion broke loose in 1641. She recalls how both the Royalists and the Parliamentarians raise an army, and how this has consequences for the local situation in Nottingham, where the King's nephew Prince Rupert (1619-1682) installed a Royalist garrison in 1642.¹⁷ She then moves to an overview of the Royalist and Parliamentarian families in Nottingham.¹⁸

⁹ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, XXII.

¹⁰ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, XXIV.

¹¹ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 15-22.

¹² Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 22-32.

¹³ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 35.

¹⁴ Martyn Bennett, *The English Civil War: A Historical Companion* (Brimscombe: Tempus, 2004), 45.

¹⁵ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 38.

¹⁶ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 38-53.

¹⁷ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 53-60.

¹⁸ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 61-62.

Over the next twenty pages, Hutchinson describes the first phase of the war in Nottingham including the local military implications. She ends this part with the declaration that John became Governor of the castle and the town of Nottingham in 1643, after which she offers an architectural description of the castle.¹⁹ While providing an account of the defence of Nottingham, a new theme appears in the foreground: the start of reputational damage for John, and accompanying mutinies and secret plots against his person. Meanwhile, the war in Nottingham escalates and Hutchinson offers a meticulous description of the fought battles and the ongoing discontent with John from the townsmen.²⁰

Hutchinson often switches between local and national events: "It will be not amisse in this place to carry on the Parliament story, that wee may the better judge things at home when we know the condition of affaires abroad."²¹ Then follows a three-page long overview of the national political events in 1643. She mentions how at the time, Parliament became divided between an Independent and a Presbyterian faction and how the King hoped this division would serve his ends.²² The main difference between these two groups concerns their vision of the Church of England's structure. While Presbyterians wanted to organize the Church on the basis of a hierarchical system, Independents emphasize the autonomy of several co-existing congregations.²³ John identified himself more with the Independent faction.²⁴ In this phase of the war, Hutchinson addresses how Cromwell increasingly draws power to himself.²⁵

After this short overview of the Parliament's situation, Hutchinson moves back to Nottingham for the period 1644-1645. Opposition and mutiny against John reaches an unprecedented scale, reinforced by new attacks on Nottingham. Meanwhile, however, in 1646 John was elected as a member of Parliament for Nottinghamshire. She describes how, during this period, the Scots received the King's person who had been stuck at Oxford which marked the end of the First Civil War.²⁶

During the small peace-period between the two wars when negotiations between Parliament and King took place, Hutchinson recounts how John got sick with rheumatism.²⁷ In 1647, John resigned as Governor of the Castle, and in 1648 the Second Civil War broke loose. She starts to pay more and more attention to misconduct of Cromwell during the description of the Second Civil War. From now on, the national and local level are more often treated interchangeably, since John was more involved on a national level through his membership of the

¹⁹ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 63-84.

²⁰ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 93-125.

²¹ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 125.

²² Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 125-27.

²³ Bennett, *The English Civil War*, 124.

²⁴ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, XIII.

²⁵ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 127.

²⁶ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 128-70.

²⁷ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 170-175.

executive Council of State, and his personal acquaintance with Cromwell.²⁸ At the end of this chapter, the Second Civil War ends, the King is brought to trial and eventually sentenced to death in 1649. She does not pay considerable attention to the King's decapitation, but more to how her husband signed his death warrant and became a regicide.²⁹

Afterwards, Hutchinson recounts how England became a republic under the tyrant Cromwell. When he reigned, John did not take up public office. When Richard succeeded Cromwell, Hutchinson outlines how debates about a possible return of the Stuart monarchy were initiated, which John strongly opposed.³⁰ After the Restoration, Hutchinson describes this turbulent period and recounts how John had to go to court, and then hide again while trying to live a quiet life. The last part of the *Life* covers John's last year in several prisons.³¹

1.3 AUTOBIOGRAPHICAL FRAGMENT

After the *Life*, Sutherland includes an autobiographical fragment about Hutchinson's own life. This fragment is based on Julius Hutchinson's edition, since Sutherland was not able to find the original manuscript.³² In this fragment, Hutchinson offers a perspective on her own life, starting with her birth. She declares thankfulness to God for making her an English citizen, and delves into the English past to highlight its exceptional path in history. She mentions the Romans that conquered Britain, the Picts that moved into Scotland, the Saxons that came after the Romans, and the Normans after them. She consequently reflects on how she came into the world at the best time and place, and is grateful for her parents' meeting. After an elaboration on her parents' and grandparent's life, she ends this fragment with her own life and education.³³

1.4 PURPOSE AND HISTORIOGRAPHICAL CONTEXT

This summary of the *Memoirs* prompts the question of Hutchinson's underlying motivation for writing them. Gheeraert-Graffeuille suggests a twofold purpose. First, Hutchinson aims to restore her husband's reputation, which was harmed severely during the Civil War, the Interregnum and after the Restoration.³⁴ The second purpose Hutchinson wanted to establish according to Gheeraert-Graffeuille was the attempt to offer a counter-history of the English Civil war at a time when Royalist historiography was dominant.³⁵

²⁸ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 175-190.

²⁹ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 190.

³⁰ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 199-227.

³¹ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 245-77.

³² Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, XXI.

³³ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 278-90.

³⁴ Gheeraert-Graffeuille, *Lucy Hutchinson and the English Revolution*, 22.

³⁵ Gheeraert-Graffeuille, *Lucy Hutchinson and the English Revolution*, 45-6.

Gheeraert-Graffeuille argues that politics only come second and that she mainly writes the *Memoirs* out of love for her husband.³⁶ I argue that neither is more important than the other. Without her husband as the main-character, the pillar around which she builds her narrative, there would be no counter-history. He is her connection to the broader political events. Conversely, her husband's life was so much shaped by the conflict, that telling his story automatically means sending a political message.

The observation that Hutchinson combines a personal with a political narrative aligns with Yuval Harari's 2012 book *Renaissance Military Memoirs: War, History and Identity, 1450–1600*. Hutchinson's *Memoirs* cannot be described exclusively by the category of military memoirs and were written after the period Harari covers. He also defines *Memoirs* as a genre "in which their authors appear as protagonists."³⁷ This is also not applicable to Hutchinson, since John mainly takes the stage in her narrative, apart from her autobiographical fragment.

However, Harari does offer interesting perspectives about the genre of memoirs. He describes how scholars struggle to define what distinguishes memoirs from other genres. They in general agree that memoirs are defined by a combination of life-story and history, of a historical narrative with a personal narrative. The last decades, scholars have reached consensus that Hutchinson blends life-writing and history. Robert Mayer for example describes the works of Hutchinson, Edward Hyde and Richard Baxter (1615-1691) as all occupying "a borderline position between lifewriting and historiography."³⁸

However, Harari calls into question that scholars tend to put these memoirs on a continuum, with life-story or autobiography at one end and history at the other. He states that scholars that study military memoirs are fascinated by the dichotomy between life-story and history:

Understanding where exactly the borderline between lifestory and history passes and what relations prevail across it is tantamount in their eyes to understanding memoirs, and would pinpoint the exact location occupied by memoirs on the history–autobiography continuum.³⁹

In contrast, he argues that although elements of both life-story and history are present in the texts, the authors themselves did not seem to apply any kind of distinction between these categories. "They are mixed together any which way, as if they were one and the same thing."⁴⁰ In his research,

³⁶ Gheeraert-Graffeuille, *Lucy Hutchinson and the English Revolution*, 21.

³⁷ Yuval Noah Harari, *Renaissance Military Memoirs: War, History and Identity, 1450–1600* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2012), 17.

³⁸ Robert Mayer, *History and the Early English Novel: Matters of Fact from Bacon to Defoe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 76.

³⁹ Harari, *Renaissance Military Memoirs*, 10.

⁴⁰ Harari, *Renaissance Military Memoirs*, 10.

Harari does not assume that military memoirs are subject to the dichotomy of life-story and history, because of the risk for anachronism.

Harari's findings are equally relevant for the historiographical landscape of the late seventeenth century, the period under study. This period is often associated with the historical revolution, a rise of empiricist, antiquarian accounts of the past driven by a search for the truth, for facts.⁴¹ These historians strongly relied on historical documents and primary materials.⁴² However, these scientific approaches to history did not replace all other forms of historical writing. Histories that deviate from this scientific, empiricist form of history are, however, often overlooked in histories of historiography because of the tendency to regard the historical revolution as a stepping stone in what we consider to be modern history today.⁴³

Alongside these antiquarian, *new* historians, humanists with the ancient historians as an example viewed history as a rhetorical form, in contrast to the scientific histories that in general shared distrust to these rhetorically laden histories. Humanists also insisted that the author should have first-hand knowledge of the events they recount. Yet, as Robert Mayer showed, these two historiographical forms were more than often intertwined and most early modern historians cannot easily be divided into one of these two camps.⁴⁴ He takes Francis Bacon (1561-1626) as an example, who considers historical truth, facts, compatible with a political and rhetorical account of the past based on direct personal experience.⁴⁵

Gheeraert-Graffeuille aptly combines the two seemingly contradictory historiographical traditions, by stating that they emphasized "the facts of experience."⁴⁶ To that end, Bacon moves forward *lives* as the most preferable genre of history writing. The rootedness in personal experience of life-writing, such as memoirs, is for him central to a reliable, true history. Gheeraert-Graffeuille argues that it is plausible that Hutchinson was familiar with Bacon's historiographical thought, as his focus on "facts of experience" can also be found in Hutchinson's narrative.⁴⁷ That Hutchinson can partly be situated in the humanist tradition is not surprising considering her

⁴¹ Gheeraert-Graffeuille, *Lucy Hutchinson and the English Revolution*, 85; Mayer, *History and the Early English Novel*, 9; Barbara Shapiro, *A Culture of Fact: England, 1550-1720* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2000), 40-1.

⁴² Mayer, *History and the Early English Novel*, 21, 28.

⁴³ Gheeraert-Graffeuille, *Lucy Hutchinson and the English Revolution*, 85-6; Mayer, *History and the Early English Novel*, 9.

⁴⁴ Mayer, *History and the Early English Novel*, 28.

⁴⁵ Gheeraert-Graffeuille, *Lucy Hutchinson and the English Revolution*, 93; Mayer, *History and the Early English Novel*, 26-7.

⁴⁶ Gheeraert-Graffeuille, *Lucy Hutchinson and the English Revolution*, 86.

⁴⁷ Gheeraert-Graffeuille, *Lucy Hutchinson and the English Revolution*, 108.

humanist education.⁴⁸ However, she also often applies historical criticism to primary sources to increase her authority as a historical writer as in the following passage:

if any one have a desire of more particular information, there were so many bookes then written as will sufficiently give it them; and although those of our enemies are all fraught with abominable lies, yett if all ours were suppress, even their owne writings impartially consider'd would be a sufficient chronicle of their injustice and oppression.⁴⁹

The importance of memoirs, such as Hutchinson's, as a historiographical genre arose as a result of the epistemological crisis that erupted during the highly divisive period of the Civil War. The pro-monarchy national chronicles were no more to be trusted. Existing histories inevitably became partial, which was not compatible with the strong contemporary emphasis on truth.⁵⁰ That is why contemporaries believed that the most truthful histories at that moment were based on first-hand knowledge of events. Gheeraert-Graffeuille argues that because of that, lives were considered histories instead of biographical accounts during these turbulent times.⁵¹ The qualities of seventeenth-century historical discourses were, as Mayer adequately describes: "rootedness in personal experience, the eliding of formal barriers, the utilitarian cast, the polemical stance."⁵² Hutchinson's text is an example of a clearly biased and personal historical text, which would not have been considered less reliable by contemporaries. Life-writing, such as Hutchinson's *Memoirs*, also often served an educational and exemplar function, which Hutchinson herself proves with her stance that she wants "to instruct the children of this erring generation."⁵³ Consequently, history writing was a form of rhetorics to actively shape historical and future realities.⁵⁴

Harari's findings are confirmed by this seventeenth-century historiographical overview: Hutchinson and her contemporaries did not make a distinction between memoirs and history. Hutchinson has no difficulties switching from John to national events and back again, which she even explicitly states: "It will not be amisse in this place to carry on the Parliament story, that wee may the better judge things at home when we know the condition of affaires abroad. The Queene,..."⁵⁵

⁴⁸ Gheeraert-Graffeuille, *Lucy Hutchinson and the English Revolution*, 29.

⁴⁹ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 37.

⁵⁰ Daniel Woolf, *Reading History in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 76.

⁵¹ Gheeraert-Graffeuille, *Lucy Hutchinson and the English Revolution*, 11.

⁵² Mayer, *History and the Early English Novel*, 76.

⁵³ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 1.

⁵⁴ Mayer, *History and the Early English Novel*, 11.

⁵⁵ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 125.

Hutchinson moreover refers to other histories, such as the official Parliamentarian's historian Thomas May, which reinforces the assumption that Hutchinson regarded her own work as history.⁵⁶ She even critically evaluates May's history as an authoritative source:

I have bene too long for that I intended, a bare sumary, and too short to give a cleare understanding of the righteousnesse of the Parliament's cause; which I shall desire you informe your selves better of by their owne printed papers, and Mr. Maye's History, which I find to be impartially true, so farre as he hath carried it on, saving some little mistakes in his owne judgment, and misinformations which some vaine people gave of them selves, and more indulgence to the King's guilt than can justly be allow'd.⁵⁷

Since there is contextual and textual evidence that Hutchinson herself considers her work history, I also explicitly use the word history to describe her work, instead of biography or memoirs. Memoirs *were* history in the aftermath of the Civil War, regardless of the gender of their authors.

Another distinction between a pair of terms can be refuted by the observation that history and life-writing were one and the same thing: memory and history. In the genre of memoirs, it is logical that the author relies on their own memory since experience and first-hand knowledge are central. However, Hutchinson integrates parts of which she was not an eyewitness, for example when she recalls the reign of Henry VIII and Elizabeth I.⁵⁸ To what extent is that memory or history? According to our modern definitions, these passages would be considered history. Yet, in the seventeenth century there was no clear distinction between what was memory and history, since the main function of history was the preservation of memory.⁵⁹ In that sense, the *Memoirs* inextricably weave memory and history together.

Yet in modern research, memory practices seem to be more associated with women like Hutchinson. Early modern women are often regarded as custodians of collective memory and transmitters of tradition across generations. However, Katharine Hodgkin shows that this perspective minimizes the active analytic research skills these women employ to select and organize information to transform living memory into a written record.⁶⁰ According to Hodgkin, women like Hutchinson teach us that the memory-history distinction is "shifting and contingent, and that our relation to the past is shaped both as history and as memory."⁶¹

⁵⁶ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 53.

⁵⁷ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 53; Devoney Looser, *British Women Writers and the Writing of History, 1670-1820* (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 2000), 36.

⁵⁸ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 41.

⁵⁹ Aleida Assmann, "Transformations between History and Memory," *Social Research: An International Quarterly* 75, no. 1 (2008): 57.

⁶⁰ Hodgkin, "Women, Memory and Family History," 312-3.

⁶¹ Hodgkin, "Women, Memory and Family History," 313.

1.5 CONCLUSION

This overview of the *Memoirs* situated within its historiographical context is essential for an adequate understanding of the *Memoirs*. It also shows that Hutchinson did not necessarily operate in the margins of male history, since her history corresponds to other seventeenth-century histories. Moreover, the observation that life-writing and history, and memory and history were interchangeable in the seventeenth century provides an important foretaste of the next argument: if history and personal narrative were one and the same thing for the seventeenth-century author, why does *herstory*-scholarship insist on drawing such a strict line between the public and the private, and between political and family history?

2. THE PRIVATE AND THE PUBLIC IN HUTCHINSON'S *MEMOIRS*

2.1 THE *HERSTORY*-INHERITANCE: FAMILY AND POLITICAL HISTORY IN MODERN SCHOLARSHIP ON HUTCHINSON

As noted, scholars of early modern female historiography inherited *herstory's* strong reliance on dichotomies between male and female historians. A common distinction they establish is the one between family history and political history. Scholars often study Hutchinson on the basis of these categories.

As noted, one of the most important voices in the history of female history writing is Nathalie Zemon Davis. She argues that women's limited education prevented them from engaging in mainstream forms of history.¹ She draws attention to "the challenges faced by anyone not called to political responsibility who wants to write about it nonetheless."² Although she does not explicitly define "political responsibility," her phrasing underscores the close relationship between politics and mainstream historical writing. She strongly emphasizes that access to public, political life was a prerequisite to write history. Women were excluded from exerting political influence, so they wrote about what they knew in their own immediate circle, "a world that has a temporal rhythm of her own, different from those of kings and revolutions."³

Building on this, Davis identifies two recurring genres in seventeenth-century female history writing. The first one is small-scale religious history, for example of the Ursulines.⁴ The second genre women engaged in is family history. Davis highlights a key difference between male and female perspectives within this genre: men tended to focus on careers and public achievements, while women emphasized the stages of the life-cycle.⁵ She does not specify how she defines stages in life-cycles, but I assume she hints at the stages of life, the progression from birth through childhood, adolescence, adulthood and eventually death. The idea Davis puts forward is that while family histories were by no means exclusive to women historians, men's family histories were oriented towards the public, whereas for women they were oriented towards the private. However, she nuances this and states that when a woman's husband held significant

¹ Nathalie Zemon Davis, "Gender and Genre: Women as Historical Writers, 1400 1820," in *Beyond their Sex: Learned Women of the European Past*, ed. Patricia H. Labalme (New York: New York University Press, 1980), 155.

² Davis, "Gender and Genre," 154.

³ Davis, "Gender and Genre," 157.

⁴ Davis, "Gender and Genre," 161.

⁵ Davis, "Gender and Genre," 162.

political influence, family history could “even in the hands of a mere woman ... expand itself into a form of political history.”⁶

Davis uses the *Life of William Cavendish*, written by Hutchinson’s contemporary Margaret Cavendish, as an example of a family history with a political dimension.⁷ In these memoirs, Cavendish presents a Royalist account of her husband’s life, who, like John Hutchinson, was actively involved in the Civil War.⁸ Cavendish herself reflected theoretically on history writing and distinguished three types of historical writing: general history, concerned with “the ways and customs of the known parts of the world, useful for merchants and travelers;” national history, “best written by statesmen and often political in content;” and particular history.⁹ This third category is not concerned with “the beginning of the world” or “long observations upon the several forms of government.”¹⁰ Cavendish prefers particular history because it “goes not out of its own circle, but turns on its own axis.”¹¹ She adheres to this definition of particular history in the *Life of William Cavendish*, offering a heroic biography of her husband without delving into broader national events. Although Davis acknowledges that Cavendish’s particular history has a political touch because of her husband’s political involvements, it still fits her statement that women wrote about a world “different from those of kings and revolutions,” because it would be limited to the political actions of the husband.¹² According to Davis, Hutchinson imitated Cavendish.¹³ There is no proof that the two women knew each other in life, but scholars assume that there was a dialectic between them. Hutchinson was undeniably influenced by Cavendish’s work.¹⁴

Yet Davis’ statement that Hutchinson imitated Cavendish’s particular history is debatable. Based on Cavendish’s own definition of particular history, Davis describes the *Life of William Cavendish* as “in no sense a history of the Revolution.”¹⁵ By contrast, Hutchinson’s *Memoirs* do offer an extensive history of the Revolution. Hutchinson’s elaboration on the beginning of England in the autobiographical fragment also does not fit Cavendish’s description of particular history, since she even recalls the Roman period: “The greatest Roman captaines thought it not unworthy

⁶ Davis, “Gender and Genre,” 162.

⁷ Davis, “Gender and Genre,” 163.

⁸ Sandrine Parageau, “Catching ‘the Genius of the Age’: Margaret Cavendish, Historian and Witness,” *Études Épistémè. Revue de Littérature et de Civilisation (XVIe – XVIIIe Siècles)*, no. 17 (2010), accessed 23.02.2025, <https://journals.openedition.org/episteme/662>.

⁹ Margaret Cavendish, *The Life of the Thrice Noble, High and Puissant Prince William Cavendish, Duke, Marquess and Earl of Newcastle ... Written by the Thrice Noble, Illustrious and Excellent Princess, Margaret, Duchess of Newcastle, His Wife* (London: A. Maxwell, 1667), unnumbered.

¹⁰ Cavendish, *The Life*, unnumbered.

