Lucy Hutchinson and the Business of Memoirs

N. H. Keeble

Until comparatively recently, Lucy Hutchinson’s Memoirs were read as a personal and private document, and, even though their significance as a primary historical source is now increasingly recognized, it is still generally assumed that they were conceived solely for circulation within her own family. Their true business, however, is with public affairs and posterity. Like the many other late seventeenth-century memoirs, they anticipate a posthumous readership, to whom they present an apologetic, justificatory, and highly partisan, account of the recent past, participating in a literary contest for the master narrative of seventeenth-century history. This argument is pursued through a comparative analysis of the Memoirs and other examples of its curious hybrid genre, part autobiography, part historiography, taking up their compositional and publishing history, their implied readership, and Hutchinson’s binary categorization of historical agents as ‘children of light and of darkness’. Unusually, Hutchinson does not identify these with the Civil War antagonists. The former, embodied in the idealized Christian gentleman John Hutchinson, fail in their ‘just defence of English liberties’ because of those on the Parliamentarian, Puritan, and republican side who betray the Good Old Cause as the Israelites betrayed Moses after their liberation. This is Hutchinson’s witness to posterity.

Lucy Hutchinson’s Memoirs of the Life of Colonel Hutchinson, as her text has been known since first published in the early nineteenth century,1 was until quite recently generally set in a personal and familial context. Given her address to her children, her devotion to her husband, and the grief at his death that occasioned the writing of the biography, this is entirely reasonable. It is the approach taken by James Sutherland who, in the introduction to his 1973 edition, points to a desire to console herself and ‘to show her children what a noble example her father had left them’ as the two main incentives to composition (xviii). Hutchinson herself foregrounds the personal and intimate nature of her account when she gives as its motivation ‘to moderate my woe, and, if it were possible to augment my love’ (1). This led such works of the 1980s as Janet Todd’s Dictionary of early modern women writers and Antonia Fraser’s The Weaker Vessel to focus on the Memoirs’ depiction of the loving relationship between Hutchinson and her husband John, pretty

---


© The Author(s) 2022. Published by Oxford University Press. This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/), which permits unrestricted reuse, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.
much to the exclusion of all else. More recently, however, in line with an increasing engagement with the wider contexts of early-modern women’s experiences, and with their contribution to political, religious, and literary culture, the focus has moved away from Hutchinson’s domestic and marital life. This shift is registered by the standard literary histories from Oxford and Cambridge: the Memoirs appears exclusively in a chapter on ‘Literature and the household’ in the Cambridge History of Early Modern Literature from 2002, but in the Oxford English Literary History from 2017 it is cited (equally exclusively) as a witness to Civil War experience. The Oxford history is in fact more interested in Hutchinson as the translator of Lucretius than as the author of the Memoirs, a measure of the transformation effected by the discovery (rather than recovery) of her true literary stature and range by David Norbrook’s archival and editorial work.

As Thomas N. Corns remarks in his literary history of the period, interest in her as a poet is now superseding interest in her as a biographer.

This new kind of attentiveness is evident in the 2015 special issue of The Seventeenth Century on Lucy Hutchinson, edited by Norbrook, which sought ‘to respond to the challenge of trying to see her as a whole and understand her place in the larger developments of her century’ by recognising in her, as is increasingly the case with the lives of other seventeenth-century women, a ‘range of political, ecclesiastical and theological interests that could push towards different forms of public engagement’. There is (significantly) only one essay in this symposium devoted to the Memoirs, and that essay (again significantly) takes up not Hutchinson’s account of her relations with her husband but rather her record of ‘the warfare which comprises a major part of the memoir’. In this essay, Martyn Bennett approaches Hutchinson not as a biographer (or autobiographer) but as a historian, reading the Memoirs in the context of contemporary historiography, particularly Thomas May, and speaking of Hutchinson’s ‘contemporary fellow historian, the royalist politician Edward Hyde, Earl of Clarendon’—not a collocation heard hitherto—to conclude that as an exercise in qualitative prosopography the Memoirs ‘are essential’.

However, for Bennet, the Memoirs remains a text removed from the public sphere in its conception and address: its ‘chief task’ is ‘to foreground her husband John and explain his actions and responses to the vicissitudes of war and political revolution’; Hutchinson ‘intended the Memoirs as a private text for circulation within the family’.

Taking its cue from Bennett’s historiographical analysis of the Memoirs, this paper proposes that, on the contrary, the public sphere is not present simply as the subject of much the greater part of Hutchinson’s text but that it is also the point of reference and address, decisively shaping its business and generic character. Without minimizing the pressure of personal circumstances, it sets the Memoirs in the context of the public life of the nation following the Restoration as those who had lived through the civil wars, Commonwealth and Protectorate attempted to construct from their experience a past that justified their role in, and understanding of, the ‘revolutions’ of the mid-century.


\[^6\] The exception is C. H. Firth’s edition of the Memoirs (London, 1906) which in its introduction (xii–xv), notes, and appendices approaches the text as a primary historical source.

\[^7\] Martyn Bennett, “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 (2015), 191–206 (191, 193–4, 204).

\[^8\] Bennett, ‘Every County’, 192.
I. THE MAKING OF MEMOIRS

The death of John Hutchinson in 1664 was the originating occasion of the Memoirs but, while her loss and grief were private and personal, Hutchinson was very far from alone in the composition of a narrative of recent history centred on personal experience—indeed, quite the opposite. Recalling and recording one's experience and understanding of the Civil Wars and Interregnum was a Restoration preoccupation, if not obsession, across the full range of religious and political commitments. Even as Lucy Hutchinson was writing her memoir of her regicide husband between (probably) 1663 and 1667, Richard Baxter in retirement at Acton was working on the autobiographical narrative that would become the Reliquiae Baxterianae, Edmund Ludlow was composing his memoirs in exile in Vevey, as was the banished Earl of Clarendon his in Montpellier. The trend continued for the next 20 years and more. In the mid-1670s, George Fox, recuperating at Swarthmoor Hall from a 14 month period of imprisonment in Worcester Castle in 1673–1674, dictated what was later published (misleadingly) as his Journal; later in that same decade, the recently widowed royalists Anne, Lady Halkett, and Ann, Lady Fanshawe, each wrote their memoirs, as did Sir Philip Warwick. In the 1680s, Gilbert Burnet and Samuel Parker was each writing a History of His Own Time, Sir John Reresby and Sir William Temple each his Memoirs, and John Aubrey his Brief Lives. In the 1690s, nonconformists such as Roger Morrice and Henry Sampson were working on histories of Puritanism derived from testimony and records of lived experience, on which Edmund Calamy would draw at the start of the next century in his prosopographical accounts of the ejected ministers.

