“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.

Anna Wall

Literature, University of East Anglia, Norwich, UK

anna.wall@uea.ac.uk.

Funding details: I am funded by CHASE DTP

Biographical note: Anna Wall’s research explores religious nonconformity in seventeenth-century Britain and how it relates, responded to, and developed out of the sixteenth-century Reformation. Her work has a particular focus on the theological writing of Lucy Hutchinson (1620-1681).

"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.

In the 1640s, Lucy Hutchinson (1620-1681) wrote a manuscript account of her husband's "services" to the city of Nottingham, a text to which she would return when she came to write the *Memoirs of the Life of Colonel John Hutchinson* in the 1660s. As well as a detailed description of civil-war Nottinghamshire, this early manuscript traces the factious relationships between the Independent, John Hutchinson, and his fellow Presbyterian committee members from 1641-1645. This factionalism was visible on a national scale in the mid-1640s, as divisions within Parliamentary forces played out in public thanks to the rising popularity of the printed pamphlet. This paper explores the links between Hutchinson's seemingly private manuscript account and this burgeoning form of public news.

Keywords: Lucy Hutchinson, manuscripts, religious factionalism, *Memoirs*, pamphlets, Nottinghamshire.

For the past twenty years or so, the Puritan writer, Lucy Hutchinson (1620-1681), has garnered much scholarly attention. Described by David Norbrook as "probably the best-known and most highly-praised early modern woman writer", Hutchinson's oeuvre offers a number of materially and generically distinct works, from an early manuscript miscellany to her anonymously printed poem, *Order and Disorder* (1679).[1] It was, however, Hutchinson's manuscript account of the life of her husband, John, during the Civil War and Interregnum, first published in 1806, for which she was best known. Julius Hutchinson (the great-great nephew of Hutchinson) edited *The Memoirs of the Life of Colonel Hutchinson* from a manuscript written in Hutchinson's hand in the late-1660s, which is now held in the Nottinghamshire Archives.[2] In the fifteen years following this publication four more editions were produced, and Julius's version has continued to exert influence over modern editions. The idiosyncratic style of the

Memoirs, somewhere between biography and history, has made it a popular topic in studies of "life-writing", such as Kathleen Lynch's study of early modern autobiography.[3] Hutchinson's gender has also made the *Memoirs* the focus of other studies, including N.H Keeble's "Lucy Hutchinson, Women's Writing and the Civil War", which explored the gendered ramifications of her self-depiction as a "shade".[4] More recently, and often in reaction to gendered readings such as Keeble's, scholarship has turned to explore the text as the product of a nonconformist writer, rather than simply a *female* one. A number of scholars have studied Hutchinson's retreat into the third person in the *Memoirs* as an articulation of distinctly Puritan ideas; Katherine Gillespie, for example, views it as a means of deploying a specifically post-Restoration political rhetoric.[5]

Despite the flourishing scholarly fields of textual materiality and the history of the book, the materiality of the *Memoirs* has been rather overlooked. Perhaps because it is a text so easily accessible in a number of printed editions, the *Memoirs* has, more recently, been studied as an uncomplicated material document. If its materiality is mentioned, it is, as in Keeble's essay, simply in relation to the *unprinted* nature of Hutchinson's text, where its manuscript form is seen as a reflection of a need for secrecy - or at least a reticence to enter the "public" world of print - on Hutchinson's part.[6] This is due to the various print editions' failure to do justice to the "messiness" of DD/Hu4 by erasing its more problematic materials; the manuscript contains not only the main narrative, but two addresses to Hutchinson's children (one unfinished), and, in its reverse end, over 40 folios of Biblical passages. In his edition, Charles H. Firth did work to redress some of the editorial choices of Julius Hutchinson, and to regain some sense of the *Memoirs* as a full manuscript, mentioning - if not including - the folios of biblical passages with which it was bound.[7] However, early erasure of the text's

complexities has allowed the *Memoirs* to be studied as a relatively complete and neatly presented text situated in one historical moment: the late-1660s. And yet, often mentioned, but rarely discussed, an earlier manuscript lies behind this product of the post-Restoration years. In this manuscript, dating most probably from 1645/6, Hutchinson recorded many of the events which are also found in her later account, namely the factious relationship between John and the other members of the Nottingham committee between 1641 and 1645.[8]

In light of the critical significance afforded to Hutchinson's other manuscripts, there has been a strange lack of focus on this contemporaneous account of the Civil War. In 1914, Sidney Race presented a paper on what he termed the "British Museum MS. of the Life of Colonel Hutchinson" to the Thoroton Society, and Firth included sections of it in the appendices of his edition of the *Memoirs*.[9] However, it was not until 2004 that Norbrook offered the first modern study of this earlier manuscript, as a means of reassessing past editorial attempts to characterise Hutchinson as "conservative and patriarchal in mentality when compared with bolder contemporary women writers such as Margaret Cavendish".[10] More recently, Giuseppina Iacono Lobo, in her essay exploring Hutchinson's presentation of John as a "man of conscience" in the *Memoirs*, briefly compares some sections of the two manuscripts to demonstrate how "Hutchinson has often enhanced the bare-bones narrative approach of the 'Defence' so that she might have room to comment on her husband's conscience".[11] Other than these studies, however, the manuscript has been mostly ignored, warranting but a passing mention in *Reading Early Modern Women: An Anthology of Texts in Manuscript and Print*, and a footnote in David R. Como's monograph on the Parliamentarians of the Civil War.[12]

Despite the studies of Norbrook and Lobo, there has never been a bibliographic exploration of the 1640s notebook, the type of which exist for Hutchinson's other

manuscripts.[13] This is perhaps due to the messy nature of the manuscript itself - now fragmented and incomplete - alongside its rather sparse prose. Overshadowed by the more stylistically complex *Memoirs,* this manuscript has been somewhat bypassed, a victim of scholarship's tendency - especially when focused on women - to transform "agency into a privilege of the rhetorically gifted".[14] It has not been studied as a document in its own right, but simply for how it corresponds to the later *Memoirs* as either a loosely connected forerunner, or draft version. Thus, its own importance has been overlooked. However, what it lacks in prose style, the 1640s manuscript more than makes up for in historical specificity and material complexity. It can also, removed from its role as a draft for the *Memoirs,* be considered generically very different to Hutchinson's other works. Margaret Ezell has called for a reassessment of what she terms "messy volumes" - manuscript spaces which served writers for more than one purpose and are today, so often, the means we have of accessing texts by female writers. While they were often "domestic papers", Ezell goes on to explain that "there are frequent indications, when one examines the textual object itself, that the volume was intended to be read by others and was used by women for a much more complicated life record than its classification suggests".[15]

This paper seeks to rescue this earlier manuscript from its relegated position as either forerunner to, or draft of, the *Memoirs*; the product of a specific historical moment, this manuscript seems as worthy of consideration as an independent text as Hutchinson's other works. On the other hand, with the *Memoirs* such a linchpin of Hutchinson scholarship, it also seems crucial to explore the manuscript which, undeniably, had such a fundamental role in the construction of the later text. What follows will be, in part, a bibliographic description of the manuscript and its contents. Yet, as with all manuscript sources it is crucial to explore the context of its creation,

exploring not just what Hutchinson wrote, but why she might have written it. By uncovering the complicated textual history of this earlier manuscript, and offering some contexts for its composition, this paper hopes to stimulate further research into the links between Hutchinson's manuscript accounts of the Civil War.

The Manuscript(s): the Writer and the Owners.

Hutchinson's 1640s manuscript is now to be found, fragmented, in the British Library: Add. MSS 25901, 37997 and 46712. These fragments are all written on the same paper stock, cut to 18.5 cm by 14 cm. The watermark is consistent throughout: a single-handled pot, with crescent and fleur-de-lis, containing the letters R/ DB. It appears that the manuscript was in one piece when it was discovered by Julius Hutchinson. In his 1806 preface to the *Memoirs*, Julius states that, upon his inheritance of Hatfield Woodhall in the late-eighteenth century, he found the following books: "1st The Life of Colonel Hutchinson. 2d. A book without a title, but which appears to have been a kind of diary made use of when she came to write the Life. 3d. A fragment, giving an account of the early part of her own life … And 4th. Two Books treating entirely of religious subjects".[16] The second of these is, quite clearly, the 1640s manuscript.

Add. MS 25901, rebound in modern binding, contains 96 folios, the bulk of the original manuscript. This manuscript was "acquired from Mr Procter 12 November 1864".[17] This appears to be the English poet Bryan Procter (1787-1874), a member of the famed London literary scene, centred on the Bedford Square house of Mr and Mrs Basil Montagu. This circle included William Godwin, Mary Wollstonecraft, and Samuel Taylor Coleridge among other pillars of nineteenth-century Romanticism.[18] Part of this coterie, Procter married Mrs Montagu's daughter, Anne Skepper in 1824. Indeed, the whole manuscript appears, at one time, to have been in the possession of his mother-in-

law, Mrs Basil Montagu, as each of the other fragments, like this one, can be linked to her. The first fragment (six folios) is found in Add. MS 39779 (British Library), a collection of autograph letters compiled by the English collector, Alfred Morrison (1821-1897).[19] This collection contains an eclectic selection of letters ranging in date from the late-sixteenth century, to the early nineteenth. The only non-epistolary material, Hutchinson's work may have been gathered into this collection as it is prefaced by a letter from Charlotte Jones written in June 1824, on the back of which is a note signed by "Anna D. B. Montagu". This suggests that the manuscript was actually sent to Procter's mother, Anna Doretha Bridget Montagu, even if, as the acquisition of Add. MS 25901 demonstrates, it later came into Anne Procter's possession through the family line.