¹¹ Cavendish, *The Life*, unnumbered; Davis, “Gender and Genre,” 164.

¹² Davis, “Gender and Genre,” 157.

¹³ Davis, “Gender and Genre,” 165.

¹⁴ Claire Gheeraert-Graffeuille, *Lucy Hutchinson and the English Revolution: Gender, Genre, and History Writing* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2022), 26.

¹⁵ Davis, “Gender and Genre,” 164.

of their expeditions, and tooke greate glory in triumphs for unperfect conquests.”¹⁶ This might not qualify as a description of “the beginning of the world,” but Hutchinson’s history does certainly not stay “on its own axis.” She also *does* offer long elaborations on forms of government. Hutchinson’s history seems to be a mix of national and particular history.¹⁷

Although Davis acknowledges the close ties between family and political history, she still assigns Cavendish’s and Hutchinson’s work to the realm of family history, supporting her broader argument that women wrote histories from within their own environment.¹⁸ Davis clarifies that particular history is in no means less valuable than general or national history. She argues that historians that write “from domestic life or the life of small units” can bring forth histories that are fully capable to grasp broader events.¹⁹ However, she still considers these histories completely distinct from those written by men, despite occasional political elements as in the works of Cavendish and Hutchinson. Davis implies that women’s confinement to the private sphere restricts them to develop a thorough, sustained relationship with public-oriented topics.

Thirsk, whom I already cited as a scholar that seeks to highlight the particularity of the female historian, also credits Hutchinson with a pioneering role and indisputable contribution to the development of family history as a genre. She locates the particularity and originality of women history writers like Hutchinson in the domains of local and family history. Men, on the other hand, were more interested in political history. Thirsk, like Davis, associates women historians’ interests with the private sphere, in contrast to the public and political focus attributed to male historians.²⁰

Daniel Woolf similarly highlights women’s exclusion from public life. Nevertheless, Woolf argues that this exclusion did not prevent women from participating in what he calls “the social circulation of historical knowledge”, particularly through their private writings.²¹ Woolf suggests that there was such a thing as “a feminine past”, a particular *feminine* way of engaging with the past in domestic, local, oral and familial terms.²²

According to him, elite women had a specific relationship with the past that was rooted in personal familiarity with their own and their husband’s ancestry and locality. He implies that women turned to family history as a means of “domesticating” their relationship with the past,

¹⁶ Lucy Hutchinson, *Memoirs of the Life of Colonel Hutchinson* (c. 1664), ed. James Sutherland (London: Oxford University Press, 1973), 279.

¹⁷ Devoney Looser, *British Women Writers and the Writing of History, 1670-1820* (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 2000), 39.

¹⁸ Davis, “Gender and Genre,” 163.

¹⁹ Davis, “Gender and Genre,” 181.

²⁰ Joan Thirsk, “Women Local and Family Historians,” in *The Oxford Companion to Local and Family History*, ed. David Hey (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 101.

²¹ Daniel Woolf, “A Feminine Past? Gender, Genre, and Historical Knowledge in England, 1500- 1800,” *The American Historical Review* 102, no. 3 (1997): 647, 650.

²² Woolf, “A Feminine Past?,” 652.

separating it from public, political and historical narratives.²³ Woolf thus draws a clear separation between women's engagement in family and local history and the male-authored tradition of political history.²⁴ Woolf's emphasis on women's involvement in family, local and domestic history also responds to the separation between the private, female and the public, male sphere.

While Woolf mentions Hutchinson only briefly, he frames her within the assumptions and dichotomies inherited from *herstory*-discourses. For instance, he notes that in nineteenth-century bestsellers, including the *Memoirs*, there exists a clear tension between the private and the public, and between the social and the political. This observation sits uneasily with his earlier claims, given that the *Memoirs* were written in the 1660's, the very period in which Woolf had observed a female tendency toward apolitical themes.

Although he acknowledges that the *Memoirs* have a political edge, he later states that Catharine Macaulay (1731-1791) was for a long time the only English female political historian. Macaulay wrote the republican *History of England* (1763-83), in which she praises the revolutionaries of the Civil War and supports Charles' I execution.²⁵ For Woolf, she is the exception, which implies that women like Hutchinson did not write real political histories.

He is not the only scholar who regards Macaulay as the first woman to engage in political history. Isobel Grundy, whom Woolf cites several times in his article, similarly argues that female political and national history writing only emerged in 1763 with Macaulay. Although women certainly participated in historical discourses before that time, they did so within apolitical genres such as the biography, historical fiction, memoirs, and family history. Whereas Woolf refers to "female concerns," Grundy speaks of "a female culture" to describe women's particular view on the past prior to the nineteenth century.²⁶

2.2 THE PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARADIGM

It is clear that these scholars inherited the *herstory*-idea of a dichotomy between male and female history writing. They associate women's history writing predominantly with private-oriented family history, relying on the deeply embedded dichotomy of the private and the public spheres.²⁷ But where did this separation between the public and the private sphere originate? The precise meaning and origins of these foundational categories remain contested and merit a study in their

²³ Woolf, "A Feminine Past?," 655.

²⁴ Woolf, "A Feminine Past?," 650.

²⁵ Philip Hicks, "Catharine Macaulay's Civil War: Gender, History, and Republicanism in Georgian Britain," *Journal of British Studies* 41, no. 2 (2002): 171.

²⁶ Isobel Grundy, "Women's History? Writings by English Nuns," in *Women, Writing, History 1640-1740*, eds. Isobel Grundy and Susan Wiseman (London: Batsford Ltd., 1992), 126.

²⁷ Amanda Vickery, "Golden Age to Separate Spheres? A Review of the Categories and Chronology of English Women's History," *The Historical Journal* 36, no. 2 (1993): 389.

own right. I will therefore offer a brief overview of influential scholarship that has addressed the widespread adoption of these concepts.

In the 1960s, the philosopher and sociologist Jürgen Habermas famously argued that a bourgeois public sphere emerged in the eighteenth century. He examines how citizens, gathering in coffee houses and salons, as well as through letters, books, newspapers, and other literary forms, engaged in critical debate, thereby forming a space where public opinion could take shape, isolated from state control.²⁸ According to Habermas, access to them was open to all citizens. He distinguishes this emerging public sphere from an intimate private sphere, consisting of civil society concerned with labour and commodities, and the bourgeois family.²⁹ Habermas thus coined the public and private sphere as historical concepts and his research proved highly influential despite the fact that he was no historian.³⁰

A second field in which the paradigm of the public and the private gained prominence is the scholarship on the Victorian period, roughly the nineteenth century. Scholars have argued that during this period, gender roles became more rigid. This scholarship mainly focuses on the exclusion of women from public spaces and their subsequent confinement to the family and household.³¹

Due to the influence of both Habermas and scholarship on the Victorian era, historians increasingly began to apply the public-private paradigm to earlier periods as well, including the seventeenth century, the focus of this thesis.³² However, more recent scholarship has started to question the usefulness of this binary opposition for the early modern period.

However, Habermas actually did not mean to establish a rigid separation between a private and a public sphere. Public debate was according to him constituted by private individuals who, technically, remained within the private sphere since they operated outside of state control.³³ Nevertheless, Erica Longfellow points out that “the seductive power” of Habermas’ theory still reinforced the division between gendered public and private spheres in scholarship on the early

²⁸ Andreas Gestrich, “The Public Sphere and the Habermas Debate,” *German History* 24, no. 3 (2006): 416.

²⁹ Dena Goodman, “Public Sphere and Private Life: Toward a Synthesis of Current Historiographical Approaches to the Old Regime,” *History and Theory* 31, no. 1 (1992): 5-6.

³⁰ Jürgen Habermas, Frank Lennox and Sara Lennox, “The Public Sphere: An Encyclopedia Article,” *New German Critique* no. 3 (1964): 49- 55.

³¹ Anne Digby, “Victorian Values and Women in Public and Private,” *Proceedings of the British Academy* 78 (1992): 195; Vickery, “Golden Age to Separate Spheres?,” 386.

³² Erica Longfellow, “Public, Private, and the Household in Early Seventeenth-Century England,” *Journal of British Studies* 45, no. 2 (2006): 315; Vickery, “Golden Age to Separate Spheres?,” 406.

³³ Laura Knoppers, “Gender and the Public Sphere in Habermas and Milton: New Critical Directions,” *Literature Compass* 11, no. 9 (2014): 616.

modern period.³⁴ This does not align with the early modern historical reality and more than often results in an anachronistic account of women in the early modern period.³⁵

Amanda Vickery and Lawrence Klein are among the scholars who have similarly questioned the usefulness of the public-private dichotomy as an analytical category, particularly in relation to the Victorian era. Vickery encourages future researchers to verify whether our contemporary conceptualizations of the public and the private align with those of the historical actors.³⁶ Klein shifts the focus on the fact that dichotomies like private and public, and the associated dichotomy of male and female, are insufficient to get a grasp of the complex reality of human experience. He highlights the frequent gap between theory and reality encountered in historical research: "When someone proposes a gap between "theory" and "practice" because people are not found doing what the "theory" says they are supposed to do, an important question becomes: what is the 'theory' of the actual practice?"³⁷

Remarkably, both scholars argue that feminist scholars played a foundational role in introducing the use of the private-public distinction into historical research. Vickery notes that feminist historians employed the framework to demonstrate how the patriarchal yoke historically oppressed women by confining them to the private sphere.³⁸ Klein similarly observes that "in feminist historical accounts, the persistent exclusion of women from public roles, power and citizenship is repeatedly asserted."³⁹ It is striking that feminists also coined the slogan "the personal – the private – is political," which, by contrast, constitutes a rejection of the framework.⁴⁰ The involvement of feminist scholars in both the construction and deconstruction of the public-private paradigm could itself be the subject of another study. What is most important here, however, is that scholars nowadays increasingly reject the absoluteness of the strict separation between the public and the private.

2.3 HUTCHINSON SUBVERTING THE PUBLIC-PRIVATE DICHOTOMY

2.3.1 Modern scholarship on Hutchinson as a challenge of the public-private paradigm

I now turn to how a critique of the public-private paradigm is useful to challenge the influence *herstory* left on research on Hutchinson's history writing. I noted that Looser and Gheeraert-Graffeuille explicitly reacted to the *herstory*-perspective in the context of Hutchinson's history

³⁴ Longfellow, "Public, Private, and the Household," 317.

³⁵ Longfellow, "Public, Private, and the Household," 333.

³⁶ Vickery, "Golden Age to Separate Spheres?," 386.

³⁷ Lawrence Klein, "Gender and the Public-Private Distinction in the Eighteenth Century: Some Questions about Evidence and Analytic Procedure," *Eighteenth-century Studies* 29, no. 1 (1995): 101.

³⁸ Vickery, "Golden Age to Separate Spheres?," 387.

³⁹ Klein, "Gender and the Public-Private Distinction," 97.

⁴⁰ Linda J. Nicholson, "'the Personal is Political': An Analysis in Retrospect," *Social Theory and Practice* 7, no. 1 (1981): 85.

writing. As a result of the often overlooked national and politically-oriented passages in the *Memoirs*, Looser places strong emphasis on the political aspects of the work. She states that Hutchinson simultaneously embraces both feminine and masculine forms of history writing, such as the description of battles. However, she does not elaborate on what she considers to be feminine. Looser maintains that scholars have wrongly dismissed Hutchinson as merely a private and family historian.⁴¹ It appears that Looser seeks to shift attention away from Hutchinson as a private, family-oriented historian to Hutchinson as a public, political historian. Nevertheless, this still implies that during the early modern period, a writer operated either in a public or a private manner.

Gheeraert-Graffeuille, who is also critic of the *herstory*-approach in the context of Hutchinson, offers a different perspective on the public and private character of the *Memoirs*. As shown, she notes that the genre of life-writing consists of a combination of the biography of one's life and the more general history of the period. Gheeraert-Graffeuille argues that Bacon's definition of life-writing closely corresponds to Hutchinson's project: "the private being never split from the public, the personal from the historical."⁴² This corresponds to the already sketched historiographical value of memoirs at the end of the seventeenth century. However, Gheeraert-Graffeuille primarily focuses on this merging of the private and the public to show that the contemporary Civil War historiographical decorum did not require a strictly objective narrative. The public, political narrative could be interwoven with personal anecdotes, a subjective experience of the war could enhance the authority of the historian.⁴³

Throughout her work, Gheeraert-Graffeuille frequently emphasizes how Hutchinson connects the personal story of her husband to the national context, yet she does not explicitly link this to the broader framework of the public and the private spheres. Moreover, she does not employ these valuable observations as an argument against the embedded dichotomies in research on early modern female history writing, despite her critique on *herstorians* in her introduction. As I will show, the merging of the public and the private in Hutchinson's oeuvre is not only evidence for Hutchinson's subjective experience of the past, but also demonstrates that the separation scholars imply between these categories results in an oversimplification and misunderstanding of the text. Gheeraert-Graffeuille offers a stepping stone for an integrated analysis of how the categories of family history and political history — and, by extension, the public and the private — function in Hutchinson's *Memoirs*.

Gheeraert-Graffeuille and Looser are not the only scholars who noticed that the dichotomy between the public and the private is not fully applicable to Hutchinson. Norbrook argues that in

⁴¹ Looser, *British Women Writers*, 46.

⁴² Gheeraert-Graffeuille, *Lucy Hutchinson and the English Revolution*, 12.

⁴³ Gheeraert-Graffeuille, *Lucy Hutchinson and the English Revolution*, 12.

Hutchinson's *Elegies*, one of her poetic works, the public and the private can never be fully distinguished. Regarding the *Memoirs*, he observes that scholars tend to read the part *To my children* as an attempt to relegate the text to the private sphere, since she addresses them to her children. Yet he notes that male historians such as Clarendon wrote similar passages. Furthermore, Norbrook challenges the idea that Hutchinson's use of the third person constitutes a gendered attempt to distance herself from political events, showing that men like Clarendon employed the same strategy.⁴⁴

Based on an analysis of Hutchinson's oeuvre, Longfellow similarly demonstrates how Hutchinson rewrites the categories of the public and the private in her own way. She criticizes twenty-first-century scholars for projecting modern notions of private and public on early modern women writers without properly understanding their "historical resonance": "It is too often easy to fall into the trap that public/political means masculine and private/personal means feminine."⁴⁵

She adds that this trap is based on outdated scholarship concerning the Victorian separate-sphere ideology. According to Longfellow, many scholars assume that there was a single definition of femininity in the early modern period, one that was always accompanied by an exclusion from the public and the political.⁴⁶ However, she concludes that for Hutchinson, "gender separation along the lines of public and private behaviour seems not to exist."⁴⁷ Longfellow offers important insights into how, in the *Memoirs*, Hutchinson simultaneously mourns both the death of her husband and the failure of the republican cause at the Restoration, the period during which she was writing.⁴⁸

Although Longfellow is not specialized in the history of historiography and without explicitly referring to the *herstory*-approach, she provides a strong argument against the idea that there was a distinctly feminine approach to the past, in exclusively private terms. Yet, because of her background in literary studies, she does not enhance our understanding of the genres of family history and political history, nor of their entanglement with the public-private dichotomy.

However, in her article "Public, Private, and the Household in Early Seventeenth-Century England", she further nuances the public-private dichotomy. She historicizes the categories of public and private, thereby answering her own call to investigate the historical resonance of these concepts. Longfellow argues that our contemporary understanding of the public and private differs profoundly from the seventeenth-century view. She rightly points to Quentin Skinner's

⁴⁴ David Norbrook, "'But a copie': Textual Authority and Gender in Editions of The life of John Hutchinson," in *Ashgate Critical Essays on Women Writers in England, 1550-1770 volume 5*, ed. Mihoko Suzuki (Surrey: Ashgate Publishing, 2009), 275.

⁴⁵ Erica Longfellow, *Women and Religious Writing* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 203-4.

⁴⁶ Longfellow, *Women and Religious Writing*, 204.

⁴⁷ Longfellow, *Women and Religious Writing*, 204.

⁴⁸ Longfellow, *Women and Religious Writing*, 198.

reminder that the fact that a past writer employed a concept familiar to modern scholars does not necessarily mean that the concept's meaning remained stable across centuries.⁴⁹

Public both today and in the seventeenth century means "that which has national or community relevance," often equated with the political.⁵⁰ However, the meaning of private is more contested and has undergone greater shifts. Longfellow argues that today, private is often defined in apolitical terms, disconnected from public life. She adds that the association between private and the family is deeply embedded in Western law.⁵¹

Longfellow's historicization of private in the early modern period disproves the association of private with the family and the apolitical. She argues that women *and* men, which refutes the association of private with women, had an understanding of private life in the sense of remote: people read, prayed, and wrote in their journal by themselves. This neutral conceptualization of private is more alike to our contemporary words alone or in private. Another meaning that early modern individuals ascribed to private is secret.⁵² What is particularly striking is Longfellow's observation that they did not "conceive of them as something wholly separate from their communal existence, nor did they see them as an area of life protected from state control or community interference."⁵³

Although she did not mention Longfellow in her research, Hodgkin seamlessly applies these conclusions to aspects of history writing. She brought together women's involvement in the recordings of the familial past with the observation that our contemporary definition of family history does not correspond to the seventeenth-century reality. She also argues that scholars tend to disregard family history as a private domain. She describes the family as a "microcosm of the state and exemplar of the godly order."⁵⁴ Through the family, as well as through marriage and childrearing, ran power-relations. These were not merely domestic and private affairs, but had public and political concerns, especially for classes that owned properties, such as the Hutchinson's. Hodgkin states that the division between the public and the private is inadequate for a complex understanding of family history, and history in general. According to Hodgkin, a

⁴⁹ Longfellow, "Public, Private, and the Household," 317; Quentin Skinner, "Meaning and Understanding in the History of Ideas," in *Meaning and Context: Quentin Skinner and His Critics*, ed. James Tully (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1988), 47-8.

⁵⁰ Longfellow, "Public, Private, and the Household," 315-7.

⁵¹ Longfellow, "Public, Private, and the Household," 315-16.

⁵² Longfellow, "Public, Private, and the Household," 315, 321, 333.

⁵³ Longfellow, "Public, Private, and the Household," 321.

⁵⁴ Katharine Hodgkin, "Women, Memory and Family History in Seventeenth-Century England," in *Memory before modernity*, eds. Erika Kuijpers, Judith Pollmann, Johannes Müller, and Jasper van der Steen (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 300.

genealogy is coloured by political events such as war and conflict, which makes a family history inextricably linked to a political history.⁵⁵

One of the case studies Hodgkin employs is Hutchinson's *Memoirs*. She states that the proportion of family history *pur sang* in the *Memoirs*, in which Hutchinson discusses John's and her own family tree, forms only a small part of the narrative:

While her radicalism does not prevent her from attaching significant value to gentle descent, once she has got through the ancestral stories which declare Colonel Hutchinson's gentility other concerns push the family domain aside.⁵⁶

This would refute the thesis that Hutchinson was a pioneer in family history. However, she later becomes entangled in a paradox similar to the one I have demonstrated in my discussion of Woolf. Hodgkin argues that the family-oriented passages in the *Memoirs* are shaped by "anecdote and example," rather than by politics.⁵⁷ She does not offer source-material to support this thesis. She thus still separates Hutchinson's family-oriented from her politically-oriented passages in the *Memoirs*, despite her statement that scholars dismiss family history as a private, apolitical domain.⁵⁸ She later adds that "the political world is fully present in her narrative", which once again contradicts her previous statement.⁵⁹

In conclusion, scholars nowadays reject the association between the early modern female historian, the private sphere, and the genre of family history. But, notwithstanding Hodgkin's significant effort, there does not yet seem to be a consistent analysis on how Hutchinson proves that women are not merely private, family chroniclers and that the separation between family history and political history might not be as strict as thought. I will fill this gap in the existing scholarship and demonstrate that the *herstory*-assumption that women historians are engaged in private family histories is not applicable to Hutchinson's *Memoirs*. In fact, she transcends this binary altogether.

2.3.2 Hutchinson's family-oriented passages

I showed that even scholars like Hodgkin hold up the distinction between the political (public) and the familial (private) passages of the *Memoirs*. I will analyse these to show that even in the seemingly family-oriented passages, Hutchinson transcends this distinction.