II. THE PUBLISHING OF MEMOIRS

Of these many Restoration memoirs, almost none was then published. Their composition was private, even secret, out of the public gaze, and in many cases with good reason: the publication of critical or oppositional opinions and convictions risked prosecution under treason, press, and religious legislation. The projects of nonconformists, Puritans, and republicans (including of


11 Baxter began his text in 1664 and had completed its first two parts by September 1665; he resumed work on it in November 1670 (Baxter, Reliquiae, 1. 9–10, 2. 291, 303).


13 In 1668 Clarendon resumed work begun during an earlier exile in Jersey in 1646–1648 on what would be published as the History of the Rebellion and Civil Wars (Oxford, 1702–1704) and The Life of Edward Earl of Clarendon ... Written by Himself and its Continuation (Oxford, 1759). On their compositional history and tangled textual relationship, see Paul Seaward in ODNB, s.v.


16 David Wykes, 'To revive the memory of some excellent men': Edmund Calamy and the Early Historians of Nonconformity, Friends of Dr Williams's Library 50th lecture (London, 1997), 3, 10, 12.

17 An exception was Margaret Cavendish's Life of William Cavendish, Duke of Newcastle which was published in 1667. This was exceptional also amongst contemporary published autobiographical and biographical works by women which lacked Cavendish's interest in public affairs and served religious ends, apologetic, exemplary or edificatory, e.g.: [Theodosia Allene et al.], The Life and Death of Mr Joseph Allene (1671); Hannah Allen, Satan his Malice and Methods Baffled (1683); Susanna Parr, Susanna's Apologie against the Elders (1658); Anne Venn, A Wise Virgin's Lamp Burning (1658); Anne Wenhurste, A Vindication of Anne Wentworth (1677). Extracts from several of these were included and discussed in Elspeth Graham, Hilary Hinds, Elaine Hobby and Helen Wilcox (eds), Her Own Life: Autobiographical Writings by Seventeenth-century Englishwomen (London, 1989).
course Hutchinson) necessarily remained unpublished at their deaths: Baxter, for example, had more than enough experience of the hostility of the Bishop of London's chaplains acting in their role as press censors never to offer the manuscript of the Reliquiae for a licence. With the passing of the Toleration Act (1689) and the final lapse of the Licensing Act in 1695, however, the great store of unpublished historiographical and autobiographical material that had by then been accumulated could go to press. If the writing of private histories of the ‘troubles’ was the great literary enterprise of the Restoration period, printing them was to be the great publishing project of the later seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries.

For the next 20 or 30 years, these first-hand accounts, written decades earlier, appeared steadily from the press. Temple’s Memoirs of What Passed in Christendom ... 1672 to ... 1679 was published in 1691, George Fox’s Journal in 1694, Baxter’s Reliquiae in 1696, and the first volume of Edmund Ludlow’s Memoirs in 1698. There followed in quick succession the memoirs of Sir John Berkeley (1699), Denzil Lord Holles (1699), Thomas Lord Fairfax (1699), Sir Philip Warwick (1701), and Sir Thomas Herbert (1702). Clarendon’s first-hand History of the Great Rebellion appeared in 1702–1704, Calamy’s various re-workings and expansions of Baxter’s Reliquiae between 1702 and 1727, Gilbert Burnet’s Whig History of His Own Life and Times in six volumes between 1724 and 1734, Samuel Parker’s similarly titled narrative in Latin in 1726 and in English in 1727–1728, and the Memoirs of the Yorkshire royalist Sir John Reresby in 1734. The history of the text of Hutchinson’s life of her husband fits exactly this pattern of private composition and posthumous publication. Even the length of time before its printing in 1806 is not exceptional: the memoirs of Calamy and Lady Fanshawe did not appear until 1829, Clarendon’s Life in 1857, and the autobiographies of both Lady Halkett and Alice Thornton in 1875.