Anna Montagu was also, at one time, in possession of the second fragment, now bound in Add. MS 46172 (four folios). Housed in another eclectic collection of materials, this fragment was donated to the British Museum in 1945. It too comes with a prefatory letter which records that this "MS. was sent to Mrs Mulock (presumably Dinah Maria) in 1854 by Mrs. Basil Montague".[20] The National Library of Scotland still holds a number of the novelist, Dinah Mulock's, letters, explaining how this fragment may also have come to be there.[21] This introductory letter records how the fragment came to be in the possession of Anna Montagu; the writer records a note from Montagu which stated that the fragment was from "a little book given to her husband by 'the solicitor of the family' - Hutchinson family I suppose".[22] Turning to Julius Hutchinson's will, written in 1807, this "solicitor of the family" can be identified as one Edward Jones of Basinghall Street, the father of Charlotte Jones who sent the manuscript to Anna Montagu in 1824.[23] Financially insecure, Edward Jones became entangled in a "long legal wrangle" over his inheritance of Hutchinson's materials, precipitated by

Mary Gallard, and eventually fled to France leaving his daughter to take care of his affairs.[24] Thus, before Montagu, it appears that Edward and Charlotte Jones were in possession of the whole 1640s manuscript. Certainly, Charlotte Jones' letter to Montagu suggests that she sent the whole, not a fragment of, Hutchinson's work:

> Your having so much admired the character of Mrs Hutchinson I have ventured to beg you will do me the favour to accept the enclosed MSS as a testimony of my gratitude for your and Mr. Montagu's kind attention to me
> It is Mrs H's first attempt at writing the Memoirs of her husband, which she afterwards admirably finished [25]

It seems, then, that the manuscript was intact when in the ownership of Anna Montagu, before a fragment was removed and sent to Dinah Murlock, and another was removed to validate that Hutchinson really was the author. Montagu notes on the back of Charlotte Jones' letter, "This fragment of Lucy Hutchinson's Memoir, was most carefully examined & compared with a small Pocket Book, kept by her, in which she noted down remarkable Events, and household matters, and with the MSS. life of her Husband, and the handwriting proved to be M^{rs} Hutchinsons".[26] While the bulk of the manuscript is now rebound in modern binding, marginal evidence of the ripping out of pages (between folios 7 and 8, and 87 and 88) suggests that the manuscript was originally bound rather than a collection of loose sheets. This is supported by some small indents visible on the inside margin of the now unbound pages which appear to show marks of sewing, and the occasional visible thread within the bound fragment which is of a different colour to the new binding.[27] Moreover, the watermark, where visible, is consistent throughout, including on the empty pages in the middle of this manuscript, showing that even these blank pages are not a more modern addition. This is corroborated by the reversal of the manuscript for the inclusion of a number of letters copied in Hutchinson's hand; the reversal and inversion of the manuscript would have been unnecessary if this material had been put together from loose sheets.

Despite this later damage, thankfully no folios appear to be missing. The first folios of the main manuscript, Add. MS 25901, are only partly filled on the recto: 1r is badly damaged (suggesting that was the original front page of the manuscript) and contains a fragment of a speech regarding the entry of a "troope of horse" into Nottingham; 2r contains a single sentence which refers to an incident of some stolen gun powder, cartoonish sketches of a castle on a hill and a face in profile, a misquoted section of Sternhold and Hopkin's psalm XII, and the name of "Fenner a bookseller at Caterbury"; 3r contains some short notes relating to a number of the events narrated, followed by a list of words which look like a game of some sort.[28] These folios, eclectic in content and quite damaged, appear to be the first pages of a collection of papers. The fourth folio of this manuscript then begins mid-sentence: "the services of the Parliament to haue r[un] some horses & dragoones to send to my Ld generalls armie".[29]

The first folio of Add. MS 39779 appears more obviously to mark the beginning of Hutchinson's narrative. The page begins with a title - or at least prose placed centrally at the top of the page - so judiciously crossed out in Hutchinson's distinctive curled style as to be unreadable. However, she then writes,

> The first service Mr John Hutchinson under tooke in this County was to accompany a petition which the well affected of the County had made to his M^{tie} y^{t} he would be pleased to returne to his Parliament which petition was carried to Yorke by the some of the men of best quallitie whose hands were to it and deliuered in the spring of 1641[30]

Chronologically this is the earliest event described in the manuscript, and in style, it looks like an introductory sentence. Add. MS 39779 contains six folios which narrate a dispute for Nottingham's gun powder between John and Lord Newark, much of which is given in direct speech.[31] These folios end with the arrival of some of soldiers at Thomas Hutchinson's house, when the prose breaks off mid-sentence:

> he then went to S^{r} Thomas Hutchinsons house where he had not long bene but ~~some came and k[no]kd as if they .s[hou]ld breake op~~ a man stept into y^{e} doore with a carabine in his hand and M^{r} Hutchinson asking what he would [32]

This quite clearly links with the first folio of Add. MS 46172, which begins, "haue he told him he came to take possession of the house Mr Hutchinson told him he had possession of it and he would know on what ri[ght] it was demanded from him".[33] This manuscript contains five folios, the last of which is heavily damaged, but contains an account of John and his brother's return to Nottingham "about the time y^{t} the Battle was fought at edge [h]ill", when they met "other most of the well affected y^{t} had bene plundered and forced to flie from y[^{e} C]avalliers".[34] While the informal style of Hutchinson's prose in this manuscript makes it harder definitely to link the end of this folio to the beginning of the fourth folio in Add. MS 25901, the narration of these events in the *Memoirs* supports the assertion that they do follow on from each other.[35] Thus, despite the style of the prose and damage to the manuscript, there does not appear to be anything missing between the end of Add. MS 46172 and the return to Add. MS 25901:

> [46172] about the time y^{t} the Battle was fought at edge [h]ill where m^{r} Hutchinson & his broth[er] going to Nottingham mett other most of the well affected y^{t} had bene plundered and forced to flie from y[^{e} C]avalliers were returned and [consu]lting [for][25901] the services of the Parliament to haue r[un] some horses & dragoones to send to my Ld generalls armie for which Mr Hutchinson had provided some horses which with all the plate and monie he could spare he intended to send to the Parliament

And so, the opening of the manuscript appears to be complete. However, the end is more problematic. As we have it, the manuscript does finish at the end of a sentence, but the final clause of the manuscript on 88r, which follows on grammatically from the prose of 87v, is written in a different hand:

> what do we suffer these fellows to vapor thus lets clout them out of the field but the maior hearing it committed him and the next morning the certificate went up subscribed

> with 700 townsmens hands and it was sent to London[.] after all was done the maior gaue some *monies to drinke among the soldiers*[36]

The section in italics above is written in a new hand; there are palaeographic differences, and Hutchinson is elsewhere completely consistent in spelling soldiers as "souldiers". This final clause is added on a page which contains, in a further hand, notes of John's appearances before the House of Lords after the Restoration of Charles II, as he strived to escape punishment for his role in the regicide. I suspect that this completion of Hutchinson's sentence may be by Montagu herself as, although only a short section, there are similarities between the words "to" and "the" which are also found on Montagu's note on the reverse of Jones' letter.

A further fragment of the manuscript - a single folio in Hutchinson's hand - has recently been rediscovered in the possession of the Nottingham Castle Museum. Donated to the Museum by Sidney Race in 1912, it begins, in Hutchinson's usual spelling, "monie to drinke among ye Souldiers".[37] When this fragment was acquired by the Castle Museum in 1912 it came with a memorandum signed by Anna D. B. Montagu, corroborating my belief that Montagu was in possession of the whole manuscript and is, in fact, the one responsible for its now fragmented state.[38] She described how "the subjoined pages are taken from the notes of Lucy Hutchinson… the MS was given to me by the family solicitor".[39] Filled on both sides, this folio details the events of late 1644, when Millington presented the petition against John's governorship to Parliament causing John to leave the governing of Nottingham to his brother, and early 1645, finishing with an account of John Meldrum's request for "maintenance of ye Yorkshire horse of neere 3000 pound a month, which yet ye countrie would willingly have borne if the horse might…".[40] Unfortunately, the framing of this fragment has cut off the final line. While this section of the text is copied into the later *Memoirs,* Montagu must have had the original folio to hand when she completed Hutchinson's

sentence as “some monies to drinke among the soldiers”, while accurate to the now missing page, was changed by Hutchinson in the *Memoirs* to, “some small sum*m* to the souldiers to drinke”.[41]

This leaf was one of two donated to the Nottingham Castle Museum by Race.[42] Race not only transcribed the second, but also included a facsimile of it in his paper. The second sheet is predominantly written in another hand which has titled the section, “An extract transcribed out of the Journall Books of the house of Lords soe far only as Relates to Coll. Hutchinson”; it is clearly the folio which preceded the notes we have extant on folio 88r of Add. MS 25901.[43] However, above these notes, in Hutchinson’s hand, and not transcribed by Race, are written just two lines: “plundering” above “1645 ~~May the Bridge~~”. While - as the fragment in Hutchinson’s hand is cut off - we cannot know for certain whether this page follows on directly from the Castle folio, the jump in time from January to May 1645 would be markedly longer than any other in this narrative. That said, Hutchinson does not offer a detailed account of this time in the *Memoirs*, writing broadly about John’s absence from Nottingham being “the occasion of many neglects in the government not by his brothers fault but the souldiers who were discontented”, covering the events of early-1645 in just two pages before the detailed account starts again with the attack on the Trent Bridge in April.[44] While we cannot say for certain without removing the Castle fragment from its frame, it is possible to suggest that the two fragments *did* follow on directly from each other and, thus, in a disjointed form, we have the completed manuscript.

It is worth turning our attention to the notes made from the Journal of the House of Lords preserved on this missing folio and within Add. MS 25901 itself. I have been, as yet, unable to identify this third hand; Race conjectures that it could be “Mrs Hutchinson’s amanuensis, who may have been the daughter to whom in old age Mrs

Hutchinson wrote 'on the Principles of the Christian Religion'", but this appears to be nothing more than a guess.[45] Comparison with the different scribal hands of *Order and Disorder* and Hutchinson's Lucretius translation bear no fruit, nor are these notes written in the hand of Julius Hutchinson (great-uncle to the Julius who edited the *Memoirs*) whose hand appears in a number of Hutchinson's manuscripts.[46] Indeed, the hand appears to be a later one, perhaps even eighteenth-century.

These notes present something of a puzzle and, at the time of writing, I have been unable to trace their exact source. Some small contractions aside, the notes are identical to the Journals of the House of Lords, originally published in the late eighteenth-century, as this entry from the 22nd of May will demonstrate:[47]

> Concerning the Kings Judges for securing their Persons and Conference w^th^ the house of Com*m*ons thereupon Viz
> The Com*m*ons Conceive the Lords intrench upon the Priviledges for Coll: Hutchinson a Member of y^e^ house of Com*m*ons could not be under such an Order of the Lords upon any account unless the Com*m*ons Order had been Consented to. Page 135 [48]

However, thanks to the inclusion of page numbers, we need not delay the writing of these notes to the end of the eighteenth century - the page numbers do not align with any of the printed editions of the Journals. Nor, frustratingly, do the notes seem to have been taken from the manuscript copies of these notes now held in the Parliamentary Archives as, again, the page numbers do not match.[49]

The presence of Hutchinson's own hand on the first folio of this material (as the facsimile in Race's paper shows) cuts off any suggestion that these pages were sewn into the manuscript separately. This is not to say that the notes must have been added while the manuscript remained in Hutchinson's possession, however, just that they were added before the manuscript was fragmented in the nineteenth century; what we can know for sure is that they were written post-1660, a significant time after the rest of this manuscript. If these notes were added under Hutchinson's instruction, this would have

required her to have had some access to the House of Lords Journals in their manuscript form, implying a stronger link to conformist, Royalist, sources than we might otherwise expect. The dedication of the translation of *De rerum Natura* to Arthur Annesley, Earl of Anglesey, does hint at these post-1660 cross-partisan connections, while Hutchinson's brother, Sir Allen Apsley, was a Royalist and served both the royal household and Parliament from 1660 until his death in 1683.[50] However, a comparison with the section of the *Memoirs* which documents John's appearances before the two Houses, does not suggest that Hutchinson relied on these notes in the construction of the later version of his life; these notes are focused on a financial settlement between John and Lord Lexington (1594-1668), while Hutchinson's own narrative, while it touches on Lexington, focuses more on the - much discussed - petition of John's innocence.[51] Thus, the chance that these notes *could* have been added while the manuscript remained in Hutchinson's possession remains, but the possibility of a later eighteenth-century writer (perhaps a descendent of Hutchinson, given the focus on the finances of the Hutchinson estate), should also be acknowledged.