In the beginning of the *Life*, Hutchinson introduces John's parents. She describes them as "two persons so eminently vertuous and pious in their generations that to descend from them was to

⁵⁵ Hodgkin, "Women, Memory and Family History," 300, 303.

⁵⁶ Hodgkin, "Women, Memory and Family History," 307.

⁵⁷ Hodgkin, "Women, Memory and Family History," 307.

⁵⁸ Hodgkin, "Women, Memory and Family History," 307.

⁵⁹ Hodgkin, "Women, Memory and Family History," 307.

sett up in the world upon a good stock of honor, which oblig'd their posterity to improve it, as much as it was their privilege to inherit their parents' glories."⁶⁰ She immediately positions John and their other children in comparison to their parents, as moral examples. Because of them, the children followed an exemplary path in life. At first sight, Hutchinson indeed seems to operate family history as a way to prove John's virtuous descent. However, John's father's exemplary path in life is shaped by his political career. She attaches extensive significance to his career as a Parliamentarian, and the suitable characteristics to be a member of Parliament. She recounts how he was elected several times, and how he was branded a Puritan during that period. The storyline of the suppressed Puritans already pops up in the first pages of her narrative.⁶¹

Moreover, she follows this by the statement that notwithstanding these difficulties, he continued until his death in 1643 as "a sitting Member of that glorious Parliament that so generously attempted, and had almost effected, England's perfect liberty."⁶² This is a reference to the Long Parliament. Hutchinson writes her *Memoirs* from a teleological standpoint, it is a story of which she knows the end, which she already uncovers in this first paragraph. The Long Parliament was disbanded and thus could not prevent the Restoration, and throughout the story it becomes clear that according to Hutchinson, the cause of that lies in a factious, divided Parliament that in the end stood under the command of the tyrant Cromwell: "the hand of God was mightily seene in prospering and preserving the Parliament, till Cromwell's Ambition unhappily interrupted them."⁶³ They were close to a different, superior form of government, a republic instead of a monarchy, until Cromwell threw a spanner in the works.⁶⁴

In the description of John's youth, Hutchinson similarly refers to the future political events. John met Colonel Thornhagh in school, "who was now train'd in his sportive militia with Collonell Hutchinson, afterwards was his fellow souldier in earnest, when the greater cause of God's and England's rights came to be disputed with swords against encroaching princes."⁶⁵

The autobiographical fragment offers another example of this, when she elaborates on her own birth and on her parents. She recalls how at her birth her father already had a son and a daughter, and her mother three sons from previous marriages. After this, she states that at the time of her birth:

⁶⁰ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 15.

⁶¹ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 17.

⁶² Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 17.

⁶³ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 191.

⁶⁴ For example see Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 211: "and now men began so to flatter with this Tyrant so to apostatize from all faith, honesty, religion, and English liberty, and there was such devilish practise of trappanning growing in fashion, that it was not safe to speake to any man in those treacherous dayes."

⁶⁵ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 24.

The land was then att peace (it being towards the latter end of the reign of king James), if that quietnesse may be call'd a peace which was rather like the calme and smooth surface of the sea, whose dark womb is allready impregnated of a horrid tempest.⁶⁶

The tempest is a recurring trope in the whole of Hutchinson's oeuvre.⁶⁷ In this passage, "tempest" suggests that the instabilities that resulted in the Civil War were already present during the reign of the former King. This small fragment of her own family history is certainly not domestic and private, since she positions her time of birth within the greater course of national events. In conclusion, these pages are not just descriptions of John's family and youth to prove his righteous breeding, but are part of her political diagnosis of the present, which she establishes through a political anatomy of the past.

Moreover, Gheeraert-Graffeuille remarks that Hutchinson uses the genre of family history in the beginning of the *Memoirs* with a clear plan: introducing the protagonists of the story. This is certainly not an apolitical enterprise, since both her own and her husband's family have Royalist family members and Hutchinson has to inform the reader of these political complexities.⁶⁸ Throughout the narrative, family members recur as important characters, for example Allen Apsley, Hutchinson's Royalist brother who defends John at the end of the latter's life in court.⁶⁹ Nevertheless, as Hodgkin pointed out, the proportion of family history *pur sang*, in which she discusses John's and her own family tree, forms only a small part of the narrative. When Hutchinson talks about the family, which is not that often, politics are certainly not absent. With these observations in mind, it is surprising that scholars like Thirsk prioritize Hutchinson's contribution to the genre of family history, rather than acknowledging her strongly political outlook.

However, I do not want to refute results from earlier research into the relationship between women and family history. These studies proved that women played an important part in the gathering of information about local communities and families.⁷⁰ Family history in general, both for women and men, gained popularity during the sixteenth and seventeenth century, especially in gentry environments such as Hutchinson's.⁷¹ Family history was a means to establish historical continuity between past and future generations.⁷² The *Memoirs* are at the same time past and

⁶⁶ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 279.

⁶⁷ Gheeraert-Graffeuille, *Lucy Hutchinson and the English Revolution*, 215.

⁶⁸ Gheeraert-Graffeuille, *Lucy Hutchinson and the English Revolution*, 46.

⁶⁹ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 232; Gheeraert-Graffeuille, *Lucy Hutchinson and the English Revolution*, 127.

⁷⁰ Hodgkin, "Women, Memory and Family History," 298; Woolf, "A Feminine Past?," 651.

⁷¹ Hodgkin, "Women, Memory and Family History," 299-300.

⁷² Woolf, "A Feminine Past?," 655.

future-oriented, as several passages show Hutchinson's concern with the connection of several generations:

They have bene in Nottinghamshire for generations; wherein I observe that, as if there had bene an Agrarian law in the famely, assoone as any of them arrived to any considerable fortune beyond his who was first transplanted hither, they began other houses, of which one is soone decay'd and worne out in an unwoorthy branch; another begins to flourish, *and long may it prosper*.⁷³

Genealogy is important for Hutchinson, so much is clear. The problem is rather the definition of family history as domestic and apolitical. As shown, in Hutchinson's family accounts, the political is always looming.

My analysis of Hutchinson's family-oriented passages shows that Hutchinson likely did not even consider the boundaries between family history and political history herself, analogous to Longfellow's and Hodgkin's findings. This corresponds to Looser's statement that the generic conditions of the late seventeenth century were long forgotten in the nineteenth century when Hutchinson was erased from the realm of history writing and remembered as a novelist.⁷⁴ That generic conditions have changed from the seventeenth, over the nineteenth up until the twenty-first century might also explain our different definition of family history. The Victorian philosophy of the separate spheres, emerging some decades after the *Memoirs* were first published by her descendant Julius Hutchinson (1806), and Habermas' influence on the domain of history have undeniably driven our contemporary projection of categories as the public and the private on seventeenth-century history writing.

2.3.3 Historicizing public and private in the *Memoirs*

As noted, Longfellow encourages the historicization of concepts used by past thinkers, like the private and the public. In the following section I will take a detailed look at how Hutchinson uses these words, which she frequently does.

Hutchinson's use of *publick* indeed refers to what Longfellow called everything with national or community relevance. However, Hutchinson mostly uses the word as adjective rather than noun: "publick interest," "publick service," "publick peace," "publick good," etc.⁷⁵ Hutchinson views "publick" in terms of performing services and duties for the state and for the common good. The phrase "publick spirit" also recurs, as a personality trait. For example, she describes John's father as a "person of greate beautie and comelinesse in all ages, of a bounteous and noble nature, of

⁷³ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 15; My emphasis.

⁷⁴ Looser, *British Women Writers*, 47.

⁷⁵ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 44, 81, 106.

cleare courage, sweete and affable conversation, of a *publick spiritt*,..."⁷⁶ Being public spirited means being willing to help your community. Her political and religious background in mind, Hutchinson ascribes the characteristic of public spiritedness to people who are by all costs committed to the republican cause.

This is reinforced by a further passage in which she contrasts this public spirit with the divided Parliament between Independents and Presbyterians. She recounts how these were so occupied with oppressing one another, that they lost sight of the public interest. However, "att that time, a certeine sort of *publick spirited* men stood up in the parliament and the Armie, declaring against these factions and the ambition of the Grandees of both..."⁷⁷ She is talking about the radical political and religious movement of the Levellers. They were opposed to monarchy and pled for religious freedom and an expansion of voting rights. Their leader was John Lilburne, whom Hutchinson mentions once in the *Memoirs* when he was leading an insurrection to plead for a form of republican government after the King's death.⁷⁸ She mentions that her husband carries great sympathy for the Levellers, and "so farre as they acted according to the just and pious and *publick spiritt* which they profest, own'd them and protected them as farre as he had power."⁷⁹ She adds that these people were the first to discover Cromwell's tyrannous ambitions, implying that he did not have this quality of public spirit, since she considers him to be one of the reasons the cause failed. Hutchinson's use of *publick* is clear and alike to our contemporary understanding of community relevance.

An analysis of the cases in which she uses *private* or *privately* shows that Hutchinson in general ascribes two definitions to these words. First of all, Hutchinson's use of private matches Longfellow's statement that in the seventeenth century, private often meant something (an object, information, a place,...) only accessible to a few people, secret.⁸⁰ There are many examples from the *Memoirs* that support this. Hutchinson herself even gives a definition of what she means by private, when she recalls how the Town Committee of Nottingham secretly betrayed John: "yet some of them who were loath the Towne should loose any that wisht ill to the Governor and his undertakings, *privately*, without his consent or knowledge, brought back severall persons that were very dangerous to the place."⁸¹ Private is in this definition certainly not apolitical, as this passage shows.

⁷⁶ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 17.

⁷⁷ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 179; My emphasis.

⁷⁸ Martyn Bennett, *The English Civil War: A Historical Companion* (Brimscombe: Tempus, 2004), 140-1; Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 191.

⁷⁹ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 179; My emphasis.

⁸⁰ Longfellow, "Public, Private, and the Household," 315.

⁸¹ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 124; My emphasis.

Additionally, Hutchinson implies a second interpretation of the word private, namely a moral disposition that runs counter the common cause. In this case, private rather refers to selfish or power-hungry, prioritizing your own concerns above the public good. She makes this contrast clear in the following passage where she describes how people benefited from their submission to Colonel John and the public cause: They “accounted it a happiness to be under his command when any publick necessity superseded the mutiny of those *private lusts* whereby all men naturally, but especially vulgar spirits, would cast off their bridle and be their owne only rulers.”⁸² Not only on the local, but also on the national level does Hutchinson elaborate on these private lusts: “When the Collonell heard how Cromwell had used his Troopes in Scotland, he was confirm’d that he and his confederates in the Armie were carrying on designes of *private ambition*.”⁸³ The contrast between the characteristics associated with private and public in this context is clear in the following passage: “that in his whole actings in this cause he never prosecuted any *private lust*, either of revenge, ambition, avarice, or vaine glory under a publick vizard, but was most truly *publick spirited*.”⁸⁴ Importantly, private in this case also does not mean apolitical.

This analysis of the words private and public shows that Hutchinson has her own understanding of these concepts, conform seventeenth-century standards. It is clear that she conceptualizes a difference between what is public and what is private. However, this does not mean that what Hutchinson considers private, in both the meaning of secret and selfish, is isolated from the public in the definition of political, as scholars who relied on the private-public dichotomy did imply. I would, on the contrary, argue that Hutchinson considers everything to be political.

2.3.4 The house(hold) as a background of the war

To refute the thesis that women domesticized and depoliticized the past, it is also interesting to look into the household of Hutchinson. Hutchinson describes how on the 20th of April 1653, Cromwell disbanded the Rump Parliament.⁸⁵ Afterwards, Cromwell became Lord Protector of the British Commonwealth, which ushered in the Protectorate.⁸⁶ John’s sympathy for Cromwell had long disappeared.⁸⁷ During Cromwell’s reign, John did not take up any public office in Parliament. Hutchinson recalls how he distanced himself from national politics. She describes how at this “absolute private condition” for John, new dynamics came to the surface:

⁸² Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 156; My emphasis.

⁸³ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 202; My emphasis.

⁸⁴ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 91; My emphasis.

⁸⁵ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 205.

⁸⁶ Bennett, *The English Civil War*, 201.

⁸⁷ Longfellow, *Women and Religious Writing*, 197.

[John] was very much courted and visited by all of all parties, and while the grand quarrell slept, and both the victors and the vanquish'd were equal slaves under the new usurpers, there was a very kind Correspondence betweene him and all his countrimen;... his house was much resorted to, and as kindly open to those who had in publick contests bene his enimies as to his continued friends.⁸⁸

It seems that John continued his political commitments outside public office. His house functioned as a meeting point for people of several factions. She later returns to this, and tells the reader that "he stay'd att home, and busied himselfe in his owne domestick employments, and having a very liberall heart, had a house open to all worthy persons of all parties."⁸⁹ In this case, the house, where political matters were discussed, carried a positive connotation, as a place where one could socialize.

However, this was not always the case. The house as a background plays an important role in the narrative, as a place constantly affected by the war. During the war, the relationship between the domestic and the military was destabilized.⁹⁰ Hutchinson confirms this, by elaborating on situations where even in one's own house, the war intruded to its core. First of all, she recalls how people were not safe in their own houses, and had to flee to another house to seek shelter. When it became clear that the war was about to begin, Thomas Hutchinson, John's father, did not feel safe anymore at home. Hutchinson describes how, although he was a moderate parliamentarian, he did not dare to stay at his own house when they received word that the King's army was about to march to Nottingham. He then sought shelter in John's house, at Owthorpe, south-east of Nottingham.⁹¹ Some time later, John went to his father's empty house. Soon after he arrived, a man with a Carabine, a small firearm, entered the house. Hutchinson recalls their dialogue:

Mr. Hutchinson askt what he would have; the man replied, he came to take possession of the house. Mr. Hutchinson told him, he had the possession of it, and would know on what right it was demanded from him; the man said, he came to quarter the Generall there. Mr. Hutchinson told him, except his father and mother and their children were turn'd out of doores, there was no roome.⁹²

Hutchinson recalls how houses could be taken for military purposes by the other party. This threat that a Parliamentarian's house could be plundered at any time recurs throughout the whole

⁸⁸ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 208.

⁸⁹ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 216.

⁹⁰ Ann Hughes, "'The Governor's wife': Women and Garrisons in the English Civil War," *The Seventeenth Century* 38, no. 3 (2023): 462.

⁹¹ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 62.

⁹² Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 63.

narrative. Hutchinson describes how their own house was attacked several times.⁹³ The soldiers in the castle can moreover not be distracted when they see their own houses ruined:

It must not moove them to see their houses flaming, and, if need be, themselves firing them for the publique advantage, to see the peices of their famelies cruelly abus'd and consum'd before them.⁹⁴

Besides plundering and military attacks, Hutchinson also describes the household as a place where conversations were held, and sometimes, with a little wine, secret information was shared. Hutchinson relates how at an evening Colonel James Chadwick, one of John's adversaries, came to town. He was received at the Major's house, where all the guests discussed how they were going to over-reach Colonel John. One of those present had a bit too much wine, and went to the castle to inform the Hutchinson's about their plans, although he himself was one of the conspirators.⁹⁵ For Hutchinson, the house was thus a place where politics could be discussed secretly, privately—if the drinks did not decide otherwise.

The house moreover often functions as a background for politically-oriented anecdotes. One of these anecdotes takes place in 1643, a period where Cavalier troops were looking for John. As he was fleeing them, he wrote a letter to his wife, which was intercepted by Captain Welch, a Cavalier. After this, Welch granted a visit to the house she was staying in, where John's brother George was also present. Welch was complaining about her husband, that it was a pity that "she should have a husband so unworthy of her as to enter into any faction which should make him not dare to be seene with her."⁹⁶ Hutchinson wanted to prove that her husband was not afraid to show himself, so she pretended George, his brother, to be her husband. Welch answered that in any other place, he would have been obliged to take him a prisoner, but here he was "in sanctuary."⁹⁷ Still, some time afterwards, George was taken prisoner in the name of John. This anecdote shows that Hutchinson considers the house to be a place where Royalist soldiers and officers could intrude whenever they wanted. This also further proves that the domestic space is not apolitical for Hutchinson.

2.3.5 Circulation of the manuscript

As we just saw that Hutchinson does not draw a strict boundary between the private and the public, I reflect on the circulation of the manuscript, and thus move beyond the content of the text itself.

⁹³ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 173, 186, 238, 239, 241.

⁹⁴ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 89.

⁹⁵ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 133.

⁹⁶ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 65.

⁹⁷ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 65.

The *Memoirs* are up until now often considered a private, personal document. Scholars emphasized the private character of the *Memoirs* through the claim that Hutchinson did not seek an audience.⁹⁸ She indeed did not publish her *Memoirs* in her lifetime, but this was rather due to the contemporary political climate. The Restoration made it risky to publish a Puritan account of the war.⁹⁹ However, that does not mean that it stayed a completely private enterprise. To that end, recent scholarship nuanced the assumption that publication was the only way to reach an audience.

Keeble for example argued that republican authors that operated after the Restoration were perfectly aware that their work could not be public at the time. They already wrote with future generations in mind. To that end, he states that Hutchinson definitely searched an audience besides her own family: posterity.¹⁰⁰ Woolf's idea and eponymous book *The Social Circulation of the Past* can similarly broaden our understanding of this issue. He extends the idea of a history of historiography that is concerned with forerunners of modern historiography as an academic discipline and acknowledges that histories circulated in other forms than published writing. History is way more than an amalgam of published texts. Each place and time in the early modern period had its own way of dealing with the past, its own historical culture, constructed by speech, writing and other forms of communication. Woolf rejects the London- and university-centred perspective and explores other sites of knowledge which can be found in local and family archives. These contain non-published documents, such as the *Memoirs* until 1806, or material culture.¹⁰¹

Hutchinson herself seems to be aware of this broader historical culture, since she digresses on the castle of Nottingham, which served as a material reminder of the past events in the middle of the Nottingham landscape, as she describes herself: "The Castle stands at one end of the Towne upon such an eminence as commands the chiefe streetes of the towne."¹⁰² The *Memoirs* themselves are also part of this historical culture. Hutchinson's manuscript is an example of such a (at the time) non-published manuscript that nonetheless contributed to the local historical culture, in the sense that it shaped, or at least attempted to shape, future generations' memories of the war. When Hutchinson was still alive, the manuscript probably stayed within a close circle, including her brother, her cousin and her patron, but this is not entirely certain.¹⁰³

⁹⁸ For example: Martyn Bennett, "Every County had more or lesse the civill warre within itselfe': the Realities of War in Lucy Hutchinson's Midlands," *The Seventeenth Century* 30, no. 2 (2015): 2.

⁹⁹ Neill Keeble, "Lucy Hutchinson and the Business of Memoirs," *The Review of English Studies* 73, no. 311 (2022): 702.

¹⁰⁰ Keeble, "Lucy Hutchinson," 712.

¹⁰¹ Daniel Woolf, *The Social Circulation of the Past: English historical culture, 1500-1730* (Oxford: Oxford University press, 2005), 10-4.

¹⁰² Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 83.

¹⁰³ Gheeraert-Graffeuille, *Lucy Hutchinson and the English Revolution*, 5.

However, there must have been some public knowledge of the text, since Catharine Macaulay repeatedly approached the Royalist descendants of Hutchinson in an effort to obtain the manuscript for her *History of England*.¹⁰⁴ She refers multiple times to Restoration historians in her work, so it is possible that she regarded the *Memoirs* as a proper historical source for her own work.¹⁰⁵ Mayer even argues that “it seems reasonable to conclude that public knowledge of the *Memoirs*' existence accorded with what Hutchinson herself anticipated as to its fate.”¹⁰⁶ There is textual evidence for this in the *Memoirs*, for example Hutchinson's declaration that her work concerns “the benefit of all.”¹⁰⁷ Gheeraert-Graffeuille adds that manuscript writing was in fact “a form of publication in its own right.”¹⁰⁸ Additionally, Hutchinson was not hostile to print, since the first five cantos of *Order & Disorder* were published anonymously in 1679.¹⁰⁹

This is helpful to leave behind *herstory*'s essentialist focus on the dichotomy of the private and the public: it is an oversimplification to assert that a manuscript becomes public only upon publication, or that it remains inherently private if it is never published. There were other ways to find an audience, which Hutchinson presumably did.¹¹⁰

2.3.6 Socio-economic context: gentry, manors, estate, and lordship

Apart from the circulation context of the manuscript, a grip on the seventeenth-century English social context can deepen the understanding of the environment in which Hutchinson circulates her ideas. Hutchinson is after all not only a woman, but a woman embedded in a specific social matrix shaped by entrenched hierarchies of the nobility and the gentry, as the family stems from a high gentry-environment.¹¹¹

Hutchinson pays considerable attention to the family's social position: “It is further observable in their descent that though none of them before Sir Thomas Hutchinson advanc'd beyond an Esquire, yet they successively matcht into all the most eminent and noble famelies in the country.”¹¹² John's family has a history in manorial units as they had been landowners for five generations. John's father Thomas inherited the estate of Owthorpe from his great-grandfather, and he became the owner of Owthorpe Hall, a manor house.¹¹³ John further inherited the estate.