It was not only delayed publication that Hutchinson’s text shared with other late seventeenth-century memoirs but also its editorial treatment. These texts caused their first editors and publishers some dismay and they invariably tried to coerce them into a tone less intimate, unbuttoned, and self-revealing. ‘The pleasures and concerns of family life weave in and out of his public life in [Whitelocke’s] diary and “Annales”, but were expunged by the editor’, Arthur Annesley, earl of Anglesey, who ‘removed every semblance of humanity’ when publishing the ‘Annales’ as Memorials of the English Affairs (1682), thereby creating the original of Carlyle’s Dryasdust. Matthew Sylvester, encouraged by Calamy, omitted from the published Reliquiae passages deemed (in Calamy’s words) ‘too mean’ for public view and liable to expose Baxter to censure. Edmund Ludlow was—like other republicans, such as Milton—modified into a
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18 See e.g. Baxter, Reliquiae, 1. 496.
19 The same period saw in addition the publication of apologetic and eulogistic (and sometimes substantial) biographical prefaces, frequently drawing on personal acquaintance, to editions of the collected works (usually in folio, often multi-volume) of recently deceased political and religious leaders intended to secure their standing in the historical record. These include: John Strype’s Account of the Life, with an Appendix or Collection of some more Memorials of the Life, of John Lightfoot prefixed to the first volume of his Works (1684); John Toland’s (anonymous) Life prefixed to the Complete Collection of the ... Works of Milton (1698); Edmund Calamy’s prefaced also anonymous to Baxter’s Practical Works (1707) (for which see Baxter, Reliquiae, 4. 370–6, 410–41) and his Memoirs of the Life of the Author prefaced to the first volumes of John Howe’s Works (1724); the Life and Character of Edward Stillingfleet prefixed to the first volume of his Works (1707); and Joseph Besses anonymous 238-page Journal of the Life of the author prefixed to the first volume of A Collection of the Works of William Penn (1726). Penn’s own Account of [the] Life and Writings of the author advertised on the title-page of the 1709 edition of Whitelocke’s Memorials of the English Affairs is in fact a disquisition on historiography.
22 Calamy, My Own Life, 1. 377–8, cited in the account of its editing in 1696 in Baxter, Reliquiae, 1. 148–54.
good Whig by his editor (almost certainly John Toland) and George Fox was similarly rendered ‘more uniform, more polished, and more cautious’ by his first editor Thomas Ellwood. Hutchinson’s ‘Life’ of her husband underwent just such modification at the hands of its first editor, Julius Hutchinson. Sensitive to the political and moral objections that her republicanism and independence of character as a married woman would be likely to generate among readers, in successive editions he undertook an editorial exercise in ‘textual policing’ to modify its political radicalism, religious zeal and feminine assertiveness, resulting in the ‘masculinization of its contents’ and the presentation of both her and John Hutchinson as ‘prototypes of reformist Whiggery’.

III. THE NATURE OF MEMOIRS

These texts differ greatly in manner, scope, and tone, but all combine features of what would later become the distinct genres of historiography, biography, and autobiography, and indeed, fictional narratives. They differ on the one hand from chronicle and narrative history by their appeal to their author’s own experience or to personal acquaintance with their subjects’ lives, often drawing on, or even taking the form of, a diary or journal (etymologically memoir is, of course, closely related to memory); and on the other from the various incipient forms of autobiography and biography by their interest in public affairs and their avoidance of the intensely subjective. It was a fine line to walk: in his preface to what he styled the third part of Temple’s Memoirs (1709), its publisher, Temple’s former secretary Jonathan Swift, felt obliged to defend Temple from the charge that he ‘speaks too much of himself’ on the grounds that those making this criticism ‘do not well consider the Nature of Memoirs. ‘Tis to the French (if I mistake not) we chiefly owe that manner of Writing … The best French Memoirs are writ by such Persons as were the Principal Authors in those Transactions they pretend to relate, whether of Wars or Negotiations.’ First-person authors of memoirs might avoid such a charge by assuming the apparently authoritative impartiality of historiography through adoption of the third rather than the first person to distance the narrator from the autobiographical subject. For a female author such as Hutchinson, this narrative strategy might prove especially serviceable in liberating the narrator from gendered constraints, but the device was used also by male authors to confer authority on the narrator’s voice. Examples include Whitelocke in his diary and the very different case of Clarendon, who in both his Life written by Himself and the History of the Great Rebellion refers to himself throughout as ‘Mr. Hyde’ and ‘the Chancellor’.

When these texts came to be printed, their combination of the personal with the public and political could be registered through titles that pointed simultaneously towards the autobiographical and the historical, such as Fox’s Journal or Historical Account of the Life, Travels, Sufferings, Baxter’s Reliquiae Baxterianae: Or, Mr Richard Baxter’s Narrative of the Most Memorable Passages of his Life and Times, Burnet’s History of His Own Life and Times and Calamy’s

25 Fox, Journal, i–x.
Historical Account of My Own Life. The term more commonly adopted, however, was memoirs (as Swift indicates), sometimes combined with the alternative style as an explanatory gloss, as in the Memoirs of the Life and Times of... Thomas Tenison (1716) and Alexander Smith's Memoirs of the Life and Times of the Famous Jonathan Wild... Never Before Made Public (1726). The bookseller Edmund Curll reflected the trend when he reissued Delarivier Manley’s Adventures of Rivella (1714) as the Memoirs of the Life of Mrs Manley (1714). The word had entered English from French in the later sixteenth century used (in the singular) in the sense of ‘memorandum’ or ‘official record’, but in the 1670s, it came to be used (in the plural) for more extended narratives, such as the Memoirs of the Life and Death of the Famous Madam Charlton (1673), a title tellingly revised from the Memories of used for the first edition issued earlier that same year; The Memoirs of Philip de Comines Lord of Argenton (1674); and the rogue narrative [Thomas] Sadlers Memoirs (1677). The scandalous Mémoires of the Mancini sisters, Hortense (1675) and Marie (1677), nieces of Cardinal Mazarin, were both promptly translated into English as The Memoires of [Hortense] the Dutchess Mazarine (1676) and The Apology, or, The Genuine Memoires of Madam Maria Mancini, Constabless of Colonna, Eldest Sister to the Duchess of Mazarin (1679). By the early 1680s, memoirs had become the term of choice (often, as in these examples, spelt following the French, memoirs) for historical and biographical narratives that claimed authority and credibility on the basis of the author’s own experience or first-hand knowledge of public affairs. The vogue was to continue for the next 40 years (occasionally in the form memorial(s)).

Hutchinson’s own term for her work was the straightforward life (15), used for biographical writing since Anglo Saxon times and still current in the later seventeenth-century: it was, it seems probable, Baxter’s own title for what was subsequently published as Reliquiae Baxterianae and it was used by his friend and colleague Samuel Clarke for his compilations of Puritan biographies, as well, of course, as by Izaak Walton for his four lives of ordained members of the established church. It was as his ‘Booke of Lives’ and his ‘collection of Lives’ that John Aubrey referred to the brief biographies he compiled for Anthony Wood. In nevertheless preferring the title memoirs in 1806, Julius Hutchinson was opting for a designation well-established since the late seventeenth century, readily recognisable by readers and entirely appropriate to the dual nature of Hutchinson’s text.

