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When writing of Elizabeth Cromwell in her ‘Female Biography’ Mary Hays noted that:

Though an excellent housewife...[she] was capable of appearing with dignity in the station to which she was exalted, as wife of the lord protector. She took a profound interest in political affairs, and stimulated her husband in the career of ambition (1).

Even considering the important work of Anne Hughes, Sue Wiseman and, in particular, Laura Lunger Knoppers and Katharine Gillespie, the personality of the women who surrounded Oliver Cromwell, both in his youth and in his maturity has often eluded us (2). In creating her work however Mary Hays was able to raise crucial issues over these particular women that concern female individuality, politics, influence, historical presence, and character when she projected both the figures of Cromwell’s wife, Elizabeth, his third daughter, Mary (who became Lady Falconberg), as well as his granddaughter Bridget Bendish, into three of the ‘Illustrious and Celebrated Women’ of their era within her ‘Female Biography’ volumes of 1803 (3).

While Hays draws these Cromwellian women individually into the conventions of the volumes of her ‘Female Biography’ they are in fact all figures in particular seventeenth-century historiographical landscapes that do provide an important background to her writing. Yet in Hays’s biographies this is not so much the contemporary seventeenth-century accounts that are now available to the modern historian concerning the ‘many pious, precious prudent, and sage matrons and holy women, with which this Commonwealth is adorned’, but instead it lies within the conventions, language and tropes of the contemporary historiography of
Hays’s own time which surrounded her work, as well as within her own particular political/social theories and reflections (4).

The historiographical context of these Cromwellian entries was formed, consciously or unconsciously, by the history of Rational Dissent, but also by the language of eighteenth-century ‘classical republicanism’ and the ‘Commonwealth’ tradition of the era (5). As such it has links with the societal, as well as political preoccupations and explanations that such a political language put forward into the public domain. Furthermore, these elements also connect with Mary Hays’s own deliberate feminist political and social agenda. We may additionally note that Hays’s understanding of the eighteenth-century historical world’s established ‘grand narrative’ for the seventeenth-century crisis provides yet another arena for interpreting her work on these biographies (6).

It is clear however that these particular ‘Cromwellian’ biographies do raise additional questions. Not the least of these, for example, is the actual presence of the historical Elizabeth Cromwell in the ‘Female Biography’ in the first place, as well as the significant absence of her Royal counterpart in the era: Queen Henrietta Maria (7). For while Hays may well have claimed that Elizabeth Cromwell was an example of ‘a woman who was possessed of an enlarged mind and an elevated spirit’, her contemporary sources on Elizabeth for the biography she produced are strictly limited (8).

It is pertinent to ask therefore if Elizabeth’s presence in the volume really lies perhaps in the contemporary status of her husband Oliver Cromwell in early nineteenth-century historiography? Even if it does, there is, fortunately, an
alternative and more positive explanation to this question. For here it will be argued that Elizabeth Cromwell’s presence in Hays’s work served a different purpose than as merely a sop to early-nineteenth century trends in Cromwellian history. Instead the biography actually offers us a valuable insight into Hays’s broader political and social aims and her theories, as well as her techniques as a philosopher. Regardless of this it must be said at the outset that ultimately the historical Elizabeth Cromwell has, and continues to be, a far too shadowy and obscure figure to grasp even for modern historians, and this is unlikely to change (9). Nevertheless, as has been noted above, it is arguable that in her work Hays while trying to find the ‘real’ Elizabeth has instead created a much more interesting and linguistically politicized ‘vision’ of a figure who could be labelled ‘Elizabeth Cromwell’, and centred as a female domesticated patriot, thereby using her as a means of creating yet another positive role model for her female readers (10).