¹⁰⁴ Robert Mayer, “Lucy Hutchinson: A Life of Writing,” *The Seventeenth Century* 22, no. 2 (2007): 325.

¹⁰⁵ Gheeraert-Graffeuille, *Lucy Hutchinson and the English Revolution*, 3.

¹⁰⁶ Mayer, “Lucy Hutchinson,” 325.

¹⁰⁷ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 2.

¹⁰⁸ Gheeraert-Graffeuille, *Lucy Hutchinson and the English Revolution*, 7.

¹⁰⁹ Gheeraert-Graffeuille, *Lucy Hutchinson and the English Revolution*, 8.

¹¹⁰ Looser, *British Women Writers*, 32; Gheeraert-Graffeuille, *Lucy Hutchinson and the English Revolution*, 4-5.

¹¹¹ Yousef Deikna, “Lucy Hutchinson and Margaret Cavendish: Civil War and Enemy Commiseration,” *Humanities* 8, no. 1 (2019): 2.

¹¹² Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 15.

¹¹³ John. P. Ferris, “HUTCHINSON, Sir Thomas (1589-1643), of Owthorpe and Nottingham, Notts.,” in *The History of Parliament: the House of Commons 1604-1629*, eds. Andrew Thrush and John P. Ferris (Cambridge:

After John's death, Hutchinson herself was even involved in the sale of the family estate to Charles Hutchinson, John's half-brother, of whom Julius Hutchinson is a direct descendant.¹¹⁴

A manor was a defining territorial, social, economic, political and legal unit that originated in the feudal system. It served as an important institution of local governance both in the middle ages as in the early modern period. It was governed by a lord that controlled a landed estate, and additionally exercised rights on the tenants that cultivated the land via a manorial court.¹¹⁵ Traditionally, scholars argue that the importance of the manors declined in the early modern period.¹¹⁶

In his 2023 book, Spike Gibbs proves the continuing influence of the manor as a vital structure in rural England throughout the early modern era. He mainly focused on manorial offices, which he defines as "specific roles which gave an individual authority within the manorial structure."¹¹⁷ The manorial structure provided specific public rights to the lord and the officers.¹¹⁸ Their private property and estate granted them public power.

Hutchinson's description of the estate that John inherited is economically-oriented and does refute the traditional perception that the feudal system lost importance in the early modern period. In the following passage, Hutchinson describes how the Royalists imprisoned tenants living on John's property:

Assoone as his father was dead and rents became due to him, the enemies in the midst of whom his estate lay, fetcht in his tenants and imprison'd them, and tooke his rents; his estate was beg'd and promised by the King; those who liv'd not upon the place flung up his grounds, and they lay unoccupied while the enemy prevail'd in the country.¹¹⁹

That Hutchinson associates John's family with their manor, and considers it a defining feature of John's life is clear by the title of this part of the *Memoirs: The Life of John Hutchinson, of Owthorpe, in the County of Nottingham, Esquire*. Kate Chedzgoj argues that this title "highlights the significance of place and status in her husband's public identity."¹²⁰ In the first passage of the

Cambridge University Press, 2010), accessed 19.06.2025, <https://www.historyofparliamentonline.org/volume/1604-1629/member/hutchinson-sir-thomas-1589-1643>.

¹¹⁴ Norbrook, "'But a copie'," 279.

¹¹⁵ *Oxford English Dictionary*, lemma "manor (n.), sense 3.a," accessed 13.07.2025, <https://doi.org/10.1093/OED/1180179635>.

¹¹⁶ "manor," in *The Oxford Companion to Local and Family History*, ed. David Hey (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 478.

¹¹⁷ Spike Gibbs, *Lordship, State Formation and Local Authority In Late Medieval and Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2023), 3.

¹¹⁸ Gibbs, *Lordship*, 2-3.

¹¹⁹ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 91.

¹²⁰ Kate Chedzgoj, *Women's Writing in the British Atlantic World Memory, Place and History, 1550-1700* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 157.

Memoirs, in which she introduces John's parents, she mentions his father's inheritance of the manor: "Sir Thomas Hutchinson was he that remoov'd his dwelling to Owthorpe; his father, though he was possessor of that Lordship,..."¹²¹ Here, she describes Owthorpe as a lordship, another term to indicate a feudal territory.¹²²

What matters here is that this gentry-environment where lordship and manors were central, formed an intellectual environment that further allowed Hutchinson to think beyond the boundaries of the public and the private. Howard Kaminsky argues that two conceptualizations of *estate* occurred in the late middle ages; a first one referring to a societal classification, to indicate status.¹²³ Hutchinson clearly also considers estate and status to be related, given that she for example mentions estate and reputation in the same breath in the following sentence: "there is yett a gentleman in that county, descendant of the older house, that possesses a faire *estate and reputation* in his father's auncient inheritance."¹²⁴

A second meaning would have referred to something belonging to an individual, mostly property and wealth.¹²⁵ This is the most recurring sense of estate in the *Memoirs*. Kaminsky argues that contemporaries did not associate estates in the sense of individual property with the private realm as we do today. "Lordships held as individual property by persons or corporations included rights of jurisdiction, armigerency, and coercive power that are today disjunctively "public.""¹²⁶

This public dimension connected to private property becomes clear in the following passage of the *Memoirs*:

for att that time the Major General, who was but a meane man's sonne and of a meane education, and no estate before the warre, had gather'd an estate of 2000ll a yeare, besides engrossing greate Offices and encroaching upon his under Officers, and maintain'd his coach and famely at a height as if they had been borne to principallity.¹²⁷

Hutchinson acknowledges that governing an estate comes with public offices, which confirms Kaminsky's thesis, although he had posited this thesis for the late middle ages. The social context from which Hutchinson writes thus leaves space for an intertwinement of private and public life, which makes it less surprising that she transcends this binary in her history of the war.

¹²¹ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 15.

¹²² "lordship," in *The Oxford Companion of Local and Family History*, ed. David Hey (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 475.

¹²³ Howard Kaminsky, "Estate, Nobility, and the Exhibition of Estate in the Later Middle Ages," *Speculum* 68, no. 3 (1993): 688.

¹²⁴ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 15; My emphasis.

¹²⁵ Kaminsky, "Estate," 688.

¹²⁶ Kaminsky, "Estate," 686.

¹²⁷ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 197.

2.4 CONCLUSION

By delving into the content of the text, as well as the social context in which Hutchinson wrote and in which her manuscript circulated, I argue that upholding the dichotomy between public political history and private family history makes no sense. Representing Hutchinson as a *feminine* historian, who sometimes touches upon politics but mainly stays within the domestic space, results in a misrepresentation and even a misunderstanding of the *Memoirs*. The whole narrative is inherently public-oriented, even in the more family-oriented passages that demonstrate that she imposes her republican beliefs at all levels of the narrative. She also shows us how the war and national politics entered the very core of society and shaped the lives of many individuals and families. Hutchinson's subversion of *herstory's* reliance on the public-private dichotomy is backed up by the fact that her manuscript was not necessarily private despite its posthumous publication, and by an overview of the seventeenth-century manorial system and gentry environment in which the public and the private were inherently connected.

Deconstructing these gendered binary categories also reveals often obscured dimensions of Hutchinson's work, dimensions that remained hidden when the analysis stayed truthful to the falsely constructed archetype of the female, private, family historian. Historicizing how Hutchinson uses the words public and private shows that private by no means refers to the domestic or apolitical. It mostly refers to the selfishness of individuals, including Cromwell. The next chapter, that refutes the *herstory*-thesis that women wrote more about emotions and the human passions, will show that this selfishness and power-hunger shape her analysis of the past events.

3. “THE WINDS OF PASSION” IN HUTCHINSON’S HISTORICAL AND PROVIDENTIAL NARRATIVE

3.1 THE EARLY MODERN FEMALE EMOTIONAL HISTORIAN IN *HERSTORY*-RESEARCH

Alongside the embedded private-public dichotomy, the notion that women’s histories place greater emphasis on affect, emotions, and passions is another inheritance of the *herstory*-approach. In *Women Writing History in Early Modern England*, Megan Matchinske points out that women’s “voices were not inscribed in narratives of kings and counsellors.”¹ Gheeraert-Graffeuille cites Matchinske as an example of a *herstorian*, since the latter denies women the possibility to engage in mainstream forms of history writing and argues that they operate “beyond the boundaries of traditional history.”² Matchinske considers women to write about the past in other genres than men, and follows the theorization of Davis that women’s social position prevented them from engaging in masculine discourses on the past. Unlike Gheeraert-Graffeuille, I do not argue that Matchinske embodies the *herstory*-movement, but rather adopted certain ideas derived from it. Matchinske is after all aware that her claims can be read as essentialist, and argues that “this is not then an argument about generic or genetic absolutes: the correlations that I draw are materially manifest rather than essential.”³ However, she does build her argument upon the assumption that women have specific notions of the past corresponding to “peculiarly female concerns about the future.”⁴

For Matchinske, female history writing in the early modern period was ethically driven. She argues that in women’s histories, there would be a moral at the end of the narrative, which connects the past to the future.⁵ In addition, she considers gender to be the constitutive element of these didactic histories.⁶ She explores the idea of a “specifically feminized historical ethics” based on “the practical experience of being a woman or of not being a man”, without assuming that this is absolute.⁷ She argues that these ethics would be driven by a relationship between the female gender and affect. In a later contribution to an edited volume, she returns to affect and emotion in the context of Hutchinson: “Emotion delineates the kind of historical resonance we

¹ Megan Matchinske, *Women Writing History in Early Modern England* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 3.

² Claire Gheeraert-Graffeuille, *Lucy Hutchinson and the English Revolution: Gender, Genre, and History Writing* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2022), 23-4; Matchinske, *Women Writing History*, 4.

³ Matchinske, *Women Writing History*, 8.

⁴ Matchinske, *Women Writing History*, 8.

⁵ Matchinske, *Women Writing History*, 1.

⁶ Matchinske, *Women Writing History*, 9.

⁷ Matchinske, *Women Writing History*, 10.

experience in reading Hutchinson's account."⁸ Exactly these emotions, the intimate details and personal anecdotes make Hutchinson a deviation from mainstream discourses on the past, characterized by "great men, great wars, and great counsels."⁹

In his 1993 book *The Grand Quarrel*, Roger Hudson recalls the events of the Civil War on the basis of memoirs written by women such as Hutchinson. He was particularly interested in these female writers because he believed it could give us insights in women's "immediate concerns," apart from the war, its causes and effects. He stated that "womenfolk such as the ladies in this book reminded their men of the claims of humanity and common sense when passions were running high."¹⁰ Here, Hudson aligns a sense of humanity and the importance of control over passions with the female gender.

These claims of women's more ethical, moral and affective approach of the past sits uneasily with the general status of history during the seventeenth century and the Civil War, which I elaborated on in the first chapter. I showed that histories, both written by men and women, were at the time more than often polemical, utilitarian and a form of rhetoric, thus inherently concerned with morality and ethics.

However, these scholars are definitely on to something. Hutchinson's *Memoirs* do have a strong moral outlook. The work is not simply a Civil War testimony, but is deeply informed by the moral agenda she projects on the past events.¹¹ Gheeraert-Graffeuille describes the *Memoirs* as "a disenchanted vision of the English Revolution from which no-one seems to come out unscathed."¹² Hutchinson's negative judgement of every historical actor, except for her husband, stems from her belief that each and every one of them is driven by excessive passions, both at the local and at the national level. In that light, Gheeraert-Graffeuille remarks that, although she is wary of the general connection Matchinske establishes between the female gender and emotion, emotions do play an important part in the *Memoirs*' moral outlook, in the form of passions. She argues, however, that this "is not to be exclusively understood in gendered terms."¹³

In this chapter, I support Gheeraert-Graffeuille's thesis that interpreting Hutchinson's focus on passions as a *feminine* trait results in a misunderstanding of the text, but that the passions nonetheless play an important role in Hutchinson's work.¹⁴ Gheeraert-Graffeuille's analysis of the passions stays limited to some observations. She does not offer an integrated analysis of how the

⁸ Megan Matchinske, "History's 'Silent Whispers': Representing the Past through Feeling and Form," *Attending to Early Modern Women: Conflict and Concord*, ed. Karen Nelson (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2013), 60.

⁹ Matchinske, "History's 'Silent Whispers,'" 60.

¹⁰ Roger Hudson, *The Grand Quarrel* (London: The Folio Society, 1993), XVII.

¹¹ Gheeraert-Graffeuille, *Lucy Hutchinson and the English Revolution*, 22, 139.

¹² Gheeraert-Graffeuille, *Lucy Hutchinson and the English Revolution*, 22.

¹³ Gheeraert-Graffeuille, *Lucy Hutchinson and the English Revolution*, 24.

¹⁴ Gheeraert-Graffeuille, *Lucy Hutchinson and the English Revolution*, 24.

passions function in the *Memoirs* as she rather mentions it as an aside to support other claims. I will extend her argument by showing how Hutchinson integrates the passions both in her historical and providential narrative, and how she connects these two. I will illustrate how she offers her own unique analysis of the Civil War, based on contemporary conversations on the anthropological role of passions. First, I will offer an overview of the seventeenth-century debate on the passions and determine which contemporary intellectual and theological frameworks were available for Hutchinson to build an argument around the passions. Following this, I will reconstruct the precise role of the passions in Hutchinson's history of the Civil War, closely related to the problem of Civil War factionalism. I deepen the understanding of Hutchinson's emphasis on the passions by connecting it to the broader issues of the Divine grace and providence. I not only show that the passions are not just a *feminine* touch to her history, but that an analysis of the passions in Hutchinson's history writing enriches our understanding of her project, as it sheds light on how she establishes a relationship between morality, historical events, and providence.

3.2. PASSIONS IN THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY

3.2.1 Terminology

During the seventeenth century, debate around the passions was central to philosophical thought. Susan James points out that the subject was not limited to philosophers, but also discussed by diverse groups such as "poets musicians, painters, playwrights, doctors, lawyers, and teachers."¹⁵

But what was meant by passions? Although they are related, it is inaccurate to equate the word passion with emotion, sentiment and affection, since these categories lacked their modern-day meaning.¹⁶ In the first decades of the seventeenth century, passion mostly referred to the passion of Christ, or the suffering of martyrs. Although the use of passion in this sense decreased, some kept using it in the sense of suffering. New meanings appeared, and passions began to be regarded as disturbances, perturbations, and illness. This gave the word a violent and irrational touch, which evolved into a third, lasting conceptualization as "vehement emotions, or the outbursts expressing them."¹⁷ These can consist of pleasure, desire, as well as pain.¹⁸ Some examples of seventeenth-century passions are ambition, greed, envy, lust for power, avarice and ferocity.¹⁹

¹⁵ Susan James, *Passion and Action: The Emotions In Seventeenth-Century Philosophy* (Oxford: Clarendon press, 1999), 2; Peter Harrison, "The Fall, the Passions, and Dominion over Nature," in *The Soft Underbelly of Reason: The Passions in the Seventeenth Century*, ed. Stephen Gaukroger (London: Routledge, 1998), 49; Amy Schmitter, "Passions and Affections," in *The Oxford Handbook of British Philosophy in the Seventeenth Century*, ed. Peter Anstey (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 442-445.

¹⁶ Schmitter, "Passion," 445-6.

¹⁷ Schmitter, "Passion," 446.

¹⁸ Schmitter, "Passion," 446.

¹⁹ Albert Hirschman, *The Passions and the Interests: Political Arguments for Capitalism before Its Triumph* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1977), 9-30.

3.2.2 The role of passions in human nature

Albert Hirschman describes how during the Renaissance, a movement arose that attempted to rethink theories to improve statecraft.²⁰ These thinkers would not rely on theorizations on how men should be, but how they really are.²¹

Niccolo Machiavelli (1469-1527), for example, condemned political philosophers that did not rely on a realistic theory of state to advise the prince on how to expand power.²² Thinkers like Thomas Hobbes (1588-1679), Baruch Spinoza (1632-1677) and Bacon all increasingly proffered theories of human nature in which passions were positioned as natural engines of human action. To build an argument on the anthropological role of the passions, the seventeenth-century thinker could draw upon established philosophical and theological traditions dating back to earlier periods.

Stoicism and epicureanism offered a first root for philosophical reflection on the passions. *Apatheia* was central in stoic thought and can be translated as *passionlessness*. Stoics believed that to live a good life, one must completely eliminate the passions. They launched the opposition between reason and passions that remained influential throughout centuries. Reason is what can accomplish the state of *apatheia* and liberate the mind from passions. This intellectual tradition experienced a revival and gained renewed prominence through the Neo-Stoic movement in the seventeenth century.²³ *Ataraxia*, an Epicurean term that refers to *freedom of perturbation* also influenced debates on passion and is closely related to *apatheia*.²⁴

Augustinianism forms a second theoretical basis of the passions. Augustine argues that all passions are forms of love.²⁵ How this passion expresses itself depends on the will. Love can in theory result in positive passions, when the will is directed to God. For example, fear can be good when it consists of fear of God.²⁶ However, he believes that since the Fall of Man and original sin, love of God was overcome by an unfavourable form of love: love of the self. Adam and Eve ate from the tree of knowledge, which made humanity inherently sinful. Augustine argued that due to the Fall, the human nature changed. Humans were from then on burdened with *concupiscence*; perversion of desire. This refers to desire for things for their own sake, for pleasure, things we

²⁰ Hirschman, *The Passions and the Interests*, 12.

²¹ Hirschman, *The Passions and the Interests*, 12.

²² Markus Fischer, "Machiavelli's Political Psychology," *The Review of Politics* 59, no. 4 (1997): 797; Hirschman, *The Passions and the Interests*, 12-3.

²³ Gaukroger, "Introduction," 6.

²⁴ Schmitter, "Passions," 448-49.

²⁵ James, *Passion*, 6.

²⁶ Peter King, "Dispassionate Passions," in *Emotion and Cognitive Life in Medieval and Early Modern Philosophy*, eds. Martin Pickavé and Lisa Shapiro (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 18.

actually do not need to survive.²⁷ The will turned to the self.²⁸ Reason did not rule over the passions anymore, but the other way around.²⁹ Augustine argued that fallen humanity was corrupted by three human sins that are described in terms of passions: lust for money and possessions, lust for power, and sexual lust.³⁰ For Augustine, the stoic ideal of *apatheia* is fiction. In contrast to what the Stoics claimed, he argues that humans cannot overcome concupiscence and thus escape passions and punishment for sin during life on earth. Nevertheless, for Augustine, there is one way out: Christ's sacrifice on the cross redeemed humankind from sin. However, this redemption can only be obtained via Divine grace.³¹

Aristotelianism, revisited in the works of Thomas Aquinas, forms another theological and philosophical source of inspiration for anthropological theories on the passions. In Aristotelian thought, moderation of the passions is desirable, and excesses and deficiencies should be prevented. Aristotle leaves open the possibility that the passions can be compatible with reason.³² Aristotle's legacy was passed on by scholastic Aquinas as he synthesized Aristotelianism and Christian doctrine.³³

Aquinas' theorization of the passions is not radically different from Augustine's. He holds up the doctrine of original Sin and the effects on the hierarchy between reason and the passions.³⁴ However, in Aquinas' work there are subtle, yet important, differences. The differences between Aquinas' and Augustine's view on the passions are very complex and could be object of another full-length study. I will focus on the most significant divergences that are directly relevant to the present analysis.