The term had, however, developed one generic relationship that was far less fitting. The first-hand insights of memoirs often offered (or promised to offer) access to otherwise inaccessible dealings: Warwick knew ‘the Secret Springs’ of public affairs during the reign of Charles I; Burnet claimed to know ‘the true secrets’ of all those ‘who had the chief conduct of affairs’. This was a
claim that in so-called ‘secret histories’ could blur the boundary between fiction and historicity41 as they apparently disclosed political and court dealings, often scandalous or salacious, unknown to, or withheld from, the general public. Aphra Behn’s epistolary novel Love-Letters between a Nobleman and his Sister (3 vols, 1684–1687), for example, was based on the scandalous relationship of Lady Henrietta Berkeley with Ford Grey, Earl of Tankerville, the husband of Henrietta’s sister Mary. The potential of apparent historicity to give credibility to fictional narratives was seized upon by translations of French nouvelles galantes recounting the amorous relations of apparently historical figures.42 Delarivier Manley, whose fictionalized account of the relationship between Charles II and Barbara Villiers, Duchess of Cleveland, in her Secret History of Queen Zarah (1705) derived from a French original,43 combined the appeal of both fashionable genres in the title of her scandalous revelations about Whig grandees, Secret Memoirs and Manners of Several Persons of Quality, of Both Sexes, from the New Atlantis (1709). The title memoirs might also validate satirical accounts of current affairs that crossed between reportage and fiction44 and straightforward fictions, most signally Defoe’s Memoirs of a Cavalier (1720).45

The concerns of Hutchinson’s Memoirs of course share very little with these texts. For all her devotion to her husband, she passes by ‘all the little amorous relations’ of his ‘fourteene months’ courtship as ‘the vanities of youth’ to be ‘forgotten’ (32, 34) and turns from them to his life of public service in Nottingham.46 In so doing she encountered the difficulty common to writers of this hybrid form of life-writing:47 how to handle within a single narrative both ‘our particular actions’ and ‘the state of the kingdom’ (37). The dilemma might be resolved, as it was by Burnet and Clarendon, by casting their memoirs as (apparently) impartial histories. More usually, memoirists moved back and forth between personal and public narratives with self-referential, and sometimes awkward, transitions: having ‘returne[d] to my own matters’, after a few pages Baxter ‘must returne to the proceedings of the Parliament’, else ‘the rest will not be well understood’.48 Hutchinson, similarly finding it ‘necessary to carry on the maine story for the better understanding of the motion of those lesser wheeles that moov’d within the greate Orbe’, will describe ‘in what posture things were abroad’ (78) and advises the reader that ‘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’ (125), often signposting such turns to public affairs as digressions: ‘here I must make a short digression from our particular actions to summe up the state of the kingdom’ (37).49 She may feel called upon to explain her authorial decisions with such comments as ‘I shall only mention what is necessary to be remember’d for the better carrying on of my purpose’ (37), or to apologize that, for example, she has ‘bene too

42 E. g. the English translation of Gabriel de Brémond [i. e. Sébastien Brémond], Mémoires Galans, ou Les Avantures Amoureauses (1680) as Gallant Memoirs (1681) (for the authorship see Ezell, Later Seventeenth Century, 288–9, with reference to Edwin P. Grobe’s 1954 Indiana University Ph. D. thesis).
43 Sébastien Brémond, Hattigé, ou les amours du Roy Tamaran, nouvelle (Cologne, 1676), Englished as Hattige, or The Amours of the King of Tamaran, A Novel (Amsterdam, 1680).
44 E. g. the short-lived weekly serial publication intended to expose and discredit the informer John Hilton, The English Guzman: or Captain Hilton’s Memoirs (1683); the anonymous Scotch Memoirs (1683) attacking the Presbyterians; and The Loyal Observer, or Historical Memoirs of the Life and Actions of Roger the Fidler (1683) mocking Roger L’Estrange and his periodical The Observer.
45 Within the text the impression of authenticity is sustained by Defoe’s dependence upon genuine late seventeenth-century memoirs, such as Ludlow’s (see further Daniel Defoe, Memoirs of a Cavalier, ed. N. H. Keeble (London, 2008), 8–18).
46 There is a similar perspective in Hutchinson’s fragmentary autobiography which is as concerned with the historical and geopolitical context of what is an explicitly English life as with her familial and personal history (Sutherland (ed.), Memoirs, 278–82).
47 The term ‘biography’ is not known until the late seventeenth century; on its anachronistic inappropriateness when used of the ‘generic multiplicity and instability’ of seventeenth century lives see Kevin Sharpe and Steven N. Zwicker (eds), Writing Lives: Biography and Textuality, Identity and Representation in Early Modern England (Oxford, 2012), passim (3).
48 Baxter, Reliquiae, 1. 252, 263.
49 On these digressions and their source, see Hutchinson, Memoirs, ed. Firth, xii–xiii. It is possible that further revision, or the opportunity to prepare her text for the press, would have smoothed out these abrupt transitions.
long for that I intended, a bare summary, and too short to give a cleare understanding of the righteousnesse of the Parliament’s cause’ (53). She has sometimes explicitly to restrain herself from following one line rather than the other lest she ‘confound stories’ (198): she will ‘ramble into an inextricable wildernesse if I persue this sad remembrance’ of the treatment of her husband, ‘To returne therefore...’ (63).

IV. DISABUSING POSTERITY

Although the effect is of (sometimes awkward) interruption and intercalation, Hutchinson’s twin narratives are bound together by a unifying theme and purpose. As their first editors discovered, memoirists took full and knowing advantage of the opportunity afforded by the private composition of their narratives to speak with uninhibited freedom of persons and events. They did so in anticipation that, while immediate publication was not possible, their work would nevertheless eventually see the light of day: posterity was the intended readership. In his memoirs, Burnet wrote ‘with a plain freedom to all sorts of Persons: This not being to be published ‘till after I am dead’ in the hope ‘that what I am now to offer to succeeding Ages, may be better heard, and less censured, than any thing I could offer to the present’.