The form and history of Hutchinson's 1640s manuscript is, then, far from straightforward. Yet, while we are now left with a fragmented, damaged, manuscript, this state is the result of nineteenth-century intervention; while in Hutchinson's possession, the manuscript was one, single document, most probably without the post-1660s notes. With this in mind, the second half of this paper, which will seek to define the style or genre of the document - to ask, quite simply, what it is - can explore this manuscript as a whole unit, written and designed by Hutchinson towards a specific, and I will argue, definable, purpose.

Generic Conventions: The Manuscript and Civil War Pamphlets

In his preface to the 1806 edition of the *Memoirs*, Julius Hutchinson referred to this manuscript as "a book without a title, but which appears to have been a kind of diary made use of when she came to write the Life".[52] Hutchinson certainly "made use" of this manuscript in the writing of DD/Hu4: many sections are copied verbatim. However, to refer to this document as a diary seems to misconstrue its purpose, as it carries connotations of writing contemporaneously, or very soon after, events, and suggests the act of writing in the same manuscript over a period of time. Contrary to this, the manuscript appears to be the result of a singular moment of retrospective composition. This is not to say that Hutchinson wrote the manuscript in one go, but that she planned out its scope before beginning, and wrote with a specific goal in mind for the finished manuscript. The style of the prose supports this assumption, with Hutchinson beginning the manuscript thus,

> The first service Mr John Hutchinson under tooke in this County was to accompany a petition which the well affected of the County had made to his M^{tie} y^{t} he would be pleased to returne to his Parliament which petition was carried to Yorke[53]

As an opening this sets out the scope of the events which Hutchinson is to narrate: the various services John performed in Nottingham. Linguistically this also suggests an overarching view of events that have already happened; most simply, Hutchinson is aware of *other* services that John undertook, of which this is just the first. Throughout the narrative Hutchinson describes the timings of events vaguely: one of her most common phrases to begin a new section of the narrative is "about this time". This imprecise way of dating events suggests both a temporal distance from them, and, moreover, a retrospective writer for whom events can be understood in relation to one another. There are also instances when Hutchinson has either forgotten or

misremembered a date which point to the retrospective compilation of this manuscript. Describing an incident with "Mr Fleetwood", a marginal note records, "Sunday October y^{e}" leaving the date incomplete, while, just before a description of the confrontation between Pendock and John's engineer, Hooper, Hutchinson seems uncertain as to when the event took place, writing "About this Somthing before this", before crossing it out and beginning on the next page "About this time".[54] These mistakes and omissions would be particularly unlikely in a manuscript written contemporaneously with the events described.

Moreover, Hutchinson has made copies of letters relating to incidents from late-1641 to August 1643 in the reverse of this manuscript. Of the ten letters recorded, six relate to a proposed meeting between John, Francis Pierrepont, and the other (Royalist) Justices of The Peace in Nottinghamshire in late 1642. Two further letters contain John's commissions, first to Major General in January 1643, and then to Governor of the Castle in June of the same year. There are also two copies of a letter from Richard Biron requesting safe passage for Lord Cartwright, sent on the 6th of August 1643.[55] Interestingly, Hutchinson has made two identical copies of this letter. One sits between the last letter relating to the peace meetings (December 1642), and John's commission to Major General (January 1642/3); the other is the final letter recorded, placed after John's commission to be Governor (June 1643). The first copy, then, appears out of date order among materials which are otherwise chronological. This retards the time of Hutchinson's copying of John's commissions to after August 1643, as they appear after this letter. Two options present themselves to explain this chronological error: either Hutchinson copied all these letters in to the manuscript at one time after August 1643, confusing the order before rectifying it with the second copy of Biron's letter; or she copied the materials in at least two sittings, including the letters relating to the attempts

at peace and Biron's letter, before then deciding to include John's commissions and so moving Biron's letter to retain the date order. Either option undermines the idea that the manuscript was written as events developed.

There are also indications that Hutchinson retrospectively corrected and amended her manuscript, dismissing any assumption that it functioned as a diary in any traditional sense. There are the usual crossings out and small textual additions that mark most manuscripts, but there are also much larger moments of textual emendation, as, for example, when Hutchinson describes the preparations for a siege following the attack at Newark in March 1644. Alongside the main text which describes John's fear that Nottingham may be attacked next, in the wide inside margins present on every page, Hutchinson has added a whole paragraph of text concerning the dissent of the committee: "at this time y^{e} Governor sending for y^{e} cap[tain]s to consult with them mason begain to utter mutinous words…".[56] Not only does Hutchinson add to her text here, but she adds a new narrative strand, related but not intrinsic to the main text. Whether contemporaneous with the main text on this page, or a retrospective addition, this marginalia implies a level of narrative construction rather than a more straightforward act of record keeping.

In support of this, the manuscript contains three examples of Hutchinson drafting her material. Two episodes are recorded roughly on the opening folios of the manuscript, before they appear in the main narrative.[57] Most starkly, folio 3r contains notes which quite clearly shows Hutchinson planning out the narrative of her manuscript, which bears quoting in full:

> ye message ~~^to^ & answer~~ y^{t}
> y^{e} Go message to plumtree his answer y^{e} deter
> his words to Dolphin &working mutinies in y^{e} towne mas[on]
> minations of y^{e} commitee concerning him & their
> Confessing to y^{e} governer y^{t} he came for nothing but to doe him mischiefe

sending up Lft Coll & his returne y^e^ rete[..][58]
of y^e^ coannoneers with y^e^ cause of their imprisonment
y^e^ Go. going to London with treacherous flatteries
& protestations to them there hindering him from peti
tioning against plumtre y^e^ false dealings &~~words of~~
speeches of Capn white against y^e^ Go in his absence
his sending vp vpon fained pretences to London to work
ags^t^ y^e^ Governor their endeavouring to make a party
in his absence against him in y^e^ towne ~~the~~ Mr Sall
insulting & domineering ouer y^e^ officers his sending for
Chad[wick]. their petition for Mill his coming downe & y^e^ rest
his carriage [59]

This short section presents, in note form, the events of the last quarter of the manuscript, including Mason's "mutinous words" (60r), the arrest of the cannoneers who had "turned Seperatist" (60v) , the betrayal of Captain White (73v), and the "contemptible and odious" behaviour of Salisbury (74v). Millington's ("Mill") petition and "carriage" can be found on the Nottingham Castle folio.[60] With lines three and five added after the main text, we can see Hutchinson making a concerted effort to place the events in order, offering a plan for the construction of the manuscript which was, thus, clearly written before she began the prose account of this section. This, alongside her textual corrections and additions, present Hutchinson as editor as well as writer of this manuscript, both planning and revising the text in preparation, perhaps, for a more public readership. This drafting on the third folio also suggests that Hutchinson had not planned for there to be much more of this manuscript, despite her last involvement in it - "May 1645 the Bridge" - suggesting prose broken off unexpectedly; she appears to have set out a self-contained narrative unit, rather than recording what was happening around her.

In line with this understanding of the manuscript as a contained and retrospectively composed narrative, and contrary to Julius' belief that it was written as a

private diary, Norbrook has titled this manuscript the "Defence of John Hutchinson", believing that it was intended to be a "document with a public purpose … and probably designed to serve in his legal defence".[61] The manuscript certainly traces John's most turbulent period in Nottingham when, plagued by dissent among his fellow committee members, he faced outright rebellion once the army general, Sir Thomas Fairfax (1612-1671), announced him governor of the town as well as the castle in November 1643. By September of the following year, with questions surrounding John's governorship exacerbated by tales of three offers he had been made to surrender the castle to the Royalists, John was summoned to London to put an end to the matter of dissent. John was heard before the Commons in April 1645.

Some features of this manuscript support Norbrook's identification of it as a public document. Most notable is Hutchinson's use of codenames; Colonel Francis Thornhagh and Captain Charles White are sometimes referred to as "CL 19" and "CL 21" or "PC 21" respectively. This rendering of the men's names appears to be code rather than shorthand, a cypher matching Karen Britland's description of a "substitution cypher" where numbers and letters stand in for the letters of the alphabet, but names could be denoted by specific symbols, letters or numbers.[62] While Hutchinson will often refer to these men by their names, these codes are used at particularly heightened moments of disobedience to John, such as Thornhagh's refusal to march with the horse according to John's orders: "CL 19 had not bene at home when the governores commissions came and did very much dispute y^{e} command of y^{e} horse".[63] In this instance, there is a gap surrounding the codename in the manuscript and the ink is different, suggesting that this use of code was a retrospective addition - that the space for the name was originally left blank. This addition is in Hutchinson's hand. This occurs again just a few pages later as Hutchinson writes "but ~~the~~ CL 19 would not

march" (she was perhaps going to write, "the colonel"). The use of code also occurs as, in a moment not included in the later *Memoirs*, Captain White interrupts John while the Colonel upbraids them for their rebellious behaviour:

> Gentlemen I recieued that publick affront lately from you which no governor in y^{e} world but myselfe would haue put up with when at a public counscil of war among all the officers enough to haue cause mutiny it was propounded how far my command extended... PC 21 answered it was not I y^{t} did it No sayd y^{e} Governor but you were present when CL 19 did it [64]

In this last example, the codename for White appears to have been written at the same time as the rest of the sentence, filling the gap, and written in the same ink. Yet again, however, "CL 19" is in a gap much bigger than its four letters should need and is, thus, noticeable as a later addition.

While cypher-like, this rendering of the names could also be a form of short hand used, not simply for concealment but, as Margaret Ezell notes, for "speed and space".[65] However, the scarcity of this shorthand and its placement in gaps much bigger than the letters need, rule out both of Ezell's alternative suggestions, stressing its use to conceal. Code, and indeed its cousin, shorthand, were of course used for many reasons. On the one hand, its presence here supports the notion of this manuscript as a public document, in which the code can be viewed as a method of exclusion - the way to keep certain bits of information from a more public reader. More recent studies have stressed the power of code as a form of *inclusion*; the ability to decipher code was "proof that one was included in a certain community" which shared a common language.[66] Either of these suggestions implies that the manuscript had a wider readership; that it was designed to be shared. We must also acknowledge that code can express an uncomfortableness with the possible publication of a text; that is, an anxiety that the text might fall into the wrong hands rather than a deliberate act of textual transmission. If this were truly a fear, however, why not use codenames at all times? For, while the uses

above note moments of particular disobedience, it must be admitted that, at other times, Hutchinson is very open in her dislike of White and his actions. She describes his "high mutiny and faction against" John, and recounts how he snubbed John, only calling him the "Colonel" rather than the "Governor", each time naming him directly.[67]

It is perhaps clearer why Hutchinson may have obscured Thornhagh's name only a few times; despite his seeming failures in these instances, she seems to have been rather fond of Thornhagh. Towards the end of the narrative, Hutchinson depicts him and John as both undermined by the committee as their positions of command were "both deriued from the same authority", while moments of his bravery in war are not overlooked.[68] Indeed, in the *Memoirs*, Hutchinson records his death in1648 in very favourable terms, describing how, "[a] man of greater courage and integritie fought not nor fell not in this glorious cause".[69] A wish to protect his reputation, then, may have been the reason to obscure Thornhagh's name during his few moments of disobedience to John. Yet, whether to protect or condemn, the infrequent use of code names pulls us away from being able to identify this text as entirely private, but also from an interpretation of it as a text only accessible to a private few in Hutchinson's textual network; if this text were written for a select coterie of codebreakers, or in fear of prying eyes, we must ask why did Hutchinson not use this code all the way through? This partial obscuring of details may fit a document designed for presentation to a court, and yet I would like to query Norbrook's categorisation of this manuscript.