According to Augustine, humanity lost the natural ability to act virtuously in the Fall. Aquinas, however, thinks the passions can still be mitigated. I cannot express this difference better than Michael Moriarty: While according to Augustine, the Fall resulted in "a radical transformation or perversion of human nature," Thomas regards it as a mere "injury;" "Augustine's themes have been transposed, as it were, into a different musical system, and they end up sounding very different."³⁵ Aquinas leaves more space for reason to control the passions. He maintains the possibility that one can behave virtuously, because humans are rational beings and to act in a

²⁷ Michael Moriarty, *Fallen Nature, Fallen Selves: Early Modern French Thought II* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 99-101.

²⁸ Barbara H. Rosenwein, "Who Cared about Thomas Aquinas's Theory of the Passions?," *L'Atelier du Centre de recherches historiques* 16 (2016), accessed 29.07.2025, <http://journals.openedition.org/acrh/7420>.

²⁹ E.J. Hundert, "Augustine and the Sources of the Divided Self," *Political Theory* 20, no. 1 (1992): 93.

³⁰ Hirschman, *The Passions and the Interests*, 9.

³¹ King "Dispassionate Passions," 17; Moriarty, *Fallen Nature*, 99-101.

³² Schmitter, "Passions," 448.

³³ James, *Passion and Action*, 48.

³⁴ Moriarty, *Fallen Nature*, 111; Elisabeth Uffenheimer-Lippens, "Rationalized Passion and Passionate Rationality: Thomas Aquinas on the Relation between Reason and the Passions," *The Review of Metaphysics* 56, no. 3 (2003): 544.

³⁵ Moriarty, *Fallen Nature*, 113.

virtuous way is in line with that reason.³⁶ According to Aquinas, the passions can and should still be governed by reason.³⁷ This government does not mean total suppression. With the help of reason, passions can contribute to the morality of human beings. Seemingly negative passions can, when guided by reason, be redirected for good causes. For example, anger is not necessarily bad when it is moderated by reason, and can contribute to a moral act.³⁸

Besides Stoicism, both Thomism and Augustinianism influenced early modern thought on the passions. Robert Miner argues that English thinkers like Hobbes directly or indirectly responded to Aquinas' "Treatise on the Passions."³⁹ In this period, Augustinian thought also regained prominence, both on the continent as the British Isles. This neo-Augustinian movement and especially its emphasis on the Fall and original sin had significant impact on theorizations on the passions.⁴⁰

How is this then relevant for this study? Gheeraert-Graffeuille observed that Hutchinson offered a historical-anthropological account of the Civil War in which "factionalism was inseparable from the disease that affected the state and resulted from the disordered passions—ambition, envy, and greed—that drove her contemporaries."⁴¹ Her emphasis on the anthropological role of the passions in her historical narrative makes her not so different from her male peers, as canonical figures like Hobbes, Spinoza and Bacon all responded to the traditions I just outlined.⁴² That Hutchinson offers an anthropological analysis of the passions was more mainstream than generally assumed by *herstory*-inspired scholars, and results in a more complex narrative than merely an 'emotional' touch to the history of the war. In the following sections, I will unravel that complexity to show that Hutchinson's emphasis on the passions is more than Matchinske and Hudson made of it.

³⁶ Moriarty, *Fallen Nature*, 111.

³⁷ Gheeraert-Graffeuille, *Lucy Hutchinson and the English Revolution*, 60; Peter King, "Aquinas on the Passions," in *Aquinas's Moral Theory: Essays in Honor of Norman Kretzmann*, eds. Scott Macdonald and Eleonore Stump (New York: Cornell University Press, 2008), 126.

³⁸ Uffenheimer-Lippens, "Rationalized Passion," 547-8, 555-6.

³⁹ Hirschman, *The Passions and the Interests*, 21-24; See Robert Miner for the relationship between early-modern mechanistic accounts of the passions and Aquinas' non-mechanistic ideas on the passions: Robert Miner, *Thomas Aquinas on the Passions: A Study of Summa Theologiae, 1a2ae 22-48* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 1.

⁴⁰ James, *Passion and Action*, 6; Harrison, "The Fall," 49.

⁴¹ Gheeraert-Graffeuille adds that Hutchinson was not the only seventeenth-century writer who considered the cause of the Civil War to be factionalism. She offers the Presbyterian Clement Walker as an example; Gheeraert-Graffeuille, *Lucy Hutchinson and the English Revolution*, 156, 162.

⁴² Hirschman, *The Passions and the Interests*, 10-15; Miner, *Thomas Aquinas on the Passions*, 1.

3.3 THE *MEMOIRS*: A HISTORY CENTRED ON HUMAN PASSIONS

3.3.1 Hutchinson's understanding of the passions: Thomism and Augustinianism

After this overview of the different conceptualizations of the passions, it is fitting to return to Hutchinson's use of the word passion, which is in line with "vehement emotions, or the outbursts expressing them."⁴³ The very first sentence of the *To my children* section demonstrates this. In this passage, she positions herself against others who may have lost a loved one, who:

"may lett loose the winds of *passion* to bring in a flood of sorrow, whose ebbing tides carry away the deare memory of what they have lost."⁴⁴

In this context, passion refers to an outburst of grief after losing a beloved. Hutchinson disapproves of this conduct and on the contrary employs the process of writing the *Memoirs* "to moderate her woe, and, if it were possible, to augment my love."⁴⁵ Hutchinson argues for the tempering of certain passions, for instance sorrow, but frames love as a positive passion. A moderate amount of passions such as love can be beneficial, but their excess ought to be avoided:

"he loved her in the Lord as his fellow creature, not his idoll, but in such a manner as shew'd that an affection bounded in the just rules of duty farre exceeds every way all the *irregular passions* in the world."⁴⁶

Gheeraert-Graffeuille similarly shows how Hutchinson does not consider passions inherently negative. Hutchinson believes that anger and love can be redirected for good causes.⁴⁷ In this way, she distances herself from Stoic and Epicurean ideas on passions, that aim at eliminating passions from human existence. Hutchinson expressed herself as a staunch opponent of Lucretius' thought in her dedicatory letter that accompanied her translation of *De rerum natura* into English. The text also consists of marginalia in which Hutchinson explicitly distances herself from Lucretius. Scholars have tried to solve the puzzle of Hutchinson's occupation with Lucretius when she clearly does not share those beliefs, and have not yet reached a fulfilling answer.⁴⁸

Importantly, Gheeraert-Graffeuille shows that for the passions to be useful, reason as a means to control the passions plays an important role.⁴⁹ Hutchinson tries to prove throughout the *Memoirs* that the Colonel can control his passions:

⁴³ Schmitter, "Passion," 446.

⁴⁴ Lucy Hutchinson, *Memoirs of the Life of Colonel Hutchinson* (c. 1664), ed. James Sutherland (London: Oxford University Press, 1973), 1.

⁴⁵ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 1.

⁴⁶ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 10.

⁴⁷ Gheeraert-Graffeuille, *Lucy Hutchinson and the English Revolution*, 60.

⁴⁸ Jonathan Goldberg, "Lucy Hutchinson Writing Matter," *ELH* 73, no. 1 (2006): 275-80.

⁴⁹ Gheeraert-Graffeuille, *Lucy Hutchinson and the English Revolution*, 60.

His whole life was the rule of temperance in meate, drinke, apparell, pleasure, and all those things that may be lawfully enjoy'd; and herein his temperance was more excellent than others' in whom it is not so much a virtue which proceeds from want of appetite or gust of pleasure, as that in him which was true, wise, and religious government of the desire and delight he took in the things he enjoy'd.⁵⁰

Reason indeed plays an important role in John's control over his passions:

The heate of his youth a little enclin'd him to the passion of anger, and the goodnesse of his nature to that of love and griefe, but reason was never dethron'd by them, but continued governess and moderator in his soul.⁵¹

Hutchinson believes that when reason and religion dominate John's passions, all is well: "*religion and reason*, its two favour'd councillours, tooke order that all the *passions* kept within their owne just bounds, there did him good service, and further'd the publick weale."⁵²

One of the few remarks of Gheeraert-Graffeulle on Hutchinson's view of the passions is that Hutchinson here relies on Aquinas, who believes that reason can keep them tempered. It seems counterintuitive that a Puritan woman would base her ideas on the passions on a scholastic theologian. Gheeraert-Graffeulle studied this paradox and showed that "the Hutchinsons' dislike of scholasticism does not mean that, like most reformed theologians, they were not experts at it."⁵³ In her secular commonplace book, Hutchinson even cites passages from the Jesuit Nicolas Caussin (1583-1651) that cover passions and virtues, which also lays bare her interest in theology.⁵⁴ Gheeraert-Graffeulle remarks that the occupation with how reason can control the passions recurs in both Caussin's and Aquinas' writings.⁵⁵

Whereas I agree that Hutchinson holds Thomist beliefs in her conceptualization of the passions, Gheeraert-Graffeulle has overlooked the influence Augustinian thought has on Hutchinson. Although Hutchinson does leave open the possibility that John can redirect his passions to the common good, I will show that she at the same time argues that passions can only be truly overcome by the Divine grace. As shown by Moriarty, neo-Augustinianism resulted in a shift from the conception of humans that are capable of living life through reason, to humans that are inherently bound by their unescapable passions, which only God's grace can solve.⁵⁶ Hutchinson

⁵⁰ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 13.

⁵¹ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 14.

⁵² Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 8.

⁵³ Gheeraert-Graffeulle, *Lucy Hutchinson and the English Revolution*, 54.

⁵⁴ Gheeraert-Graffeulle, *Lucy Hutchinson and the English Revolution*, 55.

⁵⁵ Gheeraert-Graffeulle, *Lucy Hutchinson and the English Revolution*, 60.

⁵⁶ Moriarty, *Fallen Nature*, 388-9; Although Moriarty made these observations about France, he argues that "European thought was not confined within national boundaries;" Moriarty, *Fallen Nature*, 56; He also

repeatedly puts forward Augustinian ideas on the sinful human nature since the Fall, the salvation of humanity since the death of Christ, and God's grace as the only way out of sin. She states for example that John

was yett but man: a sonne of Adam, an inheritor of his corrupted nature, subject to all the sins and miseries that attend it; which is necessary to be consider'd, that wee may the more magnifie the riches of God's grace and admirable power, whereby he raysd that wretched fallen nature and chang'd it into such a blessed image of his owne glory.⁵⁷

John is one of the fortunate to have received God's grace to overcome his sinful nature, his passions. She very clearly theorizes her own stance on the Godly grace, when she explains what she means by John's Christianity:

By Christianitie I intend that universall habitt of grace which is wrought in a soule by the regenerating spiritt of God, whereby the whole creature is resign'd up into the devine will and love, and all its actions design'd to the obedience of that for the glory of its maker... a seeking after the knowledge of him, a love and delight in his law, a perfect detestation of sinne, with a desire, delight and endeavour to doe well, a beliefe of eternitie, and a sence of men's conditions in life and death, a sence of naturall corruption, a groaning under it and desire to be freed from it.⁵⁸

Only the grace of God can effectuate true morality. In the following passage, she clarifies that not everyone can receive God's grace. God

had bene pleas'd to chuse him [John] out of the corrupted masse of lost mankind to fix his love upon him, and give him the knowledge of himselfe by his ever blessed Sonne. This principle of love and life in God, which had bene given him even when he discern'd not what it was in himselfe, had from a child preserv'd him from fleshly lusts and pollutions, and from wallowing in the mire of sinne and wickednesse wherein most of the gentry of those times were miserably plunged,...⁵⁹

Although Hutchinson certainly considers reason a tool to overcome John's passions, the rest of "lost mankind" apparently does not succeed at this because they did not receive God's grace. The ideas Hutchinson moves forward concerning the passions can be situated within the broader

primarily focused on Roman Catholic Augustinianism, but maintained that similar ideas circulated in reformed milieus; Moriarty, *Fallen Nature*, 109.

⁵⁷ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 2.

⁵⁸ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 5.

⁵⁹ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 35.

context in which the conceptual tools for thinking about the human passions were undergoing transformation, and Thomism gradually made place for Augustinianism.

3.3.2 Divine providence

Thus far, my analysis of Hutchinson's conceptualization of the passions has been limited to John's conduct of his passions. However, the rest of this chapter focuses on how Hutchinson considers human passions of all historical protagonists, except for her husband, the destructive factor in the history of the Civil War.

Before delving into the analysis, it is important to note that scholars like Hodgkin have pointed out that there is a tension present regarding Hutchinson's providential perspective: "alongside her historical narrative, she is wrestling with the question of causality, and in particular god's intent: if providence is behind all events, why did the Commonwealth fail?"⁶⁰ In other words: how is it possible that God, the motor of history and individual action, allowed the failure of the republican and Puritan cause? The tension here centres on how Divine providence is compatible with human agency.

Hutchinson, like many seventeenth-century Puritan contemporaries, indeed considers God to be the driving force of history, as she describes him as "the Almighty Author of all beings, in his various providences whereby he conducts the lives of men from cradle to the tomb."⁶¹ Hutchinson's history is embedded in a providential and eschatological framework, and this passage implies that God applies his providence even on an individual level.⁶²

Even in seemingly insignificant anecdotes, God's providence is present: Hutchinson for example describes how a canon bullet shot straight through a house where a girl rocked a baby in a cradle. By a "remarkable providence," the bullet did not hit the baby who remained unhurt.⁶³

On a political level, she also perceives God's agency. In 1643 an armistice was reached in Ireland whereby Charles could remove troops back to England to serve in the English Civil War. However, this did not bring him popularity since he was suspected of supporting the Irish Catholics in their struggle.⁶⁴ Hutchinson shares this distrust: "this rebellion in Ireland receiv'd countenance from the King and Queene of England."⁶⁵ She supports this by the argument that the King's strategic move was not according to God's plan: "God never blest his affairs after they [the army] came to

⁶⁰ Katharine Hodgkin, "Women, Memory and Family History in Seventeenth-Century England," in *Memory before modernity*, eds. Erika Kuijpers, Judith Pollmann, Johannes Müller, and Jasper van der Steen (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 307.

⁶¹ Gheeraert-Graffeuille, *Lucy Hutchinson and the English Revolution*, 262; Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 276.

⁶² Gheeraert-Graffeuille, *Lucy Hutchinson and the English Revolution*, 38, 265.

⁶³ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 96.

⁶⁴ Martyn Bennett, *The English Civil War: A Historical Companion* (Brimscombe: Tempus, 2004), 17-8; Eamon Darcy, *The Irish Rebellion of 1641 and the Wars of the Three Kingdoms* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2013), 93-5.

⁶⁵ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 52.

him, though indeed before their arrival God had begun to turn the scale.”⁶⁶ She argues that God is responsible for the King’s following loss of the cities of Gloucester and Newbury, after a longer series of victories.

Although there are many more examples of providence in the *Memoirs*, these already illustrate its prevalence. However, if God’s providence is a driving force in history, how is this compatible with Hutchinson’s dark moral outlook on the failed republican cause? Hutchinson’s disappointment over the failed cause cannot be overstated. Longfellow showed on the basis of an analysis of Hutchinson’s *Order & Disorder* that republicans like Hutchinson considered the almost reached republic as a form of heavenly Kingdom, the rule of God on earth. They wanted to bring the earth closer to God, and the failure of this cause was perceived as a second Fall:⁶⁷

Yet hath not this wheat been without its tares; God, in comparison with other countries, hath made this as a paradise; so, to complete the parallel, the serpent hath in all times been busy to seduce, and not unsuccessful, ever stirring up opposers to the infant truths of Christ.⁶⁸

Indeed, the *Memoirs* also refer to the Fall in the description of how true Christianity always had its enemies. Longfellow states that “they had glimpsed a second paradise, a way closer to God, but had lost it through human folly.”⁶⁹

An analysis of this “human folly”, in other words passions, can improve our understanding of the tension between the individual actions driven by passions and Divine providence. To do this, it is helpful to consider Looser’s suggestion that Hutchinson operates at three levels which are mirrors of one another: romantic history, political history and providence.⁷⁰ She bases this on Norbrook who showed that mirrors are central in the *Memoirs*, as a Christianized version of Neoplatonism. He showed that Hutchinson’s conception of human history in its entirety is characterized by several layers that mirror each other. He argues that earthly history in the *Memoirs* is a mirror of the heavenly, the Godly, that “all human history and social relations form a series of mirrors in which reflection after reflection stretches toward the absolute.”⁷¹ Instead of romantic history as a starting point, I will instead analyse how Hutchinson’s moral history centred around the passions of individuals reflects her political, and at last providential history. I will demonstrate that (the lack of) self-government of the passions connects the moral history of individuals to political

⁶⁶ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 126.

⁶⁷ Erica Longfellow, *Women and Religious Writing* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 200.

⁶⁸ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 281.

⁶⁹ Longfellow, *Women and Religious Writing*, 200.

⁷⁰ Devoney Looser, *British Women Writers and the Writing of History, 1670-1820* (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 2000), 41.

⁷¹ Looser, *British Women Writers*, 40; David Norbrook, “Lucy Hutchinson’s “Elegies” and the Situation of the Republican Woman Writer (with text),” *English Literary Renaissance* 27, no. 3 (1997): 471.

history. The level of political history and providential history is then again connected by (the lack of) Divine grace. In this layered analysis of the war, Hutchinson continues to draw on Augustinian ideas, whose prevalence in the narrative I already demonstrated.

3.3.3 Civil War factionalism

One of the main problems Hutchinson perceives during the period of the Civil War is factionalism, which she relates to the passions. The Oxford English Dictionary defines a faction as “organized dissenting group within a larger one, especially in politics or religion.”⁷² Factionalism is present on all levels in the *Memoirs*. Several fragments illustrate Hutchinson’s negative emphasis on factionalism regarding the three religious factions: “The papist, the State Protestant, and the more religious zelotts who afterward were branded with the name of Puritane.”⁷³ However, she later shows that factionalism extended its influence on all levels of society:

Nor was the faction only in particular Garrisons, but the Parliament House it selfe began to fall into the two greate oppositions of Presbitery and Independency. And, as if Discord had infected the whole English ayre with an Epidemicall hart-burning and dissention in all places, even the King’s Councells and Garrisons were as factiously devided.⁷⁴

Hutchinson is not concerned with strife between Catholics and Protestants, or Cavaliers and Roundheads, but rather with the distinction of different groups within the Parliamentary wing. Throughout her account of English history leading up to the Civil War, she consistently expresses concern regarding this issue. She refers to factionalism as “the wolfe came into the fold in a sheepe’s clothing and wrought more slaughter that way among the lambs than he could have done in his owne skin.”⁷⁵ She adds that mainly the ones “discontented when they could not obtaine the preferments their *ambition* gap’d at” are guilty of this betrayal.⁷⁶ More specifically, she identifies the passion of ambition as an engine of faction. The traitor from within is a returning theme throughout the *Memoirs* and is intertwined with Hutchinson’s history of the war in which the passions are the driving force. The following sections focus on several of these traitors and their passions: John’s adversaries in Nottingham, Cromwell, the King, and factious Parliamentarians.

⁷² Oxford English Dictionary, lemma “faction (n.1), sense 2.a,” accessed 16.05.2025, <https://doi.org/10.1093/OED/9609369251>.

⁷³ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 38.

⁷⁴ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 158.

⁷⁵ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 44.

⁷⁶ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 44; My emphasis.