II

To the majority of historians and biographers in the era of the later eighteenth and early nineteenth-century, Oliver Cromwell and his family, as well as the significance of the so-called ‘Puritan’ period were already fixed in ambiguity. They seemed to most historians and statesmen of Hays’s day to be really only be there to deliver a moral lesson on political ambition and a serious warning of what could happen when fanatical religion broke into politics: civil war, destruction of property, regicide and despotism. Incontestably for the majority of Hays’s contemporaries, one also only needed to glance over the Channel to see how the revolutionaries in France had performed in a similar manner with equally disturbing deeds in order to be reminded of the distracted England of the seventeenth-century
(11). In fact to the establishment supporters of the inheritance of the so-called ‘Glorious Revolution’ of 1688 and the stable constitution that was engendered by that event, the Cromwellian period was far too ‘radical’ and far too ‘tyrannical’ a beast in both its nature and results to be anything but frowned upon. For this regime was seen as an historical aberration in the triumph of progress: a true interregnum in British history. It was a dark regicidal corner of the British past that could and indeed should not be dwelt upon for too long. Instead in its place stood the historically sound, moderate mixed constitution that had resulted from the events of 1688; balanced and quintessentially English in its moods, this ‘Glorious Revolution’ was to be taken as a far more reliable a guide for the road the French should have really travelled (12)

For both Whigs and Tories of the eighteenth-century the historical Oliver Cromwell remained a disturbing creature: the major ‘fanatic’ gone wrong; a ‘king-killer’, military politician, breaker of parliaments, and a ‘Machiavellian’ hypocrite who had been mixed with far too much ambition and who had resorted to political violence to maintain his authority (13). Even for the more radical dissenters and radical political reformers of the day, who it might have been thought would have sympathetic to the non-conformist Cromwell, if not the iconoclastic ‘king killer’ and republican one, there was the problem of Oliver Cromwell’s betrayal (14). For to them Oliver did indeed represent betrayal. Here was the man who in their eyes, mainly through the besetting sin of ambition and political deviousness, had effectively betrayed the ‘good old cause’ to its enemies and thereby lost both the republic and religious toleration; this betrayal had naturally overborne any of his
‘good’ deeds. Consequently, the Cromwell of the pre-Thomas Carlyle era, into which Hay’s work can be fitted, and its understanding of the seventeenth-century upheaval in which he lived, clearly saw Oliver Cromwell as a man singularly driven by ambition, who was inclined to tyranny and was, ultimately, a mere hypocrite in his religion, and someone who if he had any modern parallels at all were to found in the revolutionary leaders in France and the ‘tyrant’ Bonaparte (15). Generally Mary Hays follows this impression of Oliver Cromwell, with the language of her standard interpretation noting Cromwell’s frequent ‘usurpations and his hypocrisy’ (16). It would indeed need all of the flamboyant rhetoric of Thomas Carlyle, and the now little remembered earlier nineteenth-century historians who proclaimed themselves admirers of Oliver, to re-invent Cromwell for the Victorian era and then to begin to create the new English image of Cromwell as a noble, morally upright Victorian Christian hero that is, in the popular imagination, occasionally at least, still with us (17).

II

Be that as it may, one of the major means for access for any biographer of the eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century such as Hays into the events of the seventeenth-century crisis of which Oliver and Elizabeth Cromwell and their offspring had played such a part was though the plethora of contemporary published primary sources of the period (18). Yet the ‘grand narrative’ into which such contemporary documents could be understood was also emerging at this time, most particularly through the work of David Hume in his ‘History of England’ (19).
Everyone who was at all interested in the Stuart period had read Hume on the era, for he was really the first historian who captured the importance of the Stuart age for British history as a whole. Some might, rightly, claim that Hume actually invented and privileged the Stuart era’s significance in the broad landscape of British history and furthermore that he opened out many of its modern lines of enquiry (20).

Hume’s ‘History of England from the invasion of Julius Caesar to the Revolution in 1688’, was a major work of history that was set to dominate the field for some considerable time, at least until the later nineteenth-century (21). It explored, in some detail, both the causation of the civil wars and their results for the history of the nation. Additionally, the ‘History’ emerged into a reasonably popular and burgeoning contemporary public market for historical literature; much of whose readership was also female and middle-class, as Hume was only too well aware (22).

Moreover, Hume clearly had other aims in mind than just to write the story of the Stuart age, for as a Enlightenment philosopher he also sought to inspire ‘virtue’ within his readers (especially his female ones), and, if he could, replace the novel currently in their hands with his ‘History’; not only to change their reading habits, but to actually use history as a central vehicle of polite communication in literary culture (23). One key to this aim, as Hays will have been well aware, given that she arguably adopted a similar methodology in her own writing of the biographies, was in the style and tone of Hume’s writing about the past.