There are a few factors which may give us pause before accepting Norbrook's categorisation of this manuscript as a legal document. John was called to London in April 1645 to face the charges of Millington's petition. However, upon John's appearance in the Commons on the 22nd of April, the House had taken "the whole matter into Consideration" and decided in John's favour; Millington was advised "to

apply himself to a further Reconcilement between the Governor and the Committee … for the Safety of the Place".[70] While the matter was referred to the Committee of both Kingdoms, this decree marked the end of any official legal problems for John. Yet, the fact that John was never actually brought to trial need not undermine the assumption that this event was the reason the manuscript was written. The aim of the Committee members was certainly to bring John to trial, and so, even if it were not the end this manuscript had to serve, Hutchinson could have been preparing for such an eventuality.

However, while the narrative events in the text as we now have it, finishing in February 1645, seem to align with the date of John's trip to London and appearance before the Commons, thanks to the previously missing Castle folio, we know that Hutchinson continued the narrative as far as Millington's visit to London, and perhaps even further. On the first page of the notes taken from the Journal of the House of Lords we can still see the words, in Hutchinson's hand, "plundering" and below, "May the Bridge". Keeble notes, in his edition of the *Memoirs* that this date is incorrect; Hutchinson actually means *April*, as the issue described, or in this case, going to be described - the fight over the Trent bridge - was one brought to the Commons on the 22nd of April by John himself.[71] This confusion over the final date in this manuscript makes it unlikely that the text was presented when John appeared in the Commons; the confusion of May for April seems impossible in a document expressly designed for appearance *in April*. Moreover, with John brought before the Commons in April of that year, the turnaround between finishing the manuscript and its use as a document in John's defence would have been less than a month. The prose of the manuscript does not bear out this idea, suggesting instead a temporal distance from the events described. The final folio - the one held by the Nottingham Castle Museum - states that,

> The Committe at London could never finish the businesse by reason of y^{e} impertinent clamours of the G[overnor's]: enemies; therefore at length wearied with y^{e} continuall &

> endlesse papers they had every day brought in, at length they made an order wherein they designed a certeine day for y^e^ dispute & determination of y^e^ power, commanding both sides to forbeare all matter of crimination one against y^e^ other, till that were determined [72]

As stated, this "determined" day never came. However, the decree of the Commons was not the end of John's problems. Indeed, it was not until October 13 1646 that the attacks brought against him by the committee were removed from the town records.[73] Indeed, during 1645 and 1646, as Hutchinson writes in the *Memoirs*, the

> Garrisons were infested and disturbd with like factious little people insomuch that many worth gentlemen were wearied out of their com*m*ands some opprest by a certaine meane sort of people in the house … some as violently curbd their Com*m*ittees as the Com*m*ittees factiously molested them[.] Nor was the faction only in particular Garrisons but the Parliament House itself began to fall into the two greate oppositions of Presbitery & Independency [74]

Thus, while the incident of the Trent Bridge brought an end to the "vexatious persecution where with the Governor had had many sore exercises of his wisdome and patience", it did not mark the end of factionalism within the Nottingham Committee, or indeed, within Parliament itself.[75] The entry of the Presbyterian Scots into the war in 1641 heightened the tensions within Parliament, meaning that political rivalries in the 1640s were not confined to that between the Parliament and the King. The infighting between the known Independent (often accused, Separatist), John, and his predominantly Presbyterian Committee, appears to be just one example of this national factionalism.

Thus, while the necessity of what we might today term a "legal impact statement" to defend John's reputation in a trial may have ended with his appearance before the House of Commons, the need for a written defence of his actions, in light of the factionalism within Nottingham castle and town, may not have disappeared so easily. If not needed as a defence for an actual trial, a written defence of John

Hutchinson would have remained a pertinent project throughout 1645 and 1646. Having been undermined and attacked by his own committee since the beginning of the war, a text which defended his actions, while attacking their malignancy and hypocrisy, may have been very timely indeed.

In this politically turbulent time, as Jason Peacey has noted, the printed pamphlet came to hold a central place in the battle to win public opinion. In his study of the interrelationship between politics and print in the mid-seventeenth century, Peacey explores the ways in which politicians used propaganda in the 1640s and 50s, exploiting growing lay interest in both printed literature and politics in the fight for personal or ideological supremacy. Peacey separates "propaganda" from "polemic" as a work which serves the interest of an individual (or group) rather than simply a work with a political message.[76] As he, alongside other critics such as David Como, has noted, far from the previously perceived breakdown of licensing control with the outbreak of the war in 1641, the beginning of the Long Parliament actually marked a period of renewed censorship during the 1640s.[77] Control of the press moved 'in-house', with the role of the Stationers' Company diminished as it was replaced by a Parliamentary committee.[78] Control over licensing then shifted between Independents and Presbyterians depending on which faction held sway in the House. In the 1640s, Peacey sees a connection between this factionalism and the proliferation of printed pamphlets as the "factionalism within parliamentarian ranks came to be replicated in the press".[79] Can we, perhaps, see *this* manuscript not as a legal defence, but as an attempt at a more public defence of John - a draft of what was supposed to be a printed pamphlet?

The vast selection of pamphlets collected by George Thomason (d.1666) between 1640 and 1661 give an indication of the rising popularity of this particular printed form in the 1640s; in 1640 he collected just twenty-two pamphlets, in 1641 this

rose to 717, and in 1642 nearly two thousand. While the numbers then drop significantly over the next few years (to between six and eight hundred), in 1647 and 1648 he collected over a thousand pamphlets each year.[80] Discussed at length in an essay by Vimala Pasupathi, the pamphlets produced by the Parliament contained "the Army's papers, letters, speeches, petitions, motions, orders, declarations, remonstrances, or vindications, or some combination of the same".[81] Yet these pamphlets were not necessarily general in scope; a multitude of works appeared giving accounts of certain battles, or, more importantly for our purpose, to defend the behaviour of an individual, such as *Carmen memoriale, or A Memoriall to keep unspotted to posterity the name and memory of Colone Thomas Rainsbrough a truly valiant and most faithful servant of his countrey,* printed in 1648, or a similar biographical defence of Colonel John Lilburne who is actually mentioned by Hutchinson in the *Memoirs* (in not terribly favourable terms).[82]

One such work, produced contemporaneously with Hutchinson's own manuscript was the 1644 *Severall Accompts of Sir John Gell … and of His Brother Thomas Gell.*[83] As the title page declares, this pamphlet was "published to clear their Innocency for false Imputations", centrally, that the Derbyshire based brothers had been embezzling Parliamentarian funds.[84] Gell worked alongside John in the fight for Nottinghamshire, and is often mentioned by Hutchinson who, clearly believing the tales of his fraud, terms him in the *Memoirs* "a very bad man".[85] Containing just two short letters and a preface, this pamphlet is formally very different to Hutchinson's manuscript. However, Gell wrote his own, much longer, manuscript account of his service to the Parliament: *True Relation of what Service hath beene done by Colonell Sir John Gell Bart. for the Kinge and Parliament*. Written post 1646 (after Gell was removed as Governor of Derby), "much is a straightforward relation of the activities of

the Derby-based regiments in order to underline the service he had performed for parliament".[86]

A further example which *was* published, is the account of the army officer, Nathaniel Fiennes (d.1669). *A Relation made in the House of Commons, by Col: Nathaniel Fiennes, Concerning the Surrender of the City and Castle of Bristoll* (1643) contains both Fiennes' speech to the Speaker and "transcripts and extracts of certain letters wherein his care for the preservation of the City doth appear".[87] While depicted as a copy of the speech Fiennes gave in the House, the prose is rhetorically aware of the need for - and perhaps presence of - a wider audience: "I make no doubt but I shall give cleere satisfaction both to this House, and to the whole world".[88] Thus, while perhaps prepared as a defence within the House, this document was made suitable for a public audience and then printed; Fiennes' *Relation* was an officially sanctioned pamphlet, licenced by John White of the Stationers' Company. These documents, then - print and manuscript - show that written accounts of "services" performed were a recognised means of publicly seeking redress for accusations of misconduct, and of demonstrating the good work, and high morals, of an individual.

Hutchinson's simple but detailed prose style in this manuscript bears marked similarities to printed pamphlets more widely. Here, for example is a description of a battle near Chester in a pamphlet published in 1645:

> About six a clock on *Wednesday* morning, he advanced within a mile of the Enemy, three miles from *Chester* the one not knowing of the other; upon notice both set themselves in a posture; General *Poyntz* upon *Hatton* Heath, divided from the Enemy on the *Milne* heath by a lane … he first charged them though upon a disadvantage, because the Enemies whole body was not come up … in which that gallant Gentleman Col: *Graves* was sore wounded, & Col: *Buthell*, but not so dangerously[89]

Hutchinson's account seems equally concerned with chronological and martial detail, as in her description of the battle for the Trent Bridge fort in September 1643. She

similarly names the day of the week, and time of the battle, and presents a detailed account of the distances between the armies and their manoeuvres:

> There is in the Trent a little piece of ground which by damming up the water the Cavalliers had made an Island they cutt the sluce in the night and *by breake of day on Thursday* had aduanced 2 coulours within *Carrabine Shot* of the fort in the morning when the Cavalliers saw what was done while they were kept in talke on the other side they were very madd & swore like divills and then as it is probable first began to thinke of flight that day yt Besiegers approached *40 yards neerer* the Bridges in that Island and advanced alsoe neerer on the other ~~Tre~~ side[90]

Furthermore, in keeping with the propaganda purposes of the pamphlets, the army is consistently referred to as "our forces", the writers evoking a sense of community through plural pronouns. The report from Chester is written in this style, where the use of "we" also gives the sense of a report straight from the battlefield: "in which expedition (though by storm) we lost but one man".[91] The same report also alerts us to another common quirk of these pamphlets, the sense of divine providence in the events narrated: "God in his good providence deferred the work to that time of day, that we might finde the fruit of many Prayers made for us".[92] At times in Hutchinson's account she writes in the same tone, reporting, in mid-1644, "it had *pleased god* to deliuer Yorke into the hands of *our* forces".[93]

The letters copied by Hutchinson which helped us to explore the composition of this manuscript (see above), also evoke the materiality of a pamphlet. Pamphlets often contained copies of letters - indeed, some were made up entirely of correspondence - creating a sense of transparency when it came to the behaviour of the army and its generals; Pasupathi has argued, that they "positioned their contents as part of a concerted, if not entirely cohesive, media strategy, wherein readers could have access to the Army's official correspondence … and form proper conclusions about what had taken place".[94] In the seventeenth century, letters were frequently recorded in household books, often by the women of the house. As Michael Mendel notes, in his study of

household record keeping, letters and family papers were kept as "raw materials to be incorporated later into a more ambitious project of memorial".[95] However, in such practices, "copyists reproduced solely the main part of the letter, sometimes only copying key passages" which could be of use in the later construction of a fuller text.[96] Conversely, Hutchinson has transcribed these letters in their entirety including, for the most part, the sender, date, where the letter was sent from, and any postscripts contained in it.