3.3.4 Nottingham

Hutchinson offers portraits of some local Nottingham men, which provides a solid starting point to broaden our understanding of how Hutchinson considers the passions to have shaped the situation in Nottingham and beyond.⁷⁷

Let us first consider the particular power relations in Nottingham. The fact that “a high mutiny and faction against the Governor” broke loose reinforced Hutchinson’s negative judgement of factionalism.⁷⁸ In the overview of the *Memoirs*, I already hinted at plots undertaken against John’s person. Between 1643 and 1645, a power struggle between John and other members of the Nottingham Committee erupted.⁷⁹ The Nottingham Committee was predominantly occupied by Presbyterians that opposed Independents like John, which offers a clear example of how factionalism occurs both on the local and national level.⁸⁰ His adversaries in the committee spread false information about him to undermine his position as the governor of Nottingham Castle, an office to which he had been appointed by the army general Thomas Fairfax. This catalysed rebellion and mutiny against him.⁸¹ Eventually in 1645, John was heard by the Committee of Both Kingdoms, the Parliamentary committee that was appointed to settle the Nottingham dispute. However, Hutchinson describes how this body was similarly corrupted by factionalism, connecting the situation in London to the situation in Nottingham. The case was later redirected to the House of Commons.⁸²

Hutchinson offers individual portraits of John’s enemies in this committee, who can be considered the wolfs in sheep’s clothing. The four particular persons Hutchinson writes a scathing description of, are John Gell, Charles White, James Chadwick and Huntingdon Plumtre.⁸³ Gheeraert-Graffeuille already touched upon the “low” and “negative” passions that Hutchinson ascribes to these men.⁸⁴

In her description of John Gell, a Parliamentarian general that was part of the Nottingham committee, Hutchinson first of all refers to him as an “adulterer,” referring to sexual passions.⁸⁵ She opposes Gell and her husband, arguing that there is a “natural antipathie” between “good and evil.”⁸⁶ This is broadly reminiscent of the passage I cited in which Hutchinson draws an antithesis

⁷⁷ Gheeraert-Graffeuille, *Lucy Hutchinson and the English Revolution*, 287; Neill Keeble, “Lucy Hutchinson and the Business of Memoirs,” *The Review of English Studies* 73, no. 311 (2022): 711.

⁷⁸ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 132.

⁷⁹ Anna Wall, ““Not so much open professed enemies as close hypocritical false-hearted people”: Lucy Hutchinson’s Manuscript Account of the Services of John Hutchinson and mid-seventeenth-century Factionalism,” *The Seventeenth Century* 36, no. 4 (2020): 624; Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, XII.

⁸⁰ Wall, ““Not so much open professed enemies,”” 23, 31.

⁸¹ Wall, ““Not so much open professed enemies,”” 19.

⁸² Gheeraert-Graffeuille, *Lucy Hutchinson and the English Revolution*, 157-60.

⁸³ Gheeraert-Graffeuille, *Lucy Hutchinson and the English Revolution*, 288.

⁸⁴ Gheeraert-Graffeuille, *Lucy Hutchinson and the English Revolution*, 289, 295.

⁸⁵ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 67.

⁸⁶ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 68.

between God and the serpent, the devil. She remarks that he also bribed news writers and consequently manipulated public records to falsely cast himself in a positive light:

This man kept the diurnall makers in pension, so that whatever was done in any of the neighbouring counties against the enemy was ascribed to him; and he had indirectly purchased himself a name in story which he never merited.⁸⁷

She further describes Gell as envious, hateful and having an ill will, referring to passions that oppose the public good.⁸⁸

Charles White, a refractory member of the Nottingham garrison, is similarly described in destructive terms: "This man had the most factious, ambitious, vaineglorious, envious, and malicious nature that is imaginable: but he was the greatest dissembler, flatterer, traitor and hypocrite that ever was."⁸⁹ She condemns the false pretence under which he proposed himself as a faithful Puritan and supporter of the cause.⁹⁰ She also considers him "the Devil's exquisite solicitor."⁹¹

Later, she states that he was driven by "factious ambition."⁹² While Gheeraert-Graffeuille does not explicitly frame this as evidence of Hutchinson's association between factionalism and the passions, it offers a persuasive indication of such a connection. She also highlights his sexual lusts: "he was addicted to many lusts, especially to that of women."⁹³

Plumtre was a local landowner and doctor, who had cured John's brother from "an epileptick disease."⁹⁴ She initially portrays him in a positive light, both because of this cure and because he appeared to be "high for the Parliament interest."⁹⁵ However, Hutchinson later accuses him of atheism and "intolerable pride."⁹⁶ Hutchinson later includes a scene in which Plumtre enters into a fight with John, who wanted to transfer the "ordinance," all artillery of the town, to the castle.⁹⁷ Plumtre did not agree with this decision, since he was concerned about his private goods. Hutchinson contrasts his focus on personal materials with the public good, since John replied that the artillery was being removed "for the advantage of the more publick interest of the Cause."⁹⁸ Hutchinson thus opposes passions such as greed with the public spirit I already discussed in the

⁸⁷ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 68.

⁸⁸ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 68; Keeble, "Lucy Hutchinson," 711.

⁸⁹ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 69.

⁹⁰ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 69.

⁹¹ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 123.

⁹² Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 112.

⁹³ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 69; Keeble, "Lucy Hutchinson," 711.

⁹⁴ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 71.

⁹⁵ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 71.

⁹⁶ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 71.

⁹⁷ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 85; Gheeraert-Graffeuille, *Lucy Hutchinson and the English Revolution*, 293.

⁹⁸ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 85.

previous chapter. Hutchinson then portrays Plumtre as “raging” and replying “in greate passion.”⁹⁹ She adds that

While this was boyling upon his spirit, he mett the Governor with some other gentlemen in the streete, and began to rayle at him for countenancing the godly townsmen, whom he call’d a company of Puritanicall prickear’d rascals...¹⁰⁰

I pointed out earlier that Hutchinson believes that, with the help of reason, John can redirect some passions, such as anger, to good causes. However, the anger Hutchinson perceives in Plumtre during this fight is of a different order and is considered immoderate. She does not seem to pass judgement on John’s physical violence, despite the fact that he would have “struck” Plumtre during this conversation.¹⁰¹ She might consider this particular anger-outburst positive since it was used against a “prophane Atheist.”¹⁰² Hutchinson shows that the exemplary Puritan, her husband, is able to govern his passions and pursue them for good ends. However, Plumtre, a false Puritan, is not able to control them in the same way as John. Presumably, this is due to the fact that John can count on Divine grace.

The last person Hutchinson offers a portrait of is Chadwick, whom she especially disapproves for his hypocrisy and selfishness. He would at the same time flatter the King, and pretend to be a devout puritan.¹⁰³ When he would have kissed the hand of the King, she states that: “Never was a truer Judas since Iscariott’s time than he, for he would kisse the man he had in his heart to kill.”¹⁰⁴ He also unfairly bought himself into powerful positions: he “had strangely wrought himself into a degree unfit for him.”¹⁰⁵ He “purchased the honor of a Barrister, though he had neither law nor learning.”¹⁰⁶ A barrister was normally a student of law that had the opportunity to practice to advocate in courts of law.¹⁰⁷ However, Hutchinson argues that he was not even a student. Her already scathing portrayal of him is intensified as she emphasizes Chadwick’s sexual lusts, since she describes him as a “libidinous goate.”¹⁰⁸ However, she adds that “his wife, they say, pay’d him

⁹⁹ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 85.

¹⁰⁰ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 85.

¹⁰¹ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 85.

¹⁰² Hutchinson, 226; Keeble, “Lucy Hutchinson,” 711.

¹⁰³ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 72.

¹⁰⁴ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 72.

¹⁰⁵ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 71.

¹⁰⁶ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 72.

¹⁰⁷ Oxford English Dictionary, lemma “barrister (n.), sense a,” accessed 16.05.2025, <https://doi.org/10.1093/OED/9750898931>.

¹⁰⁸ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 72.

with making him a cuckold.”¹⁰⁹ She is not averse to incorporating subtle humor into her writing: “Millington begun with a large enumeration of Chadwick’s worthy actions (knowne to no man).”¹¹⁰

Hutchinson’s depiction of Plumtre and Chadwick also points at their self-interest: they “at the first put themselves most forward into the businesse.”¹¹¹ This “businesse” refers to the dealings of Parliament, which they would serve for their own sakes.

Hutchinson depicts all these men as reckless, passionate and selfish, which makes them hypocrite traitors that do not act according to the cause, notwithstanding their own pretences of doing the opposite. At first glance, this might seem like mere name-calling. However, I argue that it is part of her anthropological analysis of the passions, especially with the already cited passages on the Fall in mind.

Although John seems to embody the Thomist idea of reason as a means to redirect the passions for good causes, the selfishness of these Nottingham men corresponds to the abundant self-love Augustine perceives since the Fall. Love for the self should be subordinated by love for God, but since The Fall this is not the hierarchy. Only God’s grace can change this order, but this is not granted to all. Neo-Augustinianism resulted in more accounts that consider human beings to be intrinsically driven by self-love, by a desire for their own advantage, and thus by passions.¹¹² I already illustrated the prevalence of power-hunger and self-interest in my analysis of Hutchinson’s conception of the word private in the third chapter. These Nottingham men similarly lack self-government and control over their passions because of their self-interest, which results in factious behaviour. God does not necessarily intervene in the restraint of these men’s passions. Hutchinson nevertheless interprets the passion-driven events in Nottingham in a providential light. She describes the first plot against John in Nottingham to be “providentially brought to light,” “by God’s providence.”¹¹³ Hutchinson thus depicts God as a truth-bearer who changes the course of history through his revelations of the truth on human nature.

Apart from the plot, more local events are interpreted in terms of uncontrolled passions. In 1643 and 1644, Nottingham was surprised by two attacks from the Royalist forces of Newark. In her description of the second attack, led by Charles Lucas (1613-1648), Hutchinson expresses her dismay of that day’s coldblooded murdering of both parties. Gheeraert-Graffeuille interpreted this passage as a battle “in which many contradictory human passions come into play,” which again shows the centrality of the passions.¹¹⁴ After her description of the battle, Hutchinson interprets

¹⁰⁹ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 72.

¹¹⁰ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 148; Keeble, “Lucy Hutchinson,” 711.

¹¹¹ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 70.

¹¹² Moriarty, *Fallen Nature*, 397.

¹¹³ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 144, 147.

¹¹⁴ Gheeraert-Graffeuille, *Lucy Hutchinson and the English Revolution*, 143.

their cruel abuses in a providential sense which again shows the importance of God's presence in the course of events and Hutchinson's anthropological analysis of the passions:

it was a great instruction that even the best and the highest courages are but the beames of the Almighty, and when he withholds his influence, the brave turn cowards, feare unnerves the most mighty, makes the most generous base, and greate men do those things they blush to thinke on.¹¹⁵

In this passage, she outlines the default situation of humanity: cold-blooded murder, driven by immoderate passions, is what people do when God "withholds his influence", in other words his Divine grace. This is what happens when God does not show mercy. Why did God then not intervene in this bloody battle? Hutchinson's conception of providentialism is as in the previous example by showing the truth. She paints a picture of a God who knows perfectly well what He is doing: he proclaims a higher truth by showing humanities true passion-driven nature when He withdraws His presence. The Augustinian emphasis on divine Grace and the Fall is again clearly present here.

How can she still blame John's Nottingham adversaries, when they actually could not do anything about their passions, since humanity was corrupted since the Fall? I hypothesize that Hutchinson believes that one can govern the passions up to a certain level, by for example being aware of your own self-interest and try not to act on that. However, danger for lack of control is always present since only God can really bring one to the right path. In this way, she can still individually blame the Nottingham men for the instabilities, and maintain the Augustinian idea of the Fall and Divine grace, which John did receive.

In conclusion, Hutchinson's depiction of the passions and factious men in Nottingham fits the neo-Augustinian idea that humans are self-loving creatures. Only God's grace can resolve this, but He employs this reality as an exemplary tool to guide humanity to the right path.

Gheeraert-Graffeulle suggested that what Hutchinson describes on a local level is a miniature of what happens on a national level. According to her, Nottingham functioned as a microcosm of the Civil War. Hutchinson confirms this herself with the statement that before the war completely broke loose, "every County had more or lesse the civill warre within it selfe."¹¹⁶ She repeatedly uses bottom-up metaphors to describe the course of events: "Before the flame of the warre broke out in the top of the chimnies, the smoake ascended in every country."¹¹⁷ Let us now turn to national entities and figure out if Hutchinson grasps their passions in the same way.

¹¹⁵ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 115.

¹¹⁶ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 60.

¹¹⁷ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 60.

3.3.5 Cromwell

Hutchinson's view of Cromwell conforms to many pamphlets and books written during the Interregnum and the Protectorate that consider Cromwell a Machiavellian betrayer of the cause and a tyrant. Gheeraert-Graffeuille enquired how Hutchison depicts Cromwell as "the great dissembler."¹¹⁸ Blair Warden similarly observes that the Restoration period witnessed the most vehement charges against his person, no less from republicans like Hutchinson than from Royalists. The general opinion condemned Cromwell's betrayal of the "cause of Liberty."¹¹⁹

Hutchinson blames Cromwell mainly for his dissimulation and ambition, which she considered "poyson" that so "ulcerated Cromwell's heart."¹²⁰ Most interestingly, Hutchinson here implies that his heart was in the first place not corrupted. What is different in Hutchinson's case from other Restoration histories is the Hutchinson's personal closeness to Cromwell. John and Cromwell were on good terms for a long time, since Cromwell showed support for John's difficulties in Nottingham. John's hostility towards Cromwell grew over time.¹²¹ When read in terms of passions, John condemned Cromwell that the passion of ambition got the best of him and caused the failure of the republican cause. As I showed in the previous chapter, the Levellers were the first to grow suspicious of Cromwell's ambition. After the Levellers began to stand up in Parliament, John had a conversation with Cromwell to alert him on his decreasing self-control. According to Hutchinson, John told him

how much it would darken all his glories if he should become a slave to his own *ambition*, and be guilty of what he gave the world just cause to suspect, and therefore beg'd of him to wear his heart in his face, and to scorne to delude his enemies, but to make use of his noble courage in daring to maintaine what he believ'd just against all greate oposers.¹²²

Hutchinson seems to be convinced that anyone, including Cromwell, inevitably possessed the passion of ambition. However, Cromwell only later became a slave to it. It was only after a while that he was not able to control this human nature; he later molded the army to his own will and made not only himself but also the army "slaves" to his "private ambition."¹²³

What is striking is Hutchinson's stress on the individual nature of Cromwell's ambition. In the previous chapter, I cited a passage about Cromwell and his army: "When the Collonell heard how Cromwell had used his Troopes in Scotland, he was confirm'd that he and his confederates in the

¹¹⁸ Gheeraert-Graffeuille, *Lucy Hutchinson and the English Revolution*, 244.

¹¹⁹ Blair Warden, "The English Reputations of Oliver Cromwell 1660–1900," in *Historical Controversies and Historians*, ed. William Lamont (London: UCL Press, 1998), 37–8.

¹²⁰ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 193; Gheeraert-Graffeuille, *Lucy Hutchinson and the English Revolution*, 245.

¹²¹ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 82; Gheeraert-Graffeuille, *Lucy Hutchinson and the English Revolution*, 245.

¹²² Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 180; My emphasis.

¹²³ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 202, 216.

Armie were carrying on designs of *private ambition*.”¹²⁴ Cromwell’s personal, private passions, contrary to the public good and imparted to his soldiers, constitute the chief cause for blame. He put himself above the common good, which is what humans do without God’s grace. Cromwell can, similar to the Nottingham men, be considered a wolf in sheep’s clothing with an inexhaustible power-hunger. Hutchinson and her husband seemed to trust his involvement in the cause, until he began his search for power which made him lose his self-control. What differs here from the local Nottingham Committee is the range of the effects of the lack of control over the passions. The passions as such are described similarly and all depart from the hearts of individuals, but because Cromwell is in a national position to govern others without being able to govern himself, the effect on others is larger: he was “so destructive to the whole cause and party, as it afterwards fell out.”¹²⁵ His court was “full of sinne and vanity.”¹²⁶

Hutchinson also interprets Cromwell’s lack of self-control in a providential light: “The hand of God was mightily seene in prospering and preserving the Parliament, till Cromwell’s *Ambition* unhappily interrupted them,” which confirms Longfellow’s observation that Hutchinson considered “human folly,” passions, to have ruptured the dream of a heavenly republic.¹²⁷ Gheeraert-Graffeuille further shows how Hutchinson alerts the reader that Cromwell never wanted to serve the public good, but that he was driven by a thirst for monarchical power.¹²⁸ The Augustinian self-love, translated as thirst for power, is again clearly present.

These observations show similar results as in the analysis of the passions in Nottingham. People are born with destructive passions in their hearts and can try to overcome them up until self-interest takes over. Cromwell did not have God’s grace to act according to His will. She does not mention anything related to reason to overcome passions, which confirms that only John seems to own this ability.

3.3.6 Monarchy

Hutchinson’s mockery of the monarchical aspects of Cromwell’s Protectorate shows her evident hostility to monarchy.¹²⁹ Yet how do the passions play a role in her depiction of the monarchy?

In the first half of the *Memoirs*, Hutchinson offers a history of the English past and discusses each monarch since The Norman Conquest. This appears to be the most ‘classic’ historiographical section of the *Memoirs*, reflecting a view of the past that corresponds to the conventions of history as defined since the nineteenth century. About the form of state since The Norman Conquest, she

¹²⁴ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 202; My emphasis.

¹²⁵ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 183.

¹²⁶ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 209.

¹²⁷ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 191; My emphasis.

¹²⁸ Gheeraert-Graffeuille, *Lucy Hutchinson and the English Revolution*, 250.

¹²⁹ Gheeraert-Graffeuille, *Lucy Hutchinson and the English Revolution*, 251.

states that Parliament carries the legislative, and the King the executive power. Although “severall of the kings, not satisfied with their bounded Monarchie, made attempts to convert it into absolute sovereignty,” they ultimately did not succeed: the “Nobility of the Realme” curb’d the *wild ambition* of the Tyrants, whom they sometimes depos’d for their misgovernments...”¹³⁰ She points out that the Englishmen were the “most free and obsequious subjects in the world.”¹³¹ However, all good things come to an end: “till at lengths the kings, eager to break this yoake, had insensibly worne out the interest of the Nobility by drawing them to their Courts.”¹³²

What is of particular interest here is that Hutchinson’s view of the history of the relationship between the King and the nobility is driven by their (mis)conduct of excessive passions. According to Hutchinson, these noblemen got carried away by the King, and their estates were among other “melted” away by luxuries.¹³³

Afterwards, Hutchinson offers an overview of the different monarchs, starting with Henry VIII. She states that he ensured freedom for the people because he returned “the vast revenues of the Church into the body of the people.”¹³⁴ She adds that this freedom would have persisted ever since, “had not the different interests of religion devided them among themselves.”¹³⁵ Hutchinson’s moral judgement about division and faction as triggers for war is present here.

She then turns her attention to Queen Elizabeth, whom she portrays in a favorable light, particularly for her role in defending the rights of Protestants.¹³⁶ Then follows a passage on Mary, the Queen of Scots, who was executed because she closed an agreement with “the Papists” to eliminate Queen Elizabeth.¹³⁷ She describes how “true-hearted Protestants” resisted the accession of Mary’s son, James I, to the throne.¹³⁸

For Hutchinson, the tyrannic behavior and inexhaustible power-hunger of some Kings reoccured with James I. James would have bribed men in Elizabeth’s council to ensure the path to the throne. The people were “blinded” and “betrey’d.”¹³⁹ This demonstrates that Hutchinson’s portrait of Cromwell as the great dissembler is a recurring archetype. Although James was “bred up among Calvinists”, his wife and him pursued a policy in favour of the Catholics.¹⁴⁰ He is described as the exact opposite of Queen Elizabeth: “the Protestant interest abroad” was betrayed.¹⁴¹ She also

¹³⁰ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 40.

¹³¹ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 40.

¹³² Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 40.

¹³³ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 40.

¹³⁴ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 41.

¹³⁵ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 41.

¹³⁶ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 41.

¹³⁷ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 41.

¹³⁸ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 41.

¹³⁹ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 41.

¹⁴⁰ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 41-2.

¹⁴¹ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 42; Gheeraert-Graffeuille, *Lucy Hutchinson and the English Revolution*, 260.

condemns that Arminianism in England grew. The Arminians were an episcopal movement that opposed the Calvinist doctrine of predestination.¹⁴²

The text then proceeds to a description of the court of James I, highlighting how his policies were deeply influenced by passions. She states for example that the Catholics in James' court, "humouring the King and Queene in their *lusts and excesses*, found it the most ready way to destroy the doctrine of the Gospell to *debosh* the professors."¹⁴³ She adds that James' court was "a nursery of *lust* and *intemperance*," and she characterizes him as a "*thriftlesse*", extravagant, heir.¹⁴⁴

Hutchinson's condemnation of James' passionate way of life culminates in the following passage:

Then began Murther, incest, Adultery, drunkennesse, swearing, fornication and all sort of ribaldry to be no conceal'd but countenanced vices, favour'd wherever they were privately practis'd because they held such conformity with the Court example.¹⁴⁵

In this passage, Hutchinson implies that the King reigns by example, as a mirror for the rest of the people. A lack of self-government results in a lack of government over others. This explains why the same passions she perceived in the Nottingham Committee have much greater effects and trickle down to the rest of society when they are perceived in the monarch.