Hume’s tone as a historian was in fact characterized by what David Wootton has astutely called that of the historian as an ‘intelligent spectator’ (24). This
resulted in a remarkably modern flavour to his work, with Hume adopting an
Olympian, and ostensibly neutral standpoint, to the events he described. He
eschewed both the ‘scissors and paste’ style of writing often seen in other books of
his day as well as the outright hostile and condemnatory moral tone found
elsewhere (25). Instead Hume invited his readers on a grand narrative journey, with
himself as a guide, in which character, interpretation, and meaning could all play
happily with the factual evidence. Furthermore as equals in what could in some
senses be called a ‘virtual reality’ vision of history, Hume made his readers
themselves ‘intelligent participants’ in the events he described (26). One can detect
in many of the biographies by Hays a similar aim for her readers. In general the
subject matter in such historical works was however decidedly masculine: generally
war, religion and diplomacy. Yet Hume’s new view of the past was also to place an
analysis of character and meaning within society and culture at the forefront of his
text. This switch could also naturally appeal to both sexes and in addition readers
could be thereby educated and enabled, allowing them to use history to enter into
the polite public culture of thought and conversation of the day. Hume was very
clear that his ‘History’ could particularly appeal to women. In their case, he said, it
would give advantages ‘to those who are debarred the severer studies, by the
tenderness of their complexion’, and because of the ‘weakness’ of their ‘education’.
It would ultimately assist in conversation, and history by itself, he noted, ‘opens the
door to many other parts’ (27)

Clearly Hume’s influence can be seen in Hays’s work, for at the very least she
tends to adopt some of Hume’s views and could be said thereby to have also eagerly
become one of Hume’s ‘true friends of virtue’ in her writings as a result; this latter
being one of the more singular aims Hume had for those reading his history (28).
Hays notes, for example, that her own work ‘Female Biography’ was created for the
benefit of her own sex, for their ‘improvement’ and for their ‘entertainment’, with
‘pleasure to be mingled with instruction’, as well as adding ‘lively images, the graces
of sentiment, and the polish of language’ (29). Hume had noted that history had
itself three obvious advantages for the reader: it can ‘amuse the fancy’; it ‘improves
the understanding’ and thereby it also ‘strengthens virtue’. All elements, of course,
which Hays agreed upon and which is illustrated by their mutual use of the phrase:
‘truth and virtue’. And this was indeed a laudable aim for both writers. In addition
while Hays arguably adapts Hume’s historical standards for her work and thereby is
able to serve, as she puts it, the ‘cause of truth and of virtue’, she does from a
female, though not gender exclusive perspective (30). This is a particularly
noticeable trait for her seventeenth-century entries.

IV

If Hays’s work on these ‘Cromwellian’ entries is based on the ‘philosophical
history’ and agenda of David Hume, it also continually links in with her own
developed enlightened political and social discourse. This discourse emanates from
her own reflections on the past, her present circumstances as a woman in Georgian
England, and like many another philosopher of her day, it invokes the many ‘trace-
elements’, as it were, of older ideas, consciously or unconsciously, absorbed and
filtered through Hays’s years of didactical reading and associations. Her originality, of
of course, lies in the steady feminist interpretation that is the foundation, or
Grundrisse, of her creative reflections as a biographer and the meditation of her sources. Within the context of this however there is a natural emphasis on both public and private, political and civil virtue, as well as domestic liberty, which within the Cromwellian biographies illuminates both her thoughts as a feminist philosopher and as a historian (31).

However, a further influence can be traced in Hays’s background work, particularly within these seventeenth-century entries. That is the influence of ‘republicanism’ as a political language and the use of the historical ideas of Catherine Macaulay, the great female historical rival to Hume’s interpretation of the period of the seventeenth-century crisis and someone who was herself a notable composer of a history of England written within the conventions of republican discourse.