Moreover, Hutchinson does not appear to have used these particular letters when writing this manuscript. Her early pages do make reference to these events, but in vague terms rather than in passages copied verbatim from the letters.[97] For example, the two-month endeavour to organise a meeting between the opposing sides in Nottinghamshire is, despite the presences of these letters in the manuscript, rather glossed by Hutchinson:

> Soone as Cap*tain* White was returned from Derbie the Lord Charworth & M^{r} Sutton & other Newark gentlemen writt to Coll. Pierrepont ~~to g~~ & M^{r} Hutchinson to meete them vpon pretence of their desire y^{t} this countrie might not be rained by a devision in this civill warr … but in the end it prooved that the treatie was but desired by the Newark gentlemen to prolong time till they had call*e*d a stronge force into the Country [98]

In contrast, in the *Memoirs*, the vague "the Lord Charworth & M^{r} Sutton & other Newark gentlemen" becomes, "letters signed by Lord Charworth, S^{r} Thomas Williamson, M^{r} Sutton, S^{r} Gervase Eyre. S^{r} John Digby, S^{r} Rodger Cooper, M^{r} Palmer, S^{r} John Millington", all of whom are signatories on the letters copied into the 1640s manuscript.[99] These letters, then, do not seem to have been crucial founts of information from which Hutchinson constructed this 1640s prose account; that she has copied them as entire documents complete with signatories does not support their status here as aide memoirs. Nor, however, can they be separated from our endeavours to define what kind of document this is. The presence of John's letters in the reverse suggest, perhaps, that this was a collaborative venture of wife and husband with Hutchinson acting as archivist

of John's letters.[100] This is not, however, an archived collection of John's letters, but a seemingly curated selection of *some* of his letters. The presence of other letters scattered throughout the account, such as one from the Royalist Nottinghamshire resident, Cartwright, asking to be allowed to live at home in peace, or the warrant sent to the engineer, Hooper, implies Hutchinson's wider access to her husband's correspondence.[101] As such the letters can support a reading of this manuscript as a public document of defence; rather than an aid to narrative cohesiveness, they are another form of evidence of John's behaviour during this time.

One pamphlet constructed entirely of correspondence is one concerning John himself. *A Discovery of the treacherous Attempts of the Cavaliers To have procured The Betraying of Nottingham Castle* details one attempt made by the Royalists to have John surrender Nottingham Castle to their control. Published in 1643, this pamphlet demonstrates the "interrelationship between correspondence and published news" that Nicholas Brownless has explored, containing as it does copies of five letters which relate to the offers made by Richard Dacre to John, George Hutchinson, and Captain White in December 1643.[102] As well as offering a generic model for Hutchinson's inclusion of the letters in her manuscript, however, this pamphlet appears to alert us to her own reading of this kind of material - similarities in the prose alert us to Hutchinson's access to this particular pamphlet.

John's first letter, sent 18 December, recounts Dacre's offer to him: "that if I would deliver up the Castle, the command of it should be confirmed to me and my heirs. I should receive ten thousand pounds and be well assured of it before ever I delivered the Castle, that I should bee made the best lord in *Nottingham*shire".[103] Hutchinson herself writes, "he said if the Governor would deliver up the Castle to y^{e} King he should be receiued into favour have the castle confirmed to him and his heirs

have 10000 in mony and be the best lord in the country".[104] The similarity in phrasing here is starkly obvious, as it is in the account of Dacre's letter of support from Lord Newcastle. John's letter reads, "[Dacre] then pul'd out of his pocket a paper written with these words or to this effect; *These are to authorize Colonell* Dacre *to treat with Colonell* Hutchinson *and Lieutenant Colonell* Hutchinson *for the surrendring up of the Castle and Bridges of Nottingham for the service of his Majesty and to make them large promises which shall be performed*".[105] Hutchinson writes similarly that Dacre "thereupon pulled a paper out of his pocket wherein were words to this effect", only changing "surrendring up" to "delivery of".[106] This all suggests that Hutchinson had these letters to hand when writing her account.

However, an added detail suggests that she was not actually viewing her husband's copies of these letters, but the ones recorded in this pamphlet. A marginal note in the pamphlet adds a detail to John's version of the offer to White: what he describes simply as "large offers" is expanded in the margin, "[t]he offers to Cap. *White* was 10000 pounds & 3000 to his officers".[107] This detail, missing from John's letter *is* in Hutchinson's account: "Dacre alsoe tooke Captaine Whites men aside and offered greate offers to Captaine White ten thousand pounds".[108] Hutchinson may, of course, have heard this detail directly from John, or have read a different copy of the letter which did contain the offer to White. However, this offers a tantalizing hint that Hutchinson may have read this particular pamphlet, and may have even used it in the construction of her own account.

This printed pamphlet is testament to the official nature of the Parliamentarian publishing network which, aided by the introduction an ordinance regulating printing in June, had been established by 1643. The letters, sent by John to Gilbert Millington (1598-1666), were presented to the House of Commons on December 25th 1643, and

had been printed, trusting Thomason's handwritten note on the frontispiece of a surviving copy, by the 30th of the same month. The pamphlet was printed by Richard Bishop who appears to be a key printer of Parliamentary documents; although this work does not, many of his printed productions include an official licence by order of Henry Elsynge (d.1656), the clerk assistant to the House of Commons.[109] Printed at the same time as these other works, and containing materials directly from the House, it would appear that this was a licenced production. From 1645 to late 1647, however, licencing control had shifted, along with power in the Parliament, into Presbyterian hands.[110]

As power shifted towards Presbyterians within the House, it is easy to see why Hutchinson's manuscript may not have been granted approval and printed; this shift in power, however, also offers concrete context for its composition. In the narrative, John is consistently pitted against a Presbyterian opposition. Francis Pierrepont, Huntingdon Plumtre, Gilbert Millington, Lawrence Palmer, and Captain Charles White all come under scathing attack from Hutchinson's pen as "not so much open professed enemies as close hypocritical false-hearted people … so subtle in their mischief".[111] Returning to the use of codenames above, we can perhaps now make sense of Hutchinson's apparent efforts to protect of Thornhagh's reputation despite his few moments of disobedience; a life-long friend of John, Thornhagh was a committed Independent, sympathetic to religious radicalism both within his regiment, and the parish for which he was the resident gentry, Sturton-le-Steeple.[112] All of the other committee members named were committed Presbyterians, opposed to the kind of Independence - or separatism as they saw it - displayed John; White (who defected to the Royalist cause) has been described as a "socially conservative Presbyterian", Millington supported Presbyterian church settlement, while the turn-coat, Plumtre, accused John of countenancing "a companie of prickeared Puritanicall rascals", and, after his death Pierrepont was celebrated by

Gervase Pigot in a poem as a committed Presbyterian.[113] While, in the early part of Hutchinson's narrative, the word "malignant" is reserved for Cavalier soldiers, later it comes to be a term used for those ostensibly on the same side as John.

Indeed, the Presbyterian priest and army captain, Palmer, who persuaded "some mallignant scandalous priests to ioyne in petition" against John, had his own printed material produced in January 1645.[114] *Saint Pauls Politiques, or a sermon against Neutrality,* bears the licencing approval of the Presbyterian minister, Charles Herle (1598-1659), and contains a direct attack on the "seflconceitedness" of Separatists.[115]. It also, more pertinently, attacks bad governance which arises from personal interest. This, when read in the context of John's governance of Nottingham, seems particularly direct. Using the example of Nehemiah (5.14 and following), Palmer exhorts Governors to work toward public rather than private gain, before despairing at the lot of loyal men who, chosen for public service under governors, are "maligned, scoffed at, hated, and opposed *by scornfull men, who bring the City into a snare*".[116] Following this last point, he writes, "but I wish sad experience had not taught me at this time to speak so much".[117] If, following Peacey, we seek to contextualise this pamphlet, to understand "it in the light of the reason for [its] existence", it is hard to ignore the pertinence this kind of writing had to the situation in Nottingham in late 1644.[118] This is especially true when we also consider that the work was dedicated to John's arch-enemy, Gilbert Millington, who was, according to Palmer, alone in Nottingham at the time in his commitment "to stand for the welfare both of it and the Whole Kingdom".[119] In contrast, Hutchinson's manuscript focuses on John's loyalty to Nottingham even in the face of personal loss:

> so long as he had life spend it for the good of the Towne … no extremitie should force him into the Castle y^{t} he would either die upoin the works or when he had stood out so

> long as he was able defend them if he were then forced to it he would flie to some other Garrison [120]

The narrative focuses throughout on the (public) "services" of John, and on his constant refusal to acquiesce to the bribery of Royalist soldiers. It also begins with John refusing to hand over the counties arms to Lord Newark and "leaue a poor country and the people in it naked and open to y^{e} iniury of euery passenger".[121] He performs this service "at the request of the countrie"; the narrative, at all times, seeks to dispel the notion that John acted in self-interest, or for private gain.[122]

A further attack made against John was that he was a Separatist, or at least tolerated Separatist activities. Between March and May 1644, John was faced with the issue of a group of cannoneers who wished to keep their own Separatist conventicle in the Castle. In the eyes of his committee, John was too lenient, allowing the conventicle to continue so long as it was "priuate in their chambers on y^{e} Sabboth day engaging y^{t} none else should ~~meddle~~ ^be^ with them".[123] This stipulation was flouted and, the following Sunday, John arrested the leaders, Collins and Smith. It was perceived that John acted too slowly in this matter and, as Hutchinson writes later in the *Memoirs*, it led to a "great outcry against him as a favourer of separatists".[124] The toleration of Independents for other sects was perceived - as Palmer's sermon demonstrates - as dangerous neutrality, or an acceptance of Separatism: a dangerous threat to endeavours to establish a Presbyterian church settlement. Palmer reads his chosen Biblical text, Philippians 24.12 as an exhortation "to unity and agreement", while he blames the rise of Separatism for "so many hot contentions in these days".[125] It appears that the turbulent relationship between John and his Committee was one based not singly on personal dislike, but on intrenched factional - religiopolitical - ideologies, and, moreover, that this factionalism had worked its way into the world of print by early 1645.