Baxter’s purpose is to disabuse after-ages of the misrepresentations peddled by other narratives: he wrote ‘lest the fable passe for truth when I am dead’, that ‘Posterity may not be deluded by Credulity’.

Warwick hopes his narrative of the reign of Charles I will ‘teach men of future ages’ the dangers of discord.

Clarendon’s History, the grandest of these narratives, presents to the world ‘a full and clear narration of the grounds, circumstances, and artifices of this Rebellion’ in order ‘that posterity may not be deceived, by the prosperous wickedness of these times’ into misconstruing seventeenth-century history.

In less explicit cases, a similar point of address can be inferred: Mark Goldie has plausibly suggested that the writing of Roger Morrice’s Entring Book into expensive pre-bound volumes suggests that this contemporaneous record of the 1680s was compiled with posterity in mind.

The immediate occasion and addressees might belong within the family, but this does not exclude a much wider implied readership: Temple’s ‘Memoirs of what has pass’d in my Publick Imployments’ were written at the request of his son and, while he desired they should remain in the family ‘during my Life’, his observation that, ‘when that is ended’, his narrative ‘will be in your disposal’, is far from putting an embargo on its publication.

When Reresby states that his memoirs are ‘chiefly designed’ for ‘the posterity of [his] own family’, the adverb admits a wider posterity as potential readers, as does his apology for mentioning details of domestic hospitality that may appear ‘frivolous to others’.

Just so, Hutchinson’s immediate address may be to her children, but when she writes that she is entrusted with the task of honouring her husband’s memory ‘for the benefitt of all, and particularly his owne posterity’ (2) she is looking beyond her family and its descendants to a wider readership hereafter—indeed, the syntax of the sentence privileges that readership over the Hutchinson family who are only a particular subset of those to whom she will set out the ‘wealthy stock of his glory’ (2). When she describes her husband’s appearance for ‘such of you as have not seene him to remember his person’ (3) she is thinking beyond her children. Sutherland judged it ‘doubtful’ that Hutchinson wrote with publication (however distant) in mind, citing the fact that ‘she had written with almost libellous freedom about men who were still alive’.

50 Bishop Burnet’s History of His Own Time. Vol. VI (1734), 1251–2.
51 Baxter, Reliquiae, 2. 552, 576.
52 Warwick, Memoires, 88.
53 Clarendon, History, 1. 1.
54 Mark Goldie, Roger Morrice and the Puritan Whigs (Woodbridge, 2016), 96.
and the need to avoid offending her daughter-in-law and antagonizing her son Charles (xix). However, as we have seen, licence to speak freely was precisely what was claimed by the authors of memoirs that were to be withheld for posthumous publication, and family offence need not have weighed heavily if the hope was that at some point after her death the memoir might be printed.

V. TWO CONTENDING PARTIES

As is indicated by the explicit intention of Baxter, Clarendon, and Burnet to set the record straight, this address to after ages was very far from disinterested: memoirists had designs on posterity. First-hand authority is adduced (‘I remember’, ‘I heard’, ‘I saw’ are recurrent verificatory formulae) to substantiate through personal witness a particular understanding of the recent past. The prefatory editorial note to Warwick’s Memoires states that

\[
\text{The Vindicating of the Cause and Actions of his Royal Majesty [Charles I] and His Friends, and to do right to Truth, were the great inducements to his Writing these Remarks: So to rectifie mistakes, and rescue the Memory of that Injur’d Prince from the false Imputations and Indignities that have been cast upon Him by Prejudiced and Malicious Men, is the cause of this Publication.}
\]

These narratives were, that is to say, fiercely partisan, commonly apologetic, and even polemical. Writing in the 1680s, Gilbert Burnet prefixed to his History of His Own Time an historical review to explain how, ‘tho’ the wars be over long ago, yet … they have left among us so many seeds of lasting feuds and animosities, which upon every turn are apt to ferment and break out a-new’. In the factional lobbying, publishing, and party organizational arrangements of the Popish Plot and Exclusion Crisis of 1679–1681—in the eyes of such contemporaries as Roger L’Estrange, the continuation of the civil war by political means—the ‘seeds of lasting feuds’ that had germinated in the Court and Country parties of the 1670s grew into the heated opposition of Whigs and Tories. In the first decade of the next century, Daniel Defoe discerned ‘two contending Parties’ throughout seventeenth-century history, ‘distinguish’d, as in like Cases, by Names of Contempt; and tho’ they have often chang’d them on either side, as Cavalier and Roundhead, Royalists and Rebels, Malignants and Phanaticks, Tories and Whigs, yet the Division has always been barely the Church and the Dissenter, and there it continues to this Day’. Late seventeenth-century memoirs generally enlisted in one or other of these ‘two contending Parties’. Margaret Cavendish, Duchess of Newcastle, for example, intended that her life of her husband would ‘set forth and declare to after ages’ the justness of the cause of Charles I, ‘the actions and sufferings of [Charles II’s] most loyal subjects’, and the ‘truth’ of her husband’s

57 Sutherland was responding to the suggestion of Sydney Race, ‘The British Museum MS. of the Life of Colonel Hutchinson and its Relation to the Published Memoirs’, Transactions of the Thoroton Society of Nottingham, 28 (1915), 35–66 (36), that it is a fair assumption that Hutchinson’s memoirs ‘were intended for publication’, ‘in all probability’ inspired by the publication of Margaret Cavendish’s Life of William Cavendish, Duke of Newcastle (1667).

58 Cf. David Norbrook’s remark in ODNB, s.v., that ‘it is likely that Hutchinson hoped the Memoirs would ultimately reach an audience beyond her family’, and also the compelling argument of Anna Wall that Hutchinson’s earlier unpublished account of her husband’s service in the 1640s, drawn on in the Memoirs, has the generic character of a pamphlet and a public document that may well have been intended for print publication (‘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 (2021), 623–51 (635–43).