After a description of the growing suppression of the Puritans under James' reign, Hutchinson states that the Catholics kept on raising him "above the heavens, while he lay wallowing like a swine in the mire of his *Lust*."¹⁴⁶ Lust is indeed the common thread throughout Hutchinson's account of James' reign; lust for power, but also for money, sex, alcohol, and other blasphemous practices. He clearly does not have his passions under control according to Hutchinson. She considers the Catholics to be guilty of the same immoralities and describes how because of that, two factions of Catholics and Puritans arose, which was a trigger for war. She even states that the Pope obtained "his empire by frawd, false doctrines, lies and hipocrisies."¹⁴⁷ In describing how the Puritans were perceived by their oppressors, she employs the very same vocabulary she uses to characterize the passions of the Puritan's enemies: under James' reign, the Puritans were regarded as "seditious factious hipocrites, ambitious disturbers of the publick peace."¹⁴⁸ In doing so, Hutchinson underscores the irony: it's a classic case of the pot calling the kettle black.

¹⁴² Andrew Ollerton, *The Crisis of Calvinism in Revolutionary England, 1640-1660: Arminian Theologies of Predestination and Grace* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2023), 1.

¹⁴³ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 42; My emphasis.

¹⁴⁴ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 42.

¹⁴⁵ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 42.

¹⁴⁶ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 43; My emphasis.

¹⁴⁷ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 39.

¹⁴⁸ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 44.

The passions that so dominated James' court at first seem absent when Charles succeeded the throne. Hutchinson argues that court changed, because Charles was "temperate, chaste and serious," in comparison to James whom she described as intemperate.¹⁴⁹ She depicts Charles as an art enthusiast that encouraged "men of learning and ingenuity."¹⁵⁰ These "ingenuities" were "less offensive than the *bawdry* and prophane abusive witt which was the only exercise of the other Court."¹⁵¹ Bawdry refers to immoralities in a sexual sense which once more rises the connotation with sexually-oriented passions. Although Hutchinson seems to begin Charles' story on a positive note, it is soon clear that she does not think more highly of Charles than of James:

But as in the primitive times it is observed that the best emperors were some of them stirr'd up by Sathan to be the bitterest persecutors of the Church, so this King was a worse encroacher upon the civill and spirituall liberties of the people by farre than his father.¹⁵²

She attributes this to external influences that stirred up his passions, for example his marriage with the Catholic Henrietta Maria. Because of this marriage, the Catholics were favoured and the Puritans oppressed.¹⁵³ She portrays her, again following the Augustinian idea, as a self-driven person: "she had no more passion for him than wat serv'd to promote her designs."¹⁵⁴ There are two other persons who had a disastrous influence on the King; the

Arch Bishop of Canterbury, a fellow of meane extraction and arrogant pride, and the Earle of Strafford who as much outstript all the rest in favour as he did in abilities, being a man of deepe pollicy, sterne resolution, and ambitious zeale to keepe up the glory of his own greatnesse.¹⁵⁵

She clearly describes Charles' counsellors in terms of passions and self-interest, which has a bad influence on the King himself. Her stance is once again that when one is not able to govern his or her own passions, one also cannot competently govern others.

Hutchinson consequently argues that "he thought himself no Monarch so long as his will was confin'd to the bounds of any law," and "so bent upon being an absolute uncontrowlable Soveraigne that he was resolv'd either to be such a King or none."¹⁵⁶ She also highlights his "self-will'd ambition."¹⁵⁷ The word ambition appears again, as in Cromwell's and some of the

¹⁴⁹ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 46.

¹⁵⁰ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 46.

¹⁵¹ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 46.

¹⁵² Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 46.

¹⁵³ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 46.

¹⁵⁴ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 49.

¹⁵⁵ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 48.

¹⁵⁶ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 46-7.

¹⁵⁷ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 47.

Nottingham men's depiction. His will assents to his passions. It is clear that Hutchinson considers King Charles' inexhaustible desire for power a catalyst for the following instabilities in the country.

Although this again seems mere name-calling, it does fit her anthropological analysis of the passions. In the autobiographical fragment, she articulates her general view of monarchy, which confirms the patterns previously identified in her portrayals of specific Kings. She states that the combination of monarchy, aristocracy and democracy proved to protect the people "against the pest of every one of those formes, tyranny, faction, and confusion."¹⁵⁸ However, she adds that it is

not possible for man to devise such just and excellent bounds as will keepe in *wild ambition*, when prince's flatterers encourage that beast to breake his fence, which it hath often done, with miserable consequences both to the prince and people.¹⁵⁹

In this passage, Hutchinson claims that humanity lacks the ability to develop sustainable government of the passions, especially when external influence is involved. This confirms that she is convinced that it is possible to control them for some time, but sooner or later, they will inevitably take over when Divine grace is not involved. Although she for some time upholds the Thomist possibility of control over the passions, the Augustinian idea stays dominant. When the King lacks total self-control, the passion of ambition is so strong nothing can be done from the outside. The end of the passage again shows that Hutchinson's moral judgement of the local Nottingham men, Cromwell and the King is similar, but she that acknowledges that the consequences of the King's and Cromwell's passions are much more profound than the local Nottingham men.

3.3.7 Parliament

A fourth entity in which the passions function as a self-destructive catalyst of instability is Parliament. The following passage ensures that I can move smoothly between an analysis of the King's passions, and the Parliamentarians' passions, since she condemns some Parliamentarians that:

they forsooke their party, and were content to be the King's slaves, rather than divorce themselves from those *lusts* which found countenance from both priests and princes on the one side, and, on the other, was preacht downe by the ministers, and punisht by the Magistrates.¹⁶⁰

¹⁵⁸ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 280.

¹⁵⁹ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 280; My emphasis.

¹⁶⁰ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 57; My emphasis.

This passage proves that the history of the dynamic between Parliament and King is actually just a result, a by-product of their individual morality. She divides Parliament into two groups: a group that is seduced by the King's passions and lusts, and a group that is not. The Parliamentarians who had Royalist sympathies were "sentenc'd to be incapable of ever sitting againe as Members of that House."¹⁶¹ Although it may appear that the division within Parliament had thus been resolved, throughout the period of the war, distinct groups continued to emerge within the Parliamentary ranks, most notably the Independents and the Presbyterians. Hutchinson regards the split of Parliament into various wings as an unfortunate development. She would have preferred a unified Parliament, collectively committed to the cause.¹⁶²

She thus attributes a negative connotation to factionalism within Parliament, as she does within the Nottingham Committee in which the two same groups of Presbyterians and Independents were present. On the Parliamentary service of John's father, she states that "he was severall times elected, and ever faithful to his trust and his countrie's interest, tough never approving violence and *faction*."¹⁶³ She further connects King Charles' selfish passions to this division of Parliament between Presbyterians and Independents in 1645: "the King had hope by their devisions to prevaile for the accomplishments of *his owne ends*."¹⁶⁴

Hutchinson mainly deplores the factious attitude of the Presbyterians. She states that John, who identified more closely with the Independent faction, believed that "if the greatest enemy he [John] had in the world had proposed anything beneficial to the public, he would support it."¹⁶⁵ On the contrary:

some other were to blame in that particular, and chiefly those of the Presbyterian faction, who would obstruct any good rather than those they envied and hated should have the glory of procuring it; the sad effects of which *pride* grew atlength to be the ruine of the most glorious cause that ever was contended for.¹⁶⁶

She connects the Parliamentarian's factious stance to pride. The passion of pride, closely associated with the passion of ambition, ruined the Puritan cause at the expense of the public good.

However, not only the Presbyterians prioritized personal gain above the common good: "the designing selfe interested men of both factions."¹⁶⁷ This corresponds to the Augustinian stance

¹⁶¹ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 58.

¹⁶² Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 167; My emphasis.

¹⁶³ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 17; My emphasis.

¹⁶⁴ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 127; My emphasis.

¹⁶⁵ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 167.

¹⁶⁶ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 167; My emphasis.

¹⁶⁷ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 179.

that men are driven by self-interest. In the previous chapter, I cited the following passage on the Levellers: “att that time, a certeine sort of publick spirited men stood up in the parliament and the Armie, declaring against these factions and the *ambition* of the Grandees of both...”¹⁶⁸ This serves as further evidence that Hutchinson intertwines factionalism with the passions, and that the private passion of ambition stands in contrast to the public good. In another passage on which she elaborates on insurrections that were breaking out on all levels of society, she states that

but while the House was highly busie in faction, they tooke no care of any of the Garrisons, especially of such as were like to continue firme to the cause, the Presbyterian faction having a designe to Corrupt or weaken them all...¹⁶⁹

In this passage, she once more blames the Presbyterians’ factionalism, driven by self-interest, for the weakening of the Parliament garrisons.¹⁷⁰

She also discusses the Divine providence in the context of the Presbyterian faction and connects God’s providential power to their misconducts: “God, that was the principal author, was not look’d upon, and gave them [the Presbyterians] therefore up to become their owne and others’ Idolls, and so to fall.”¹⁷¹ Hutchinson here describes their growing self-interest in an idolatrous way, to which God reacted by providing their fall.

3.3.8 Moral history ↔ political history ↔ providential history

All these entities, both on the local and national level, make clear that Hutchinson’s history of the English Civil War is centred around an anthropological analysis of the human passions.

For Hutchinson, the political history of the war is an epiphenomenon of the moral history of individuals. Hutchinson believes that, until a certain level, stability in the state could be obtained by stable self-government, control over the passions. This corresponds to Ethan Shagan’s theorization on moderation. Moderation in the seventeenth-century should not be understood as looking for an Aristotelian golden mean. Ethan Shagan argued that moderation of the passions was more associated with strong regulation and government of the self.¹⁷² Shagan adds that internal government of the passions was inherently connected to external, political government of subjects.¹⁷³ Hutchinson similarly connects internal government of the passions with external,

¹⁶⁸ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 179; My emphasis.

¹⁶⁹ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 174.

¹⁷⁰ Another passage in which Hutchinson speaks negative of the Presbyterians: “and so hot they grew in the zeale of their faction that they from thenceforth resolv’d and endeavour’d to close with the common enemie, that they might thereby compasse the destruction of their Independent Antagonists;” Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 186.

¹⁷¹ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 167.

¹⁷² Ethan Shagan, *The Rule of Moderation : Violence, Religion and the Politics of Restraint in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 15.

¹⁷³ Shagan, *The Rule of Moderation*, 15.

state government. Self-government is her connection between the morality of an individual and political history. Uncontrolled excessive passions of individuals resulted in war.

Hutchinson connects this moral-political history to a providential history. Hodgkin described this as “mixed temporalities” as she moves between historical and providential time.¹⁷⁴ She argues that the passions are only to be controlled to some degree. True control, as in John’s case, requires god’s Grace. The grace of God is what connects Hutchinson’s political history of the war to a providential worldview. Hutchinson positions herself within the broader debate on the political implications of personal passions, which she supports with Augustine doctrine. She only refers to the Thomist idea of reason as a means to control the passions in the context of John, who did in fact receive Divine grace. This illustrates that we should situate Hutchinson at the transitional period in which both neo-Augustinianism and Thomism offer the basis for arguments on the passions.

This analysis nuances Gheeraert-Graffeuille’s thesis that Nottingham functioned as a microcosm of the Civil War. There is indeed considerable evidence that shows how Hutchinson approaches the war as a bottom-up chain of instabilities. However, I argue that the microcosm metaphor is not exactly geographical, from Nottingham to the national level, but the hearts of individual men. Hutchinson shows that what happens in Nottingham is no different from what happens on a national level, because humans are corruptible since The Fall. Her analysis of the war is underpinned by her analysis of human nature, the hearts of men influenced by their uncontrolled passions. That the greed, envy, ambition, and other passions that occur on a national level simultaneously occur on the local level is then logical, since all humans are burdened with sin since the Fall.¹⁷⁵

3.3.9 Hutchinson’s hope for a future republican England

I already pointed out that scholars notice that Hutchinson struggles with the fact that God did not prevent the failure of the republican cause. However, the lack of self-control from individuals like the Nottingham-men, Cromwell and the King, or factions like the Presbyterians does not subvert Hutchinson’s trust in God’s plan. Although it may seem that His plan failed, she includes passages that imply that God just took a little detour, and that the misfortunes of the war are instructions from God on the true nature of humans. Her seemingly dark, pessimistic view of past events, carries an underlying message of hope that an ideal republic could be realized. Hutchinson’s text is consequently by no means pessimistic.

¹⁷⁴ Hodgkin, “Women, Memory and Family History,” 308.

¹⁷⁵ Gheeraert-Graffeuille, *Lucy Hutchinson and the English Revolution*, 162.

Hutchinson repeatedly casts her gaze towards the future. She makes this clear in her autobiographical fragment, where she states that she “thought it might be a meanes to stirre up my thankfulness for things past, and to encourage my faith for the future.”¹⁷⁶ She does this by recalling all “generall and particular providences” in her life.¹⁷⁷ She implies that God’s hand in her personal past ensures that He will act similarly in the future. I already mentioned the passage in which Hutchinson stated that the mixture of monarchy, aristocracy and democracy protected the people against factionalism and other dangers for the country, but that man’s ambition corrupts this protection. She added thereto that these threats “could never in any age so tread downe popular liberty but that it rose againe with renewed vigor.”¹⁷⁸ This seems to be a message of hope, that the people, her Puritan and republican people, will be free at last. She also describes the war that was so devastating for the Puritans in the following way:

the subtile serpent putt off his owne horrid appearance, and comes out in a Christian dresse, to persecute Christ in his poore prophetts that bore wittnesse against the corruption of the times. This intestine quarrell hath bene more successful to the devill and more afflictive to the church than all open warres, and, I feare, will never happily be decided till the Prince of Peace come to conclude the controversie.¹⁷⁹

She evokes a millenarian image where the return of Christ will give counsel. Apart from her autobiographical fragment, the end of the *Life* also reveals a certain light at the end of the tunnel. At the end of John’s life, Hutchinson recalls how she spent his last days, crying and mourning over the injustice done to John:

One day when she was weeping... he gave her reasons why she should hope and be assur’d that this cause would revive, because the interest of God was so much involv’d in it that he was entitled to it. She told him she did not doubt but that the cause would revive.¹⁸⁰

If Hutchinson would not carry any hope, she would not place such emphasis on the passages where both she and John express their thoughts on the future. At John’s deathbed for example, Hutchinson recalls he pronounced the following words to his daughter: “doe you mourne for me as for one without hope? Doe not so: there is hope.”¹⁸¹

In that regard, it is also important to consider Hutchinson’s conceptualization of the purpose of John’s death. Throughout the *Memoirs*, Hutchinson often depicts him as a martyr.¹⁸² She also

¹⁷⁶ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 278.

¹⁷⁷ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 278.

¹⁷⁸ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 280.

¹⁷⁹ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 281.

¹⁸⁰ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 264.

¹⁸¹ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 272.

¹⁸² Gheeraert-Graffeuille, *Lucy Hutchinson and the English Revolution*, 9.

frequently compares him to Christ.¹⁸³ Before he was imprisoned, Hutchinson did not accept John's wish to die as a martyr for the cause, and lobbied against his imprisonment on her own behalf without her husband's support, who was ready to sacrifice himself publicly.¹⁸⁴ Hutchinson later comes to terms with her husband's wish and eventually inscribes John's martyrdom in a millenarian vision of the future.¹⁸⁵ This is apparent when she talks about "the advancement of the Cause by the patient suffering of the Martyrs, among which his [John's] owne was to be eminent."¹⁸⁶

Hutchinson strengthens this trust in John's martyrdom for the Puritan and republican Cause by including the following quote John would have expressed to her: "I shall advance the cause more by my death, hasting the vengeance of God upon my unjust enemies, than I could doe by all the actions of my life."¹⁸⁷ She adds that even after his death, John still is an immortal guide "to light us through the darke world."¹⁸⁸ That Hutchinson does not consider John's death as an end, but rather as a beginning, also becomes clear in the sentence she ends the *Life* with: "Lett us blesse the Lord for him [John], and for the signall and eminent mercy shew'd unto him, which made him in life and death victorious over the Lord's and his enemies."¹⁸⁹

She already implements this view at the beginning of *To my Children*, when she addresses John's immortality:

His vertues are recorded in heaven's annalls, and can never perish; by them he teaches us and all those to whose knowledge they shall arrive. What have wee then lost? His flesh ? No—that is but lay'd to sleepe that it may wake againe more vigorous and beautifull. That corruption hath by the power of Christ a seed of incorruption: that mortall shall shortly awake immortal.¹⁹⁰

3.4 CONCLUSION

This chapter demonstrated that Hutchinson underpins her history by her own specific theory on the passions as part of the human nature. In the *Memoirs*, the history of individuals reflects the political history of the war, which is once again connected to a providential history. For Hutchinson, lack of self-government over the passions connects the moral history of individuals to the broader political history. The cause of the war lies in uncontrolled, excessive passions of

¹⁸³ Longfellow, *Women and Religious Writing*, 196.

¹⁸⁴ Gheeraert-Graffeulle, *Lucy Hutchinson and the English Revolution*, 182.

¹⁸⁵ Gheeraert-Graffeulle, *Lucy Hutchinson and the English Revolution*, 297.

¹⁸⁶ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 242.

¹⁸⁷ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 264.

¹⁸⁸ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 3.

¹⁸⁹ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 277.

¹⁹⁰ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, 2.

individuals. This applies to figures from the local to the national level, both John's adversaries in Nottingham, as Cromwell, the King, and Parliamentarians. She again connects this to a providential framework, in which only God's grace can result in a truly moral society, where passions and sin could be overcome. In the narrative, the aforementioned figures could not count on this grace, in contrast to John. However, Hutchinson considers all this to be part of God's plan and offers an optimistic view on the future in which the heavenly Kingdom on earth, the Republic, could be realized. I argued that Hutchinson's work is grounded not solely in Thomist thought, but that scholars like Gheeraert-Graffeuille overlooked that it is also deeply shaped by Augustine's conception of the passions, and especially his connection to the Fall and his emphasis on self-love.

I began this chapter with the observation that *herstory* created the assumption that women wrote ethically-driven histories with an emphasis on the human emotions. Two scholars inherited this idea and connected Hutchinson's emotional style, focus on passions, and moral outlook with her gender. They argued that the emotional emphasis on passions is what makes her history of the war different than those of her male contemporaries. The previous analysis illustrated that Hutchinson's do not merely rely on an emotive register to feminize her account of the war. Instead, she responds to changing philosophical and theological tools in the widespread conversation around the passions to create her own, original, bottom-up version of the war.

4. CONCLUSION

4.1 RECAP

In this research, I revisited the history writing of Lucy Hutchinson in her *Memoirs of the Life of Colonel Hutchinson*, in which she offers a republican version of the English Civil War and Restoration. This was necessary to illustrate that the persisting *herstory*-paradigm is no adequate tool to study early modern female history writers. *Herstory*-scholarship relied on the oversimplified assumption that there was a strong dichotomy between early modern masculine and feminine histories. This resulted in scholarship on Hutchinson that emphasized her feminine pen. It presented Hutchinson's *Memoirs* as a private, local, history of the Civil War, relying on the embedded public-private dichotomy. In addition, scholars read Hutchinson's focus on human passions as a way to apply a feminine emphasis on emotions to the history of the war. Building on an overview of the content of the *Memoirs* and Hutchinson's relationship to the seventeenth-century historiographical practices in the first chapter, I exhaustively deconstructed these two premises.

In the second chapter, I showed that Hutchinson subverts the binary between male, public and female, private historiography. I thereby deconstructed the gendered public-private dichotomy that influences research on Hutchinson. I shed light on how Hutchinson merges family history and political history as one and the same thing, how she defines what is public and what is private, how she considers the household to be an inherently political space in turbulent times, how her so-called private manuscript held inherent public value, and how the seventeenth-century English manorial system blurred the public-private dichotomy.