If then, Hutchinson's manuscript is written in the form and style of a pamphlet, and we can view it as an answer to one already existing print publication, with prose of at least one section based upon another, why did this manuscript not end up in print? We can perhaps see why, in late 1646, it would not have been granted a licence. Licensing formed part of "a concerted effort to ensure the composition of works which were deemed politically necessary", and works could be rejected (as Gell's full narrative may have been given its failure to appear in print) on the grounds of timing or content, or "because political grandees lacked the time of the inclination to consider them closely".[126] On a governmental level, the issue of John's governance had been solved by mid-1645. Even if the House wanted to maintain John's command of Nottingham a pamphlet conferring their decision may have been viewed as no longer timely, or indeed, this particular manuscript too rude about what were still key members of the Parliament; Hutchinson writes of the committee as "hypocritical false-hearted people", of Francis Pierrepont's "undermining malice", and openly of the betrayal of Plumtre.[127] Ultimately, this work would hardly have met the approval of a Presbyterian licenser. Moreover, just a year before, the kind of factionalism recorded in this narrative had been held accountable for Parliament's military failure at the siege of Newark, with the Scottish minister, Robert Baillie (1602-1662), blaming the "malcontent of the Independent souldiers who did mutinie".[128] The licensing of this work may have felt, to Parliament, felt like the re-opening of old wounds. Essentially, Parliament's concern in the mid-1640s was to maintain an official rhetoric of unity and agreement, an effort which this manuscript's presentation of factionalism would have undermined.

However, as Peacey notes, bookshops were full of unlicensed pamphlets throughout the 1640s and 50s. Yet, these unlicensed materials were, by necessity, the result of networks of individuals - politicians, publishers, printers - to which Hutchinson

in Nottingham may not have had access. While her manuscript miscellany, DD/Hu1 (Nottinghamshire Archives), is testament to Hutchinson's place within a flourishing, and wide-ranging, literary coterie in the 1630s and 50s (including the poets John Denham and her brother-in-law, Charles Cotton), and her dedication of *De rerum Natura* to the Earl of Anglesey in the 1670s resembles a patronage relationship, there is little evidence that Hutchinson had access to the kinds of circles which would have enabled the printing of this kind of material in the mid-1640s.[129] While Joad Raymond has explored the possibilities offered to women by the pamphleteering press, he finds that the majority of works by women were either religious in focus or entering into debates surrounding the status of women in society.[130] There is no recorded case of a woman penning a pamphlet of this kind, but the involvement of women in all aspects of publishing pamphlets means we cannot rule this out entirely.[131]

What we are faced with then, is a work which contextually, formally and stylistically, appears to be a pamphlet in manuscript form. There are plenty of reasons why this manuscript never appeared in print, not least because Hutchinson may not have chosen to have the work printed. In later years, she forcefully dismissed the writers of such materials as "scribblers" and "mercenary pen[s]", and the pamphlets themselves as containers of false news.[132] And yet, if the task of identifying civil war propaganda "must begin with a decoding methodology which explores biographical evidence of connections between authors and political grandees … and which contextualises the work of such authors in terms of message, timing, and the reason for publication", it is hard to ignore this manuscript's appearance as an example of such a form even if it remained unprinted.[133]

In the past, women's manuscript writing has been viewed as domestic, private writing (the words are so often synonymised), and it is only recently that we have come

to explore women's role in Habermas's "public sphere" in the seventeenth century. This manuscript, unlike the later *Memoirs* which was directly address to the Hutchinson's children, and which focused on private, familial details alongside John's political struggles, is unconcerned with domestic matters. While the copies of letters, and level of detail point towards an intimate knowledge of John's life at this time, this is not reflected in the prose, which retains a distance from its subject matter. While Hutchinson does retain this distance to some extent in the *Memoirs* through the much discussed means of referring to herself in the third person - "Mrs Hutchinson" - there is space in that later manuscript for familial matters: the birth of their children, her fears of moving to Nottingham, John's religious resolve not to bow to the demands of his committee. For the most part this manuscript remains uninterested in anything outside of the scope of the events it describes.

In this sense, then, even while unpublished, we can define this manuscript as a public document. This is particularly true if we accept the bifurcated definition of public/ private offered by political theorist, Jeff Weintraub, for whom "public" need not only pertain to that which is "open, revealed, or accessible" but also to that which is "collective or affects the interests of a collectivity of individuals"; that is, the act of having been made public - in the sense of shared with a wider audience - need not define the public nature of a text.[134] The failure of this manuscript to *become* a printed pamphlet should not mean that we ignore its status as such.

The strong connection to an established genre shows Hutchinson to have been aware of a literary context, even if she did not seek publication. Our interest in this document should stem, therefore, not from simply how it feeds into the *Memoirs*, but how it exists as a free-standing manuscript. As I have already stated, the notes from the House of Lord's Journals perhaps make us aware of an afterlife of this manuscript, one

in which it was transformed from a defence of John in the style of a pamphlet, into notes, or a source material, for the *Memoirs*. What must be denied, however, is that this was the purpose for which the 1640s manuscript was originally intended. In relation to the *Memoirs*, this manuscript must also be viewed as a source material in its own right, as much as Thomas May's histories or the biblical and theological texts to which Hutchinson frequently alludes, rather than a connected draft.

If we accept this manuscript as a document intended for publication, it could radically change our understanding of Hutchinson's writing in the mid-seventeenth century. The consequences of a renewed understanding of Hutchinson as a writer working towards publication as early as 1645, could lead to a changed conception of her other manuscripts as more public documents than scholarship has so far acknowledged. Furthermore, this document shows us what kind of writer Hutchinson was in the mid-seventeenth century, a time for which we have only one other surviving work: her manuscript miscellany.[135] An intriguing document, this other manuscript does not contain original compositions - it does not place the younger Hutchinson as a writer, only as a reader. On the other hand, *this* manuscript shows Hutchinson working towards an original composition, drafting and editing her text, and drawing on an established genre in order to find a space for that work. While not *auto*biographical, and thus excluded from the category of "life-writing" explored in Michelle M. Dowd and Julie A. Eckerle's edited collection, *Genre and Women's Life Writing in Early Modern England*, this biographical account may also show "the ways in which early modern women made use of formal and generic structures to constitute themselves in writing".[136] While not writing of herself directly, Hutchinson has, nevertheless, recoursed to an established genre in the construction of her text, demonstrating "early modern women's familiarity with various aspects of an increasingly textual world".[137]

Raymond, among others, has studied how women used pamphlets as a "vehicle for negotiating the limitations on women's speaking" - that is, female involvement in pamphlet culture has been seen to spring from an interest in defending their sex.[138] Hutchinson offers an alternative area of study: women's involvement in the distinctly male world of Civil War pamphlets. Similarly, much work has been done on Quaker women's later involvement in pamphlet culture; should scholarship perhaps be looking further back in the seventeenth-century when considering women's involvement in this genre which, in the words of print historian, Alexandra Halasz, "open[ed] up the social space that will come to be conceptualized as the public sphere"?[139]

Furthermore, with Civil War pamphlets so often presented as the result of "corporate authorship" - the product of Lord Fairfax and his army - it is easy to elide individual contributions to this genre.[140] This has led to a London-centric focus on pamphlets; they were after all, rarely printed anywhere else. Thus, this manuscript encourages us to not only look at Hutchinson anew, but to question the creative endeavour which lay behind mid-seventeenth print productions more generally. That is, Hutchinson's manuscript need not only change our understanding of the interplay between gender and pamphlet culture, but more widely the role of individuals in the creation of them, or - even if we step away from the suggestion that Hutchinson was intending to publish her text - the reaction of individuals to this emerging genre in the early-seventeenth century. How individuals engaged with this generic form to respond to specifically local, and even personal, situations, is an area well deserving of future study.

Acknowledgements

I am very grateful to David Norbrook and Tom Roebuck for reading and commenting upon early drafts of this article. My thanks must also go to Andrew King of the Nottingham Castle Museum, and to Stuart Jennings for his advice on the political and religious sympathies of Francis Thornhagh.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest.

Notes

---

[1] Norbrook, "Textual Authority and Gender", 130; Hutchinson, DD/Hu1; *Order and Disorder*.

[2] Julius Hutchinson (ed.), *Memoirs*; Hutchinson, DD/Hu4. On Julius Hutchinson's editorial style see Burden, "Editing Shadows", 171-191.

[3] Lynch, "Inscribing the Early Modern Self", 56-69.

[4] Keeble, "The Colonel's Shadow", 227-247.

[5] Gillespie, "Shades of Representation", 195-214. See also, Murphy, "Lucy Hutchinson, Civil War", 87-113.

[6] Keeble, "The Colonel's Shadow", 250.

[7] Firth (ed.), *Memoirs*.

[8] Study of the materiality of the *Memoirs* will be greatly aided by the forthcoming volume of Hutchinson's works which will contain both a newly edited text of the *Memoirs* and the 1640s manuscript. I hope this paper will work in concert with the publication of a printed edition of this manuscript, offering as it does, a study of its material features; Norbrook and Bennet (eds.), *Works of Lucy Hutchinson, Volume 3*.

[9] Race, "The British Museum MS". This article is now available online: http://www.nottshistory.org.uk/articles/tts/tts1914/hutchinson1.htm; Firth (ed.), *Memoirs*.

[10] Norbrook, "Textual Authority and Gender", 110.

[11] Lobo, "Lucy Hutchinson's Revisions of Conscience", 134. Based on Norbrook's study, Lobo calls the 1640s manuscript, the "Defence".

[12] Ostovich and Sauer (eds.), *Reading Early Modern Women*, 283; Como, *Radical Parliamentarians*, 250.

[13] Studying the materiality of Hutchinson's work has mostly been the reserve of David Norbrook and the other editors of her collected works. See, Norbrook, "Lucy Hutchinson and Order and Disorder"; Norbrook, "The 1675 Manuscript and its Context"; and Norbrook, "Introduction to the Theological Notebook".

[14] Nevitt, *Women and Pamphlet Culture*, 4.

[15] Ezell, "Domestic Papers", 41-2.

[16] Julius Hutchinson, "Introduction", i-ii. The first item here is DD/Hu4; the second, the 1640s manuscript; third is what he titled "The Life of Mrs Lucy Hutchinson, Written by Herself: a Fragment" (now lost); and the forth items are the manuscripts of *The Principles* and *On Theology*.

[17] Item HuL 8, *CELM*: https://celm-ms.org.uk/authors/hutchinsonlucy.html.

[18] For more on the Bedford Square community see, Wardle, "Basil and Anna Montague", and Calder, "Carlyle and Irving's London Circle".

[19] Add. MS 39779 (British Library), 40-47.

[20] Add. MS 46172 (British Library), 93-97 (97).

[21] MS. 3128, items xii and xiii, Letters collected by Allan Paton Park (The National Library of Scotland).

[22] Add. MS 46172, 97.

[23] Julius Hutchinson, Will, PROB 11-1525-134 (The National Archives). Charlotte Jones was a witness to this will.

[24] Norbrook, "General Introduction", xxiii; Fitzwilliam Correspondence, 102.26 (Northants. Record Office).