59 Warwick, Memoires, sig. A3.

60 For a case study in these terms, see Peter Lake, Reading Clarke’s Lives in Political and Polemical Context, in Sharpe and Zwicker (eds), Writing Lives, 293–318. See also Claire Gheeraert-Grafeuil, ‘Entre polémique et histoire: comment écrire les guerres civiles anglaises (1640–1660)’, in Emmanuelle Dupraz and Claire Gheeraert-Grafeuil (eds.), La Guerre civile: représentations, idéalisations, identifications (Mont-Saint-Aignan, 2014), 51–73.

61 Bishop Burnet’s History … Vol I, 2.

62 [Daniel Defoe], A New Test of the Church of England’s Loyalty (1702), 5.

63 On the development of party opposition and its cultural resonance, see Tim Harris, Politics under the Later Stuarts: Party Conflict in a Divided Society, 1660–1715 (Harlow, 1993).
'actions and endeavours’ for his King and country. On the other side, the memoirs of Holles were published expressly as ‘an Apology for that Party who took up Arms, not to destroy the King, or alter the Constitution, but to restore the last, and oblige the former to rule according to Law’. These texts were, that is to say, ranged against each other in a struggle for the master narrative of seventeenth-century history: on one side the Puritan, Parliamentary and Whig memoirs of Baxter, Ludlow, Holles, Calamy and Burnet’s *History of My Own Time*; and on the other the royalist and Tory memoirs of Cavendish, Berkeley, Warwick, Clarendon, Parker and Reresby. Burnet might disclaim any intention in writing his memoirs ‘to blast the Memory of some and to exalt others, to disgrace one Party and to recommend another’, but there is very little doubt who in his *History of His Own Time* is to be applauded, who denounced, nor which party he judged better served the public weal. Baxter’s historiographical ideals may have looked for credibility, evidence, and impartiality, but they were entirely compatible with forceful opinions and partiality. His partisanship was not untypical in seeing in party opposition a deeper antipathy: his historical agents are categorically distinguished in the traditional Christian terms of ‘an universal and radicated Enmity between the Carnal and Spiritual, the Serpent’s and the Woman’s Seed … through all the World, in all Generations, Gen. 3.15 Rom. 8. 6, 7, 8.’ Baxter looked no further than this *Cain and Abel Malignity* (1689) for the key to current affairs: the Civil War and all that ensued were explicable in terms of this perennial conflict: ‘It’s certain that the fundamental, universal Quarrel through the World, is between the followers of *Cain* and *Abel*, the Serpents and the Womans Seed, or the Servants of Satan and Christ’. 

VI. THE CHILDREN OF LIGHT AND OF DARKNESS

Just such a binary schematic shapes Hutchinson’s narrative. In the prefatory address ‘To my Children’, she gives as the explicit purpose of the *Memoirs* the preservation of her husband’s memory through an account of ‘his holy, vertuous, honorable life’ (3) but through that purpose she reaches beyond the immediately memorial and eulogistic. ‘To my Children’ may seem like a private prefatory address focused on John Hutchinson’s personal virtues, but it is the key to the public resonance of the apologetic and justificatory narrative to follow. The representation of him as an ideal Renaissance gentleman establishes the criteria by which the actions of all those who subsequently figure in the narrative are judged, and almost invariably found wanting. This general distinction has two particular inflexions in Hutchinson’s representation of her husband’s merits. It is unexpectedly specific, and pointed, first, in its stress on not merely his Christianity but on a specific kind of witness. His Christian faith was a matter not of works or duties but a ‘habitt of grace … wrought in a soule by the regenerating spiritt of God’ (5). From a young age, he had a ‘perfect detestation of sinne’ and a ‘sence of naturall corruption, groaning under it and desire to be freed from it’ (5–6), which in time was granted and he became ‘establisht much in the way of Mr. Calvin, but not as his way, but the way of God’, his faith set on ‘a sure and orthodox foundation in the doctrine of the free grace of God given us by Jesus Christ’ (6). He ‘never did aniething without measuring it by the rule of conscience’ and, when ‘God turn’d the greate wheel in this nation’ and he encountered adversity, he ‘cheerfully’ submitted: ‘The more God chasten’d him the more he lov’d him’ (6). Throughout, ‘his heart was sincere and stedfast to the Lord’ (7). Although the word does not appear in Hutchinson’s characterization of her husband,

65 There were also the Parliamentarian memoirs of Thomas Lord Fairfax and Sir Thomas Herbert, but these were published with exculpatory rather than justificatory purpose.
66 *Bishop Burnet’s History … Vol. VI*, 1251.
67 *Baxter, Reliquiae*, 1. 279 (see 1. 28–41, 72–94, for further discussion).
68 *Baxter, Against the Revolt to a Foreign Jurisdiction* (1691), 1–2.
this is unmistakably the spiritual biography of a Puritan. What Hutchinson will trace, like so many Puritan narratives and characterizations, are his ‘steps’ in making ‘progresse’ in the Pauline ‘race of piety’, from one degree of virtue to another (1, 5). She will, in the democratic sense of the term used in Puritan discourse, ‘celebrate the glories of a saint’ (2).