Though a cloudy and sometimes obscure word in the era, republicanism had become, by the time Hays was writing, a political language rather than a political programme in the British context (32). Led by a ‘Commonwealth’ tradition, as well as a dissenting element, it spoke the language of freedom, liberty and virtue as well as independence of mind and provided a valuable means to critique the corruption and luxury lying at the heart of Georgian government (wealth, standing armies, commerce, passions, prejudices, as well as ‘placemen’ in parliament). Its essence also lay in the same ‘virtue’ that Hume had already preached and that Hays inclined towards. Its antithesis was perceived as self-interest and corruption, particularly in contemporary government, trade and commerce, where indeed its main targets lay (33). It also had roots in both humanist thought, and neo-classicalism, as well Renaissance thought and particularly in the ideals of civic humanism. The latter stressed action, liberty and participation in political life. The language used history,
particularly the models of Roman republican history, to uncover the satisfactory
systems of effective political participation, control and action. It used the values of a
humanist education to reveal ideas and to educate individuals in such ideas. The
result would be, or so it was hoped, a world dominated by ‘the ideal of the virtuous
independent citizen’, with a mixed constitution that not only allowed ‘virtue’ to
flourish, but even limited the effects of the inevitable process of entropy that lay
deep within all societies (34).

Unfortunately the general view of republicanism in the eighteenth century
was that it was a distinctively masculine identity that continued to orientate itself
around the idea of the active citizen. This idea of the citizen was naturally seen in
terms of the figures of the statesman and warrior, who purposely and actively
engaged in both public politics and war. There would therefore be seemingly no role
in such an obviously masculine world for female participation. In reality, women
could even be roundly condemned in this republican world-view as the potential, or
actual, fount of political corruption. For by feminising and distracting masculine
society they could thereby lead it further into decay (35). The feminine and
republicanism were meant not to mix, as women and politics were meant to be
ideologically, if not practically, naturally exclusive (36).

Certainly the previously recognised site of action for the most notable of
what were often labelled ‘petticoat’ politicians of the past, had been seen in the
precincts of royal court where, as John Milton had once pointed out, they ‘might
grow to that insolence as to appeare active in state Affairs’ – a certain sign, thought
Milton, of a ‘dissolute, degenerate, and pusillanimous Commonwealth’ (37). The
personal, sexual and political intermingled in such corrupt places. Yet seen within
the perspective of the well-publicised contemporary domesticated virtues and as the
guardians of the moral life of the home and hearth, women could ultimately find a
place in this republican vision. Personal virtue and education could be used in the
domestic arena to claim civic participation and citizenship. Women could access this
virtue on the domestic front in order to reach the ‘perfectibility of human reason’. Historically this was seen most obviously in the widespread legacy of ancient
Republican Rome, where there were models of women- Roman matrons and
‘worthies’ - who indeed offered a particular way out of all of this negativity (38). This
vision is certainly one that Hays plays with and indeed, as we shall see, especially
takes into her portrait of Elizabeth Cromwell. Unquestionably therefore the brief
biography of Elizabeth Cromwell created by Hays has traces of republican civic virtue
within it and a virtue as practiced by a woman who is seemingly portrayed as worthy
of standing next to the most noteworthy of Roman matrons. The latter characters
being ones that Hays also deals with elsewhere in the ‘Female Biography’ (39).

Certainly, while the very idea of the active woman presented a singular
challenge to the masculine version of the republican hero as it stood, there were, as
Hays demonstrates, various examples who could be drawn upon from historical roll
call of virtuous Roman matrons. This was found within an already embedded
tradition of the ‘worthy woman’ – a principle of women who definably took upon
themselves the mantle of the citizen though action (40). The idea of action in public
was one of the major characteristics of the virtuous republican Roman hero and as J
G A Pocock notes: ‘The end of history is to lead examples of pubic virtue; the end of...
politics and liberty is to act on those examples and supply them’ (41). Such biographies could therefore deliver a view of women as at least aspiring to the political, and they could also deliver texts that would prepare women in the relevant virtues of action, by creating both self-awareness and the correct stimulus that would enable them to imagine themselves as political entities (42). Moreover in their role as educators of statesman virtue was crucial