[25] Add. MS 39779, 40v.

[26] Ibid.

[27] Add. MS 25901 is now bound with green thread. What appears between 33-34 and 82-83, is white.

[28] Add. MS 25901, 1r-3r. The incident with Newark and the gun powder is retained in the *Memoirs*: Hutchinson, DD/Hu1, 90-93. See Keeble (ed.), *Memoirs*, 77-79.

[29] Add. MS 25901, 4r.

[30] Add. MS 39779, 42r.

[31] See note 28.

[32] Add. MS 39779, 47v.

[33] Add. MS 46172, 93r.

[34] Add. MS 46172, 96v.

[35] Hutchinson, DD.Hu4, 109-110. See Keeble (ed.), *Memoirs*, 91.

[36] Add. MS 25901, 87v-88r.

[37] Hutchinson, fragment, "Memoirs of the Life of Colonel Hutchinson", NCR 1912-59 (Nottingham Castle Museum), 1r.

[38] A facsimile of this memorandum is preserved in Race.,"The British Museum MS", 1.

[39] Ibid.

[40] NCR 1912-59, 1v.

[41] Add. MS 25901, 88v; Hutchinson, DD/Hu4, 234. Hutchinson starts to write "mon[ies]" in DD/Hu4 before crossing it out.

[42] Nottingham Castle Museum Baseline Database for NCM 1912-59. The fragment was purchased from Walter V. Daniell in 1912.

[43] Race, "The British Museum MS", 1.

[44] Hutchinson, DD/Hu4, 235-237 (236).

[45] Race, "The British Museum MS", 1.

[46] Hutchinson, scribal poem, "Order and Disorder", MS fb. 100 (Beinecke Library); Hutchinson, scribal poem, "On the Nature of Things", Add. MS 19333 (British Library). Julius's hand can be seen frequently in the margins of DD/Hu4.

[47] "Journal of the House of Lords: Volume 11, 1660-1666", *British History Online*: http://www.british-history.ac.uk/lords-jrnl/vol11. The notes range in date from May to September of 1660 and the corresponding sections can be found in the online version on the following pages: 69-70, 103, 126, 134, 144, 154, 169.

[48] Add. MS 25901, 88r.

[49] "The Manuscript Calendars of Journals", HL/PO/JO/25 (Parliamentary Archives).

[50] Seaward, "Apsley, Allen (1616-1683)", *ODNB*.

[51] Hutchinson, DD/Hu4, 380-390.

[52] Julius Hutchinson, "Introduction", i. By the "life", Julius means DD/Hu4.

[53] Add. MS 39779, 42r.

[54] Add. MS 25901, 78r and 65r-66v.

[55] Add. MS 25901, 90r-96v.

[56] Add. MS 25901, 60r.

[57] Add. MS 25901: 1r corresponds to 43v-44r, while notes on 2r corresponds to 47r.

[58] Damage to the manuscript here makes this text unreadable.

[59] Add. MS 25901, 3r. For clarity, I have retained the original line breaks.

[60] NCR 1912-56.

[61] Norbrook, "Textual Authority and Gender", 111.

[62] Britland, "Reading Between the Lines", 15-26 (16).

[63] Add. MS 25901, 40r.

[64] Add. MS 25901, 49v.

[65] Ezell, "Domestic Papers", 41.

[66] Britland, "Reading Between the Lines". 18.

[67] Add. MS 25901, 66v; 69r.

[68] Add. MS 25901, 73v. In June 1643 Thornhagh was wounded and imprisoned yet escaped: 13r.

[69] Hutchinson, DD/Hu4, 275.

[70] "22 April 1645", in *Journal of the House of Commons Volume 4, 1644-1646*: http://www.british-history.ac.uk/commons-jrnl/vol4/pp118-119.

[71] Keeble (ed.), *Memoirs*, 196. "22 April 1645", *Journal of the House of Commons*: http://www.british-history.ac.uk/commons-jrnl/vol4/pp118-119.

[72] NCR 1912-59, 1r.

[73] Seddon, "Colonel Hutchinson", 71-81.

[74] Hutchinson, DD/Hu4, 239.

[75] Hutchinson, DD/Hu4, 240.

[76] Peacey, *Politicians and Pamphleteers*, 2.

[77] Peacey, *Politicians and Pamphleteers*, 137-161; Como, "Print, Censorship and Ideological Escalation", 821. Christopher Hill argued for a breakdown of press control in 1641, an argument shown to be an oversimplification by Annabelle M. Patterson who argued that censorship was not particularly rigorously enforced before the Civil War. See Hill, "Censorship and English Literature", 32-71, and Patterson, *Censorship and Interpretation*, 27-29.

[78] Peacey, *Politicians and Pamphleteers*, 138.

[79] Ibid., 148.

[80] Fortescue, *Catalogue of the Pamphlet Books … Collected by George Thomason*, xxi.

[81] Pasupathi, "Army Pamphlets and London Culture", 233.

[82] Hutchinson, DD/Hu4, 290. *Engagement vindicated & explained*.

[83] Gell, *The Severall Accompts*.

[84] Gell, *The Severall Accompts*, frontispiece.

[85] Hutchinson, DD/Hu4, 111.

[86] Bennet, "Lucy Hutchinson's Midland Shires", 199.

[87] Fiennes, *A Relation*, frontispiece.

[88] Fiennes, *A Relation*, 3.

[89] *The Kings Forces*, 5.

[90] Add. MS 25901, 27v (my emphasis).

[91] *The Kings Forces*, 4.

[92] Ibid., 6.

[93] Add. MS 25901, 72v (my emphasis).

[94] Pasupathi, "Army Pamphlets and London Culture", 236.

[95] Mendle, "Preserving the Ephemeral", 219.

[96] Ibid., 233.

[97] Add. MS 25901, 4v-9v.

[98] Ads. MS 25901, 5r.

[99] Hutchinson, DD/Hu4, 121.

[100] James Daybell notes that this was common practice among married couples in his essay, "Gendered Archival Practices".

[101] Add. MS 25901, 43v; 48v.

[102] Brownless, "News also came by Letters", 395.

[103] *A Discovery*, sig. A2.

[104] Add. MS 25901, 38v-39r.

[105] *A Discovery*, sig. A2.

[106] Add. MS 25901, 38v.

[107] *A Discovery*, sig. A2v.

[108] Add. MS 25901, 39v. While the figure of "ten thousand pounds" is mentioned in the body of the letter, this is in regard to John's reward should he "deliver up the castle", rather than Captain White's reward. The section on sig. A2 details the rewards for John (£10000 and command of the castle), his brother (£3000), and Captain Poulton (£2000): *A Discovery*, sig. A2.

[109] The licenced works of Bishop include, Devereux, *A Letter* (1643); *A Briefe relation* (1643); and Fairfax, *A True Relation* (1645).

[110] Peacey, *Politicians and Pamphleteers*, 152-154.

[111] Add. MS 25901, 33v.

[112] Jenning's biography of Thornhagh is forthcoming, *Colonel Francis Thornhagh (1617-1648) and the Nottinghamshire Horse*. On the radicalism of Sturton-le-Steeple see Jennings, "The Gathering of the Elect", 52.

[113] Add. MS 25901, 17v; Appleby, "The War Hero", para. 7; Greaves, "Millington, Gilbert (1598-1666)"; Jennings, "The Gathering of the Elect", 127; Scott, "Pierrepont, Francis (1607-1658)"; *Elegies on the Death of … Pierepont*, 52.

[114] Add. MS 25601, 67v.

[115] Palmer, *Saint Pauls Politiques*, 3.

[116] Palmer, *Saint Pauls Politiques*, 7, 11 (original emphasis).

[117] Ibid., 11.

[118] Peacey, *Politicians and Pamphleteers*, 13.

[119] Palmer, *Saint Pauls Politiques*, sig. A2v.

[120] Add. MS 25901, 14r.

[121] Add. MS 39779, 43v.

[122] Ibid., 45r.

[123] Add. MS 25901, 60v.

[124] Hutchinson, DD/Hu4, 195.

[125] Palmer, *Saint Pauls Politiques*, 1, 3.

[126] Peacey, *Politicians and Pamphleteers*, 142, 174.

[127] Add. MS 25901, 33v, 56r, 24r.

[128] Baillie, *Letters and Journals*, 2:153. For more on this factionalism in 1644 see Como, "Religious Politics", 233-255.

[129] Hutchinson, DD/Hu1; Hutchinson "On the Nature of things", Add. MS 19333.

[130] Raymond, "Speaking Abroad", 276-322.

[131] On women's roles in early-modern newsbooks and pamphlets see, Nevitt, "A Woman in the Business of Revolutionary News", 85-120.

[132] Hutchinson, DD/Hu4, 111-112.

[133] Peacey, *Politicians and Pamphleteers*, 130.

[134] Weintraub, "Public/ Private Distinction", 1-2.

[135] Hutchinson, DD/Hu1.

[136] Dowd and Eckerle, "Introduction", 1.

[137] Ibid., 1.

[138] Raymond, *Pamphlets and Pamphleteering*, 277.

[139] Halasz, *The Marketplace of Print*, 4. On Quakers see, Ezell, "Breaking the Seventh Seal", 132-160. On women's involvement in pamphlet culture more widely see, Nevitt, *Women and the Pamphlet Culture of Revolutionary England*; and Hinds, *God's Englishwomen*.

[140] Pasupathi, "Army Pamphlets and London Culture", 234.

Bibliography

Manuscripts

Beinecke Library, New Haven, MS fb. 100. Lucy Hutchinson. *Order and Disorder*. c. 1670.

British Library, London, Add. MS 19333. Lucy Hutchinson. *On the Nature of Things*. c.1670.

British Library, London, Add. MS 25901. Lucy Hutchinson. The Biography of Colonel Hutchinson, including copies of correspondence. c.1645.

British Library, London, Add. MS 39779, ff. 42r-47v. Lucy Hutchinson. Fragment of the biography of Colonel Hutchinson. c.1645

British Library, London, Add. MS 46172, ff. 93r-96v. Lucy Hutchinson. Fragment of the Biography of Colonel Hutchinson. c.1645.

National Archives, London, PROB 11-1525-134. Will, Julius Hutchinson. 1807.

National Library of Scotland, Edinburgh, MS 3128, xii and xiii. Letters collected by Allan Paton Park.

Northamptonshire Record Office, Northamptonshire, Fitzwilliam Correspondence, 102.26. Letter of Charlotte Jones.

Nottingham Castle Museum, Nottingham, 1912-59. Lucy Hutchinson. Fragment of the Biography of Colonel Hutchinson. c.1645.

Nottinghamshire Archives, Nottingham, DD/Hu1. Various hands. Notebook Miscellany. c.1635-1650.

Nottinghamshire Archives, Nottingham, DD/Hu4. Lucy Hutchinson. Biography of Colonel Hutchinson. c.1670.

Parliamentary Archives, London, HL/PO/JO/25. The Manuscript Calendars of the Journals.