Secondly, the arena for the exercise of John Hutchinson’s Christian commitment is civic, political, and military. Within that arena, ‘There never was a man more exactly just in the performance of duties to all relations and to all persons’ (9), ‘as farre from envie of superiors as from contemning those that were under him’ (11). He did not seek ‘emptie titles’ nor ‘envied any man’s due precedence’, disdained ‘glory’ that was not founded in ‘vertue’, did not seek, or take pride in, ‘popular applause’, nor ‘sett vulgar commendations at such a rate as to act contrary to his owne conscience’ and was ‘farre from vaine affectation of popularity’ (11). He was neither sycophantic to his superiors, never giving ‘himselfe blindly up to the conduct of the greatest master’ (8), nor wilfully assertive in the exercise of his own authority, being ‘as ready to heare as to give counsell’, to ‘heare as well as speake’ (7). Throughout the unpredictability and turmoil of the Interregnum he remained constant: ‘he most hated hipocrisie in religion, either to complie with changing governements or persons’ (9); ‘He was never surpriz’d nor amazed nor confounded with great difficulties or dangers’ (10). This is a model servant of the English commonwealth. This is far more than a tribute from his widow to a loved husband. In its specificity, this encomium conjures its opposite, those who aim for worldly renown, are hypocritical, court popularity and bend with the times. Thus is established the fundamental opposition and contrast that structures the Memoirs. The emphasis on John Hutchinson’s Puritanism and republican commitment to public service shapes a narrative constructed as a struggle between the Christian virtues of the exemplary John Hutchinson and ‘the mallice of his enemies’ (3) who ‘walk’d not according to the Gossip’ (6) and whose ‘wickednesse his righteous soule abhorrr’d’ (9). Sheep are divided from goats politically as well as religiously: the account of ‘one of the best of men’ (2) for whom ‘the rightousenes of the Parliament’s cause’ lay in ‘the defence of the just English liberties’ (53), will by contrast ‘discover the deformities of this wicked age’ and the ‘erring children of this generation’ (1). Both John Hutchinson’s experiences and the national discord demonstrate ‘that naturall antipathie which is betweene good and evil’ (68). In every incident, the narrative’s Pauline taxonomy ranges the ‘children of darknesse’ against ‘the hated children of light’ (44), against ‘honest men’ ‘well affected … to righteous liberty’ and ‘faithful … to God and God’s people’ (72), including, of course, John Hutchinson: ‘So were all the children of darknesse convinc’d by his light that they were more in awe of his virtue than his authority’ (206).

Such a categorical, even judgemental, authorial voice is, as we have seen, characteristic of later seventeenth-century memoirs whatever their protestations of disinterest and impartiality. Hutchinson’s memoir may promise ‘a naked undrest narrative, speaking the simple truth’ (1), but such authentically Puritan plainness proves wholly compatible with explicit republican opinionativeness and withering assessments of the duplicity, hypocrisy and unreliability of others. Indeed, as C. H. Firth noted, she rather disapproved of the impartiality of Thomas May’s History of the Parliament of England which Began … 1640 (1647) as too indulgent to the ‘guilt of Charles II’ (53). What is distinctive in Hutchinson, however, is that the ‘children of darknesse

---

69 Within the narrative itself, those maligned as ‘Puritans’, who include John Hutchinson (54), are saluted as ‘the people of God’ established in faith and holiness (43).

70 1 Cor. 9:24; Gal. 5:7; Phil. 2:16; Heb. 12:1.

71 Cf. the comment in a chapter on Lucy Hutchinson in Giuseppina Iacono Lobo, Writing Conscience and the Nation in Revolutionary England (Toronto, 2017), that ‘The Memoirs confronts readers with a seemingly flawless —if constructed — picture of John Hutchinson. He is at once an Englishman, a republican, and a man of conscience’ (129; the point is developed on 138–49).

72 Rom. 2: 19; 2 Cor. 4: 6; 1 Thess. 5: 5.

73 Hutchinson, Memoirs, ed. Firth, xii.
and of light’ are not equated with Burnet’s two feuding factions or Defoe’s ‘two contending parties’. Rather, both are located within the Puritan, Parliamentarian and republican traditions; save for her preparatory account of ‘the state of England’ (53) that led to Civil War, and occasional later comments, Royalists and episcopalians are all but ignored. The opposition is not between warring antagonists but is played out in John Hutchinson’s dealings as Governor with Nottingham Castle and its garrison, the town and the County Committee as the narrative’s density of circumstantial and local detail is marshalled to represent a contest between his defence of ‘civill and spirituall liberties’ (46) against (in a nice phrase) ‘factious little people’ (158) less wholeheartedly committed to the Parliamentarian cause than he. 74

And not only less committed. John Hutchinson contends with an almost Jacobean cast of knaves and villains: the malicious, cruel, deceitful and incompetent Sir John Gell and his ill-disciplined troops (67–8); the ‘factious, ambitious, vaineglorious, envious, and mallitious’ Charles White whose Parliamentarian commitment and a ‘vizard of godlinesse’ broke when he joined Booth’s uprising in 1659 (69); the ‘horrible Atheist’ Huntingdon Plumtre (70–1); the ‘exquisite villain’ James Chadwick (72), an ‘engine of mischiefe’ (133) who adopted ‘a forme of godlinesse, the better to deceive’ (72). These are set against such as Francis Thornhaugh, ‘a man of a most upright faithfull heart to God and God’s people’ and ‘of a most excellent good nature to all men’; Gervase Pigott, ‘a very religious, serious, wise gentleman, true-hearted to God and his country’; Joseph Widmerpoole who ‘had a perfect honest heart to God, his country and his friend’; and Gervase Lomas, ‘who could not be reckon’d among the gentry’ but ‘a stout and an understanding man, plane and blunt, but withall godly, faithfull to his country, and honest to all men’ (72–3). The repeated locutions, particularly the coupling of ‘God’ and ‘country’—John Hutchinson had ‘an invincible courage and a passionate zeale for the interest of God and his country’ (76)—make the point. Through his engagement with these individuals is enacted a contest no less elemental than Baxter’s Cain and Abel malignity, with John Hutchinson in the role of Christian champion: ‘it was a worke which God call’d him to’ (106).