In any case it is this tradition of female worthies – especially those images of the ‘model republican woman’- that Hays taps into in parts of her Cromwellian work. The purpose of republican history in her era still remained to educate warriors and statesmen into the mores of war and politics, but Hays’s female biographies, which are written by a woman about women, could enable her to declare a form of moral and educated equivalence by using a republican worldview (43). Moreover, Hays had a variety of republican women to draw upon and these undoubtedly influenced the portraits of the Cromwellian women she wrote about. This was still however a contested discourse that, somewhat inevitably, revolved around the key elements of female sexuality and chastity: a debate that had existed as an on-going dialogue between the archetypal Christian female virtues of domesticity and motherhood as opposed to the pagan values of stoicism, rationality, morality and public action for some considerable time (44)

One example of the context of the model Republican woman lies in Hays’s opening lines to her biography of Livia Drusilla, the wife of the emperor Augustus:

The characteristic of the Roman Nation was grandeur: its virtues, its vices, its prosperity, its misfortunes, its glory, its infamy, its rise and fall, were alike great. Even the women, disdaining the limits which barbarism and ignorance had, in other
nations, assigned to their sex, emulated the heroism and daring of man. Ambition is the passion and scourge of republics: where every thing is possible, every thing will be attempted; it is the glory of human nature, that necessity only can bound its efforts (45).

Here the emphasis is created by Hays drawing upon Jacques Roergas de Serviez’s text ‘The lives and amours of the emperesses, consorts to the first twelve Caesars of Rome &c’ (1723) and Tacitus’ Annals as her sources (46). It is, on one level, merely Hays’s view of women overcoming the limits of society in Rome, but more significantly perhaps, as the reader should note, it an exemplar of women overcoming these same limits set up in the modern era. Indeed by the very emulation of the republican identifiers of female heroism and daring it would enable such modern women to engage in action themselves. Linked to the defence of the state moreover, the Tacitan ‘rei publicae amor’ could also provide a reflective model for the contemporary female reader to engage in the values of republican education and the public good through the patriotic enable them to act to sustain their male counterparts in the civic world as ‘proto-citizens’ (47). Lastly, the significance of the idea that ‘where everything is possible everything will be attempted’ was also a lesson for her female reader on the real merits of the republican virtue of action that could break boundaries. The fact that ‘necessity’ here remains the only real boundary to effort is naturally also noteworthy.

Hays’s biographical entry on Porcia, wife of Brutus and daughter of Cato, further outlines the ideal that republican virtues are necessary for the female actor in the political world of the citizen. Porcia is depicted by Hays as self-trained in both
mind and understanding and shows her worthiness, her fortitude and her courage— her republican virtue—by a self-inflicted wound that was meant to show to her husband that she was really worthy of his trust by the very pain she bore with stoicism and fortitude and thus Porcia was, importantly, capable of giving him advice on an equal level (48). By showing her strength of will she could state her claim to expect, not merely the common courtesies and civilities of an ordinary wife or concubine, but to share in the thoughts and counsels, in the good and evil fortune, of her husband: and that, whatever weakness might be imputed to her sex, her birth, education, and honourable connections, had strengthened her mind, and formed her to superior qualities.

In turn her courage sustains him in his action (49)

Hays also quotes in the same biography, a friend of Brutus, who, it is said, repeated from Homer the address of the Trojan princess to her husband—

“Be careful, Hector, for with thee my all,
My father, mother, brother, husband, fall.”

Brutus replied, smiling, ‘I must not answer Porcia in the words of Hector to Andromache,

“Mind you your wheel, and to your maids give law.”

For, if the weakness of her frame seconds not her mind, in courage, in activity, in concern for the cause of freedom, and for the welfare of her country, she is not inferior to any of us’ (50)

The Republican message was in this case very clear and would particularly reappear in the lives of Elizabeth Cromwell, Mary, Lady Falconberg and Bridget Bendish, for the three women as Hays portrays them are women of republican action of various kinds and in the case of Elizabeth Cromwell she also became the ‘domesticated’ patriot hero who can express the values of civic virtue (51).

The most notable contemporary republican historian who undoubtedly influenced Hays’s work however was also female: Catherine Macaulay (52). To Hays,
Macaulay herself showed the elements in her character of the stoic Republican matron who was active in the polity around her; a pose that Macaulay partly constructed herself in her public character (53).