Primary printed books

Baillie, Robert. *The Letters and Journals of Robert Baillie, A.M.* 3 vols., edited by David Laing. Edinburgh, 1841-2.

Devereux, Robert. *A Letter written from his excellency Robert Earle of essex unto the Speaker of the House of Commons.* London: Richard Bishop for Lawrence Blaiklock, 1643.

Discovery of the treacherous Attempts of the Cavaliers To have procured The Betraying of Nottingham Castle, A. London: Richard Bishop, 1643.

Elegies on the much Lamented Death of the Honourable and Worthy Patriot, Francis Pierepont, Esq. 1659.

Engagement vindicated & explained. Or the reasons upon which Lieut. John. Lilburne took the engagement. Published by a well-wisher of the present authority, on purpose to satisfie scrupulous minds in the lawfulnesse of taking the said engagement, The. London: John Clowes, 1650.

Fairfax, Thomas. *A true relation of the taking of Bristoll… published according to order*. London: Richard Bishop, 1645.

Gell, John and Thomas. *The Severall Accompts of Sir John Gell Baronet and Colonell, and of is Brother Thomas Gell, Esquire, Lievetenant Colonell.* London: R.L., 1644.

Fiennes, Nathaniel. *A Relation made in the House of Commons by Col: Nathaniel Fiennes, Concerning the Surrender of the City and Castle of Bristol August 5. 1643 Together with the Transcripts and Extracts of certain Letters, wherein his care for the preservation of the City doth appear*. London: R.D., 1643.

"Journal of the House of Commons: Volume 4, 1644-1646" *British History Online.* http://www.british-history.ac.uk/commons-jrnl/vol4/pp118-119.

"Journal of the House of Lords: Volume 11, 1660-1666". *British History Online*. http://www.british-history.ac.uk/lords-jrnl/vol11.

Kings Forces Totally Routed by the Parliaments Army under the Command of Major Generall Poyntz, The. London: Edward Hubard, 1645.

Order and Disorder or the World Made and Undone being Meditations Upon the Creation and the Fall as it is Recorded in the Beginning of Genesis. London: Margaret White and Henry Mortlock, 1679.

Palmer, Lawrence. *Saint Pauls Politiques, or A sermon against Neutrality Preached At Margarets Westminster on the Lords Day December 13. 1644. Divers of the Honourable House of Commons being Present.* London: Robert White, 1645.

Secondary printed books and articles

Appleby, David. "The War Hero, the Eccentric and the Turncoat: the Men Behind Three Signatures". *Civil War Petitions* (2020).

https://www.civilwarpetitions.ac.uk/blog/the-war-hero-the-eccentric-and-the-turncoat-the-men-behind-three-signatures/

Bennet, Martyn. “euery country had the civill warre, more or lesse within itselfe’: The Realities of War in Lucy Hutchinson’s Midland Shires”. *The Seventeenth Century* 30, no. 2 (2015): 191-206. https://doi-org.uea.idm.oclc.org/10.1080/0268117X.2015.1047256

Britland, Karen. “Reading Between the Lines: Royalist Letters and Encryption in the English Civil Wars”. *Critical Quarterly* 55, no. 4 (December 2013): 15-26. https://doi-org.uea.idm.oclc.org/10.1111/criq.12072

Brownless, Nicholas. “News also came by letters’: Functions and Features of Epistolary News in English News Publications of the Seventeenth Century”. In *News Networks in Early Modern Europe*, edited by Joad Raymond and Noah Moxham, 394-419. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2016.

Burden, Mark. “Editing Shadows: The Changing Text of Lucy Hutchinson’s *Memoirs of the Life of Colonel Hutchinson*”. In *Textual Transformations: Purposing and Repurposing Books from Richard Baxter to Samuel Taylor Coleridge*, edited by Tessa Whitehouse and N.H. Keeble, 171-191. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019.

Clader, Grace J. “Carlyle and Irving’s London Cricle’: Some Unpublished Letters by Thomas Carlyle and Mrs. Edward Strachey”. *PLMA* 69, no. 5 (December, 1954): 1135-1149. https://www-jstor-org.uea.idm.oclc.org/stable/459774

Como, David R. “Print, Censorship, and Ideological Escalation in the English Civil War”. *Journal of British Studies* 51, no. 4 (October, 2012): 820-857. https://www-jstor-org.uea.idm.oclc.org/stable/41999120.

Como, David R. *Radical Parliamentarians and the English Civil War*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018.

Dowd, Michelle M. and Julie A. Eckerle, eds. *Genre and Early Modern Women's Life Writing*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007.

Daybell, James. "Gendered Archival Practices and the Future Lives of Letters". In *Cultures of Correspondence in Early Modern Britain*, edited by James Daybell and Andrew Gordon, 210-237. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2016.

Ezell, Margaret J. M.. "Domestic Papers: Manuscript Culture and Early Modern Women's Life Writing". In *Genre and Women's Life Writing in Early Modern England*, edited by Michelle M. Dowd and Julie A. Eckerle, 33-48. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007.

Fortescue, G.K. *Catalogue of the Pamphlets, Books, Newspapers, and Manuscripts Relating to the Civil War, the Commonwealth, and Restoration, Collected by George Thomason, 1640*-1661: *Volume 1, Catalogue*. British Museum, 1908.

Gillespie, Katherine. "Shades of Representation: Lucy Hutchinson's Ghost and the Politics of the Representative". In *Milton Now: Alternative Approaches and Contexts*, edited by Catherine Gray and Erin Murphy, 195-214. Basingstoke: NY: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014.

Greaves, Richard L. "Millington, Gilbert (1598-1666)". *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Oxford: Online, 2004. https://doi-org.uea.idm.oclc.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/18761

Halasz, Alexandra. *The Marketplace of Print: Pamphlets and the Public Sphere in Early Modern England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Hill, Christopher. “Censorship and English Literature”. In *The Collected Essays of Christopher Hill, volume 1*, 32-71. Brighton: Harvester Press, 1984.

Hinds, Hilary. *God’s Englishwomen: Seventeenth-Century Radical Sectarian Writing*. Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 1996.

Hutchinson, Lucy. *Memoirs of the Life of Colonel John Hutchinson*, edited by Charles H. Firth. London: George Routledge & Sons, 1906.

Hutchinson, Lucy. *Memoirs of the Life of Colonel John Hutchinson*, edited by Julius Hutchinson. London: Longman, 1806.

Hutchinson, Lucy. *Memoirs of the Life of Colonel John Hutchinson*, edited by N.H. Keeble. London: Everyman, 1995.

Jennings, Stuart B. *“A Gallant Gentleman”: Colonel Francis Thornhagh (1617-1648) and the Nottingham Horse*. Helion: Century of the Soldier, forthcoming.

Jennings, Stuart B. “The Gathering of the Elect’: the Development, Nature and Social-Economic Structures of Protestant Religious Dissent in Seventeenth Century Nottinghamshire”. PhD diss., Nottingham Trent University, 1999.

Keeble, N.H. “The Colonel’s Shadow’: Lucy Hutchinson, Women’s Writing and the Civil War”. In *Literature and the Civil War,* edited by Thomas Healy and Jonathan Sawday, 227-247. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

Leader, Zachary. “Introduction”. In *On Life Writing*, edited by Zachary Leader, 1-6. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016.

Lobo, Giuseppina Iacono. “Lucy Hutchinson’s Revisions of Conscience”. In *Writing Conscience and the Nation in Revolutionary England*, 134-138. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2017.

Lynch, Kathleen. “Inscribing the Early Modern Self: The Materiality of Autobiography”. In *A History of English Autobiography,* edited by Adam Smyth, 56-69. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016.

Mendle, Michael. “Preserving Ephemeral: Reading, Collecting, and the Pamphlet Culture of Seventeenth-Century England”. In *Books and Readers in Early Modern England: Material Studies,* edited by Jennifer Anderson and Elizabeth Sauer, 201-207. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2002.

Murphy, Erin. “I remain, an airy phantasm: Lucy Hutchinson, Civil War and Ghost Writing”. *ELH* 82, no. 1 (Spring: 2015): 87-113. doi:10.1353/elh.2015.0006.

Nevitt, Marcus. *Women and the Pamphlet Culture of Revolutionary England, 1640-1660*. New York: Routledge, 2006.

Norbrook, David. “But a Copie’: Textual Authority and Gender in Editions of *The Life of John Hutchinson*”. In *New Ways of Looking at Old Texts,* edited by W. Speed Hill, 109-130. Temp. AZ: Arizona Centre for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 2004.

Norbrook, David. “Lucy Hutchinson and Order and Disorder: the Manuscript Evidence”. In *English Manuscript Studies, 110-1700, Volume 9,* edited by Peter Beal and Margaret J. M. Ezell, 257-291. London: The British Library Board, 2001.

Norbrook, David and Reid Barbour, eds. *The Works of Lucy Hutchinson Volume 1: Translation of Lucretius*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.

Norbrook, David and Martyn Bennet, eds. *The Works of Lucy Hutchinson Volume 3: The Memoirs of the Life of Colonel John Hutchinson*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, forthcoming.

Norbrook, David, Elizabeth Clarke and Jane Stevenson, eds. *The Works of Lucy Hutchinson Volume 2: Theological Writings*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018.

Ostovich, Helen and Elizabeth Sauer, eds. *Reading Early Modern Women An Anthology of Texts in Manuscript and Print, 1550-1700.* New York and London: Routledge, 2004.

Pasupathi, Vimala C. "Mars Rising: Army Pamphlets and London Culture post-1642". *The Yearbook of English Studies* 44 (2014): 232-248. https://www-jstor-org.uea.idm.oclc.org/stable/10.5699/yearenglstud.44.2014.0232.

Patterson, Annabelle M. *Censorship and Interpretation: The Conditions of Writing and Reading in Early Modern England.* Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press, 1984.

Peacey, Jason. *Politicians and Pamphleteers: Propaganda During the English Civil Wars and Interregnum.* New York: Routledge, 2016.

Race, Sidney. "The British Museum MS. of the Life of Colonel John Hutchinson, and its Relation to the Published Memoirs". *Transactions of the Thoroton Society* 18 (1914). http://www.nottshistory.org.uk/articles/tts/tts1914/hutchinson1.htm.

Raymond, Joad. *Pamphlets and Pamphleteering in Early Modern England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Seaward, Paul. "Apsley, Allen (1616-1683)". *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Oxford: Online, 2004. https://doi-org.uea.idm.oclc.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/600.

Seddon, P. R. "Colonel Hutchinson and the Disputes between the Nottinghamshire Parliamentarians 1643-45". *Transactions of the Thoroton Society*, 98 (1944).

Scott, David. “Pierrepont, Francis (1607-1658)”. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Oxford: Online, 2015. https://doi-org.uea.idm.oclc.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/94585.

Wardle, Ralph M. “Basil and Anna Montague: Touchstones for the Romantics”. *Keats-Shelly Journal* 34 (1985): 131-171. www.jstor.org/stable/30210224.

Weintraub, Jeff and Krishan Kumar, eds. *Public and Private in Thought and Practice: Perspectives in a Grand Dichotomy*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1997.