In my deconstruction of the public-private dichotomy, I discovered that Hutchinson employs the term private to describe selfish behaviour of historical actors, which in turn, directed my attention to Hutchinson's historical-anthropological analysis of the passions as an argument against *herstory*. This formed the focus of the third chapter that refuted the thesis that Hutchinson focuses on human passions to write an emotional, *feminine* history of the war. Hutchinson's engagement with passions was not driven by a female urge to emotionalize her text, but to tell the reader that the republic was not realized due to the private passions with which humanity was unescapably burdened since the Fall. She creates her unique bottom-up analysis of the war drawing on Thomist and, for the most part, Augustinian theories on the passions. The deconstruction of the *herstory*-assumption enhanced our understanding of Hutchinson's connection between the morality of individuals, political history, and providential history.

These two chapters prove that an analysis of Hutchinson's text undermines the strongly embedded *herstory*-opposition between masculine and feminine histories. Overstepping the

herstory-paradigm not only counters the isolation of female historians from the canon, but truly enhances our understanding of the message Hutchinson wanted to convey with her history. She turned to the past to tell the future her version of it, a future she dreams will be republican. The analysis of her historical project led me to unexpected destinations, such as the philosophies of Aquinas and Augustine, but that is precisely what made the process so compelling. These truly fascinating parts of her historical writing came into view precisely when the binary perspective was left behind, and when I started to look beyond presuppositions that have been passed on by generations of scholars.

4.2 LIMITATIONS AND FURTHER RESEARCH

In revisiting Hutchinson's history writing, I encountered some limitations. First of all, the scope of this research did not allow to subject all of Hutchinson's oeuvre to the questions asked here, despite the fact that many of her writings are shaped by the historical events of the Civil War. Further research is required to provide an exhaustive account of Hutchinson as a challenge of the *herstory*-paradigm. A second challenge was, since my aim was to refute an existing theoretical framework, that I had to rely on a combination of theories from various fields to build my own. This is not merely a challenge, but also a strength, as I believe that the combination of intellectual history, gender history, the history of political thought, the history of philosophy and the history of historiography provides a fruitful framework for such a hybrid text as Hutchinson's. However, one case-study is not enough to build a whole new framework of female historical writers. With my revision of Hutchinson's *Memoirs* as a case study, I aim to encourage future scholars to do the same. In this way, I hope to look beyond our particular cases in the future, and strive for a more inclusive reconsideration of these captivating early modern women historians, so that they might finally be studied as they merit.

4.3 EPILOGUE

Offering overlooked historical actors a voice in historical research is incredibly challenging. Yet I am convinced that we can achieve an inclusive approach if we keep on questioning our own discipline and methods. We should dare to reconsider and reassess what was considered inclusive in the second half of the previous century. Maybe people will read my research as anti-feminist, since I explicitly question feminist approaches. However, I still consider what I did in this thesis feminist. I truly admire what feminist scholars did in those *herstory*-days, since they granted early modern female historians visibility. But just as feminism constantly changes, our methods should change. I sincerely hope that I conveyed the message that Hutchinson should not be included in the canon of history writing because she is a woman, but because her history is simply worth studying.

5. BIBLIOGRAPHY

Images

Cover page: Anonymous, *engraving of Lucy Hutchinson after portrait by Robert Walker*, 1806. Internet Archive. Accessed 6.08.2025. <https://archive.org/>.

Published primary sources

Cavendish, Margaret. *The Life of the Thrice Noble, High and Puissant Prince William Cavendishe, Duke, Marquess and Earl of Newcastle ... Written by the Thrice Noble, Illustrious and Excellent Princess, Margaret, Duchess of Newcastle, His Wife*. London: A. Maxwell, 1667.

Hutchinson, Lucy. *Memoirs of the Life of Colonel Hutchinson* (c. 1664). Edited by James Sutherland. London: Oxford University Press, 1973.

Databases

Oxford English Dictionary, <https://www.oed.com/>.

Secondary Literature

Assmann, Aleida. "Transformations between History and Memory." *Social Research: An International Quarterly* 75, no. 1 (2008): 49-72.

Bennett, Martyn. "'Every County had more or lesse the civill warre within it selfe': the Realities of War in Lucy Hutchinson's Midland Shires." *The Seventeenth Century* 30, no. 2 (2015): 191-206.

———. *The English Civil War: A Historical Companion*. Brimscombe: Tempus, 2004.

Campbell, Gordon. "Lucy Hutchinson." In *The Renaissance (1550-1660). Macmillan Anthologies of English Literature*, edited by Gordon Campbell, 359-62. London: Palgrave, 1989.

Chedgzoy, Kate. *Women's Writing in the British Atlantic World: Memory, Place and History, 1550-1700*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

Cook, Susan. "'The story I most particularly intend': the narrative style of Lucy Hutchinson." *Critical Survey* 5, no. 3 (1993): 271-77.

Coward, Barry and Peter Gaunt. *The Stuart Age: England 1603-1714, Fifth Edition*. New York: Routledge, 2017.

Cunnings, Brian and Freya Sierhuis. "Introduction." In *Passions and Subjectivity in Early Modern Culture*, edited by Brian Cummings and Freya Sierhuis, 1-9. London: Routledge, 2016.

Darcy, Eamon. *The Irish Rebellion of 1641 and the Wars of the Three Kingdoms*. Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2013.

Davis, Nathalie Zemon. "Gender and Genre: Women as Historical Writers, 1400-1820." In *Beyond their Sex: Learned Women of the European Past*, edited by Patricia H. Labalme, 153-82. New York: New York University Press, 1980.

- Deikna, Yousef. "Lucy Hutchinson and Margaret Cavendish: Civil War and Enemy Commiseration." *Humanities* 8, no. 1 (2019): 43.
- Digby, Anne. "Victorian Values and Women in Public and Private." *Proceedings of the British Academy* 78 (1992), 195-215.
- Edwards, Mark. "Christians and Stoics." In *The Routledge Handbook of Early Christian Philosophy*, edited by Mark Edwards, 219-32. London: Routledge, 2020.
- Ferris, John P. "HUTCHINSON, Sir Thomas (1589-1643), of Owthorpe and Nottingham, Notts.," In *The History of Parliament: the House of Commons 1604-1629*, edited by Andrew Thrush and John P. Ferris. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010. Accessed 19.06.2025, <https://www.historyofparliamentonline.org/volume/1604-1629/member/hutchinson-sir-thomas-1589-1643>.
- Fischer, Markus. "Machiavelli's Political Psychology." *The Review of Politics* 59, no. 4 (1997): 797-829.
- Fissel, Mark Charles. *The Bishops' Wars: Charles I's Campaigns Against Scotland, 1638-1640*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- Fueter, Eduard and Emile Jeanmaire. *Histoire de l'historiographie modern*. Paris: Félix Alcan, 1914.
- Gaukroger, Stephen. "Introduction." In *The Soft Underbelly of Reason: The Passions in the Seventeenth Century*, edited by Stephen Gaukroger, 1-16. London: Routledge, 1998.
- Gaunt, Peter. *The English Civil War: A Military History*. London: I.B. Tauris, 2014.
- Gestrich, Andreas. "The Public Sphere and the Habermas Debate." *German History* 24, no. 3 (2006): 413-30.
- Gheeraert-Graffeuille, Claire. *Lucy Hutchinson and the English Revolution: Gender, Genre, and History Writing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2022.
- Gibbs, Spike. *Lordship, State Formation and Local Authority In Late Medieval and Early Modern England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2023.
- Gibson, Jonathan. "Making the *Memoirs*: Missing Leaves in the Manuscript of Lucy Hutchinson's Life of John Hutchinson." *The Seventeenth Century* 38, no. 3 (2023): 403-12.
- Goldberg, Jonathan. "Lucy Hutchinson Writing Matter." *ELH* 73, no. 1 (2006): 275-301.
- Goodman, Dena. "Public Sphere and Private Life: Toward a Synthesis of Current Historiographical Approaches to the Old Regime." *History and Theory* 31, no. 1 (1992): 1-20.
- Grundy, Isobel. "Women's History? Writings by English Nuns." In *Women, Writing, History 1640-1740*, edited by Isobel Grundy and Susan Wiseman, 126-39. London: Batsford Ltd., 1992.
- Habermas, Jürgen, Frank Lennox and Sara Lennox. "The Public Sphere: An Encyclopedia Article." *New German Critique* no. 3 (1964), 49- 55.
- Harari, Yuval Noah. *Renaissance Military Memoirs: War, History and Identity, 1450–1600*. Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2012.

- Harrisson, Peter. "The Fall, the Passions, and Dominion over Nature." In *The Soft Underbelly of Reason: The Passions in the Seventeenth Century*, edited by Stephen Gaukroger, 49-78. London: Routledge, 1998.
- Hicks, Philip. "Catharine Macaulay's Civil War: Gender, History, and Republicanism in Georgian Britain." *Journal of British Studies* 41, no. 2 (2002): 170-98.
- Hirschman, Albert. *The Passions and the Interests: Political Arguments for Capitalism before Its Triumph*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1977.
- Hodgkin, Katharine. "Women, Memory and Family History in Seventeenth-Century England." In *Memory before modernity*, edited by Erika Kuijpers, Judith Pollmann, Johannes Müller, and Jasper van der Steen, 297-313. Leiden: Brill, 2013.
- Hudson, Roger. *The Grand Quarrel*. London: The Folio Society, 1993.
- Hughes, Ann. "'The Governor's wife': Women and Garrisons in the English Civil War." *The Seventeenth Century* 38, no. 3 (2023): 461-74.
- Hundert, E.J. "Augustine and the Sources of the Divided Self." *Political Theory* 20, no. 1 (1992): 86-104.
- James, Susan. *Passion and Action: The Emotions In Seventeenth-Century Philosophy*. Oxford: Clarendon press, 1999.
- Kaminsky, Howard. "Estate, Nobility, and the Exhibition of Estate in the Later Middle Ages." *Speculum* 68, no. 3 (1993): 684-709.
- Keeble, Neill. "Lucy Hutchinson and the Business of Memoirs." *The Review of English Studies* 73, no. 311 (2022): 700-713.
- Kelsey, Sean. "The Death of Charles I." *The Historical Journal*, 45, no. 4 (2002): 727-54.
- Kewes, Paulina. "Acts of Remembrance, Acts of Oblivion: Rhetoric, Law, and National Memory in Early Restoration England." In *Ritual, Routine, and Regime: Repetition in Early Modern British and European Cultures*, edited by Lorna Clymer, 103-31. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2006.
- King, Peter. "Aquinas on the Passions." In *Aquinas's Moral Theory: Essays in Honor of Norman Kretzmann*, edited by Scott Macdonald and Eleonore Stump, 101-32. New York: Cornell University Press, 2008.
- . "Dispassionate Passions." In *Emotion and Cognitive Life in Medieval and Early Modern Philosophy*, edited by Martin Pickavé and Lisa Shapiro, 9-31. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- Klein, Lawrence. "Gender and the Public-Private Distinction in the Eighteenth Century: Some Questions about Evidence and Analytic Procedure," *Eighteenth-century studies* 29, no. 1 (1995): 97-109.
- Knoppers, Laura. "Gender and the Public Sphere in Habermas and Milton: New Critical Directions." *Literature Compass* 11, no. 9 (2014): 615-24.
- Lerner, Gerda. *The Creation of Feminist Consciousness: from the Middle Ages to eighteen-seventy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993.
- Longfellow, Erica. "Public, Private, and the Household in Early Seventeenth-Century England." *Journal of British Studies* 45, no. 2 (2006): 313-34.

- . *Women and Religious Writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Looser, Devoney. *British Women Writers and the Writing of History, 1670-1820*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 2000.
- "lordship." In *The Oxford Companion of Local and Family History*, edited by David Hey, 475. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- "manor." In *The Oxford Companion to Local and Family History*, edited by David Hey, 478. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- Matchinske, Megan. "History's "Silent Whispers": Representing the Past through Feeling and Form." In *Attending to Early Modern Women: Conflict and Concord*, ed. Karen Nelson, 59-77. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2013.
- . *Women Writing History in Early Modern England*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- Mayer, Robert. *History and the Early English Novel: Matters of Fact from Bacon to Defoe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- . "Lucy Hutchinson: A Life of Writing." *The Seventeenth Century* 22, no. 2 (2007): 305-35.
- McMahon, Darrin and Samuel Moyn. "Introduction: Interim Intellectual History." In *Rethinking Modern European Intellectual History*, edited by Darrin McMahon and Samuel Moyn, 3-12. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.
- Miner, Robert. *Thomas Aquinas on the Passions: A Study of Summa Theologiae, 1a2ae 22-48*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- Moriarty, Michael. *Fallen Nature, Fallen Selves: Early Modern French Thought II*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- Nesvet, Rebecca. "Missing persons: Lucy Hutchinson, Feminist Biography, and the Digital Archive." In *The Invention of Female Biography*, edited by Gina Luria Walker, 73-82. London: Routledge, 2017.
- Nicholson, Linda J. "'the Personal is Political': An Analysis in Retrospect." *Social Theory and Practice* 7, no. 1 (1981): 85-98.
- Norbrook, David. "'But a copie': Textual Authority and Gender in Editions of The life of John Hutchinson." In *Ashgate Critical Essays on Women Writers in England, 1550-1770 volume 5*, edited by Mihoko Suzuki, 274-94. Surrey: Ashgate Publishing, 2009.
- . "Lucy Hutchinson in her Fifth Century." *The Seventeenth Century* 38, no. 3 (2023): 369-83.
- . "Lucy Hutchinson's "Elegies" and the Situation of the Republican Woman Writer (with text)." *English Literary Renaissance* 27, no. 3 (1997): 469-521.
- . "Memoirs and Oblivion: Lucy Hutchinson and the Restoration." *Huntington Library Quarterly* 75, no. 2 (2012): 233-82.
- Offen, Karen. "Defining feminism: a comparative historical approach." *Signs* 14, no. 1 (1988): 119-57.
- Ollerton, Andrew. *The Crisis of Calvinism in Revolutionary England, 1640-1660: Arminian Theologies of Predestination and Grace*. Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2023.

- Parageau, Sandrine. "Catching 'the Genius of the Age': Margaret Cavendish, Historian and Witness." *Études Épistémè. Revue de Littérature et de Civilisation (XVIe – XVIIIe Siècles)*, no. 17 (2010). Accessed 23.02.2025, <https://journals.openedition.org/episteme/662>.
- Peters, Erin. "Trauma Narratives of the English Civil War." *Journal for Early Modern Cultural Studies* 16, no. 1 (2016): 78-94.
- Rosenwein, Barbara H. "Who Cared about Thomas Aquinas's Theory of the Passions?." *L'Atelier du Centre de recherches historiques* 16 (2016). Accessed 29.07.2025, <http://journals.openedition.org/acrh/7420>.
- Ross, Sarah C.E. and Elizabeth Scott-Baumann. *Women Poets of the English Civil War*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2017.
- Schmitter, Amy. "Passions and Affections." In *The Oxford Handbook of British Philosophy in the Seventeenth Century*, edited by Peter Anstey, 442-72. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.
- Scott, Joan. *Gender and the Politics of History*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1988.
- Shagan, Ethan. *The Rule of Moderation: Violence, Religion and the Politics of Restraint in Early Modern England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.
- Shapiro, Barbara. *A Culture of Fact: England, 1550-1720*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2000.
- Skinner, Quentin. "Meaning and Understanding in the History of Ideas." In *Meaning and Context: Quentin Skinner and His Critics*, edited by James Tully, 29-67. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1988.
- Smith, Bonnie. *The Gender of History: Men, Women, and Historical Practice*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2000.
- Spongberg, Mary. *Writing Women's History since the Renaissance*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002.
- Thirsk, Joan. "The History Women." In *Chattel, Servant or Citizen*, edited by Mary O'Dowd and Sabine Wichert, 1-11. Belfast: The Institute of Irish Studies, The Queen's University of Belfast, 1995.
- . "Women Local and Family Historians." In *The Oxford Companion to Local and Family History*, edited by David Hey, 100-9. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- Thompson, James. *A History of Historical Writing, Volume 1: From the Earliest Times to the End of the Seventeenth Century*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1942.
- Uffenheimer-Lippens, Elisabeth. "Rationalized Passion and Passionate Rationality: Thomas Aquinas on the Relation between Reason and the Passions." *The Review of Metaphysics* 56, no. 3 (2003): 525-58.
- Vickery, Amanda. "Golden Age to Separate Spheres? A Review of the Categories and Chronology of English Women's History." *The Historical Journal* 36, no. 2 (1993): 383-414.
- Wall, Anna. "'Not so much open professed enemies as close hypocritical false-hearted people': Lucy Hutchinson's Manuscript Account of the Services of John Hutchinson and mid-seventeenth-century Factionalism." *The Seventeenth Century* 36, no. 4 (2020): 623-51.

- Warden, Blair. "The English Reputations of Oliver Cromwell 1660–1900." In *Historical Controversies and Historians*, edited by William Lamont, 35-48. London: UCL Press, 1998.
- White, Hayden. *The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Europe*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1993.
- Woolf, Daniel. "A Feminine Past? Gender, Genre, and Historical Knowledge in England, 1500- 1800." *The American Historical Review* 102, no. 3 (1997): 645-79.
- . *Reading History in Early Modern England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- . *The Social Circulation of the Past*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.

6. APPENDIX: DUTCH SUMMARY

Revisiting Early Modern Female History Writing: Lucy Hutchinson's History of the English Civil War and Restoration in the *Memoirs of the Life of Colonel Hutchinson*

NEDERLANDSE SAMENVATTING

In de jaren 1660's schreef de Engelse Lucy Hutchinson (1620-1681) de *Memoirs of the Life of Colonel Hutchinson*, een republikeinse en puriteinse geschiedenis van de Engelse Burgeroorlog (1642-1651) tot de Restauratie (1660) met haar echtgenoot als protagonist. In het zog van de tweede feministische golf werden de *Memoirs* erkend als geschiedschrijving. Onder invloed van de *herstory*-beweging die op zoek gaat naar de specificiteit van de vrouwelijke pen, werd dit geschiedkundig werk tot nu toe bestudeerd op basis van de dichotomie tussen vrouwelijke en mannelijke geschiedschrijving. Deze thesis toont aan dat deze dichotomie gepaard gaat met twee andere gegenderde assumpties: (1) vroegmoderne schreven eerder publieke, politieke, militaire geschiedenissen, terwijl vrouwen private familiegeschiedenissen schreven; (2) vroegmoderne vrouwen schreven hun geschiedenissen met een grotere focus op de menselijke passies en emoties. Ik stel dat deze benadering resulteert in een misinterpretatie van vrouwelijke geschiedschrijving, met Hutchinson als voorbeeld.

In het eerste hoofdstuk van dit onderzoek geef ik een overzicht van de *Memoirs* en positioneer ik de tekst binnen het zeventiende-eeuwse historiografische landschap. In een tweede hoofdstuk beargumenteer ik aan de hand van de *Memoirs* dat Hutchinson de dichotomie tussen het private en het publieke overstijgt en dat zij geen onderscheid maakt tussen familiegeschiedenis en politieke geschiedenis. Het derde hoofdstuk toont aan dat Hutchinson geen emotioneel geladen stijl gebruikt om haar werk een vrouwelijke toon te geven, maar dat ze haar geschiedenis onderbouwt met een antropologische analyse van de menselijke passies als destructieve factor in de Burgeroorlog. Om haar eigen *bottom-up* analyse van de Burgeroorlog te ondersteunen, baseert ze zich op bestaande filosofische en theologische kaders, voornamelijk de leer van St. Augustinus.

Deze studie toont aan dat het *herstory*-paradigma de meest fascinerende aspecten van Hutchinsons geschiedschrijving in de schaduw laat, en een misinterpretatie van de tekst oplevert. Ik hoop andere onderzoekers te inspireren om de *herstory*-zoektocht naar binaire verschillen tussen mannelijke en vrouwelijke geschiedschrijving achterwege te laten, om samen een nieuw theoretisch raamwerk te creëren. Alleen zo wordt het mogelijk om vroegmoderne geschiedschrijvers op een genuanceerde manier te benaderen en om hen volwaardig op te nemen in de geschiedenis van de geschiedschrijving.