Certainly Macaulay’s ideas in her history of the seventeenth-century were moral ones that would engage and enable her reader to act, or at the least to teach them to speak and write in turn in the wider polity. Her works naturally illuminate the upheavals of the seventeenth-century, but importantly they would also shine a light on those of the eighteenth-century. Consequently, Macaulay’s synthesis of the idea of active citizenship and assertive individuality, as well as civil rights, would allow women like herself to work outside the formal political arena through moral choices in a wider polity that would ultimately aim to sustain or affect the nature of liberty via ‘moral autonomy’ (54). These moral choices could, of course, be ‘gender neutral’ as they are largely based upon the human elements of rationality, liberty and republican virtue – but they could contain within them the idea of women as ‘proto-citizen’- the civic woman who was ready to assume the responsibilities that she was qualified to bear irrespective of her sex.

Unfortunately Macaulay’s view of Oliver Cromwell was not a positive one, for she, like many of her contemporaries, merely saw Oliver as an important figure who had regrettably ‘deprived his country of full and equal system of liberty’ (55). He was, additionally, a hypocrite who had betrayed the English revolution of which Macaulay was a keen supporter. Instead she took the members of the Long Parliament as her real heroes of that age and as men who were already on the true
path of revolution and democracy: John Pym, John Hampden and Algernon Sydney. They were patriotic heroes (56). This meant that Hays, who undoubtedly used Macaulay’s work on the period she was writing about, also took up Macaulay’s vision of Oliver as the dangerous hypocrite. Yet, Oliver’s wife Elizabeth could be used in a different manner: to both correct the Protector’s faults and to show the opportunities for a patriotic women in state affairs.

V

Mary Hays’s vision of Elizabeth Cromwell is as a woman worthy and as a neo-Roman matron, as well as a proto-citizen and a ‘domesticated’ version of the patriot-hero (57). Her entry on Elizabeth Cromwell is a tightly written piece and links the known ‘facts’ of her day on Elizabeth with Hays’s own opinions. This, as we know, was a usual part of Hays’s method of work, where each character [was] judged upon its own principles... the reflections, sparingly interwoven, have been such as naturally arose out of the subject (58)

The main characteristics of Elizabeth Cromwell that Hays reflects upon therefore are Elizabeth’s ‘enlarged mind and elevated spirit’. Both elements are seemingly ones that Hays found singularly lacking in Elizabeth’s husband Oliver. Yet, such civic virtues, as these are, do allow Hays to place Elizabeth Cromwell on the same plain as the popular patriot heroes of Hays’s own era, celebrated by Macaulay: John Hampden, John Pym and Algernon Sydney. Such individuals not only possessed pacific temperaments, they were republican ‘patriots’ in the true civic sense of the word, and importantly had not betrayed the revolution, like Oliver. They were ‘modern’ in their outlook. All of which meant of course that they could be all too
easily absorbed into the pantheon of English liberties and provide suitable role models (59). In this instance, however, Elizabeth Cromwell’s mixture of being ‘an excellent housewife and [having] an exalted dignity’, as described by Hays, also distinctively ‘domesticated’ the idea of the heroic patriot. For Elizabeth could adjust her personality to become a republican Roman matron, such as Livia or Porcia, and yet she was also modern enough to become flexible to occupy both the role and individual persona in the domestic arena when appropriate. Elizabeth Cromwell therefore proves to be the link between the nobility of ‘housewifery’ (the domestic arena preached by many of the contemporaries of Hays’s own time) and the activity of political dignity (the citizen that lies within the republican discourse); the latter element also being seen as an essential of her life. Moreover, she was not merely written by Hays as a housewife, and thereby warped and constricted, but also as a ‘politician’, in the best sense of the word, and possessed both sensitivity and civic virtue enough to steadily influence her husband, rather like Porcia, through her own interest in politics and to stimulate him to act where she could not; rather in some respects like a more benign version of Lady Macbeth. So much so that Elizabeth Cromwell’s subsequent ‘prudent’ retirement at the Restoration, mentioned by Hays at the end of her biography, then makes perfect sense. For prudence, another noticeably feminine republican virtue, enabled Elizabeth’s retirement from the ‘active’ life at the opportune moment, like a female