More than the fate of Nottingham is at stake. Through this essentially rhetorical, rather than analytical, depiction of her husband’s local interactions Hutchinson exemplifies what she takes to be the religious and political maladministration of the interregnum regimes: this same failure to live up to the standards embodied in John Hutchinson characterizes players on the national stage. As John Hutchinson’s ‘noble spiritt of governement, both in civill, military, and oecumenical administrations’ (8) exemplifies true service to the commonwealth, so those who opposed him typify the factional self-interest and ambitious pride that wrecked the Good Old Cause. Worst amongst them are the Presbyterians, once ‘the zealousest promoters of the cause’ (167), who forsook ‘God and the People’s cause when they could not obteine the reines of Government in their owne hands’ (215) and in Parliament in 1648 ‘endeavour’d to close with the common enemie’ to effect ‘the destruction of their Independent Antagonists’ (186). After the crowning of Charles II at Scone they entered into ‘a treasonable conspiracy with Scotland’ (191), betraying the ‘righteous cause’ and ‘the interest of their country’ (187), as they would when, ‘thirsting and ‘hunting after blood’ (227), they worked for the Restoration. In this they were aided by the inadequacy of Cromwell’s son Richard (‘a peasant in his nature’ who ‘became not greatnesse’ (209)), the anarchy of the ‘Arbitrary raigne’ (219) of the Army in 1659 and the ‘dissimulations’ of Monke (222), events that led John Hutchinson ‘to loose all hope of setling this poore land

---

74 On the divisiveness that lay behind this binary representation see P. R. Seddon, ‘Colonel Hutchinson and the Disputes between the Nottinghamshire Parliamentarians, 1643–45’, Transactions of the Thoroton Society, 98 (1944), 71–81, and Wall, ‘Not so much open professed enemies’, 639–41.

75 I am indebted to RES’s anonymous reader for the persuasive suggestion that if, as Firth (ed.), Memoirs, 24, supposed, this is a variant spelling of ‘economical’, the word is used not, as Firth suggested, in the sense ‘domestic’ but, following mention of civil and military administrations, to signify religious government (OED, s.v. ‘economical’, 2a), and that it may indeed be a variant spelling of ‘ecumenical’.
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upon any righteous foundation' (222). With the dissolution of the ‘glorious’ Long Parliament (224), as he had foreseen (229), the country ‘began to grow mad’ and desire the return of the King (224):

Above all, there is Cromwell. The plain dealing John Hutchinson, who ‘never was any man’s Sectary, either in religious or civil matters’ but acted only with ‘a full perswasion of conscience’ (166–7), early upbraided Cromwell for becoming ‘a slave to his owne ambition’ (180), and subsequently warned him, John Lambert and their associates against ‘the poysom of ambition’ (180, 193–4, 211), but to no avail. Cromwell went on to weed out ‘the godly and upright-hearted men’ from the Army and to replace them with ‘rascally turnecoate Cavaliers, and pitifull sottish beasts of his owne alliance’ (194) who were subsequently only too ready to do his bidding. Hutchinson’s representation of the Lord Protector being ‘worshipt’ as a ‘beast’ (209) constructs his court in the image of the beast from the sea in Revelation, a type of the Devil, identifying Cromwellians as children of darkness. The major generals are ‘like Basshaws’ (212), so seduced by success that ‘God, that was the principall author, was not look’d upon, and gave them therefore up to become their owne and others’ Idolls, and so to fall’ (167). ‘True religion was now allmost lost, even among the religious party’ (209), as was liberty when ‘both the victors and the vanquishd were equall slaves under the new usurpers’ (208). There remains only the example of John Hutchinson’s steadfastness in defeat and persecution to promise ’the advancement of the Cause by the patient suffering of the Martyrs’ (242).

Early in her narrative Hutchinson develops a familiar Puritan trope of historical typology in an extended parallel between England and Israel and, ‘If small things may be compar’d with greate’ (35), between her husband and Moses, the liberator of the Israelites. Unlike Moses, he enjoyed no ‘miraculous power’ to become ‘the Lord’s sole Viceroy’; he was ‘joyn’d with many partners equally sharing the worke’ (36), but his and their experience was of a disappointment akin to Moses’s in the idolatrous reaction of the Israelites to the challenge of freedom when they ‘turned aside quickly out of the way which [the Lord] commanded them’.77 Through a series of such apostasies by the English Parliamentarians and Army, ‘The people’s freedome … in a free Republic’ (214) was lost:

The greate deliverance of God’s people, their unthankfullnesse and miscarriages after it, no lesse than theirs of old, is too sadly knowne to all. What griefe and exercise of spiritt this was to the Moseses of our times those that have bene witnesses of it cannot but with bleeding hearts remember: in this, whosoe considers the following history shall find that Mr. Hutchinson againe might often take up the paralell of the greate Hebrew Prince. (36)

There could be no more direct statement of Hutchinson’s intention to tell for a wider readership than her immediate family (‘whosoe considers’) the history of England’s Israelites who, despite their liberation through God’s providence, failed to reach the promised land and yet remain in the wilderness.78

Rather than a private and familial document, the Memoirs is, then, of a piece with other late seventeenth-century memoirs in its appeal to personal experience of public events to vindicate a fiercely partisan binary interpretation of the past. Like them, it is poised between subjective experience and public affairs but, like them, its business, finally, is with the public sphere, not the personal, and with posterity, not its contemporaries. These are Hutchinson’s targets as her husband is her subject, which is why by far the larger part of the text is not about marital relations

77 Exod. 32: 8.
78 That Hutchinson after the Restoration maintained contact with some of these ‘Moseses’ is evidenced by her association with John Owen’s nonconformist congregation; see Crawford Gribben, ‘Lucy Hutchinson, John Owen’s Congregation, and the Literary Cultures of Nonconformity’, Review of English Studies (forthcoming).
at all but John Hutchinson’s reaction to public affairs in Nottingham and, subsequently, to the Restoration. Through him, ‘an Englishman, a christian, and a Gentleman’ (228), Hutchinson vindicates the Good Old Cause as, in the best Classical and Christian traditions of republicanism, the true embodiment of selfless service to the common good, betrayed by ‘the children of darknesse’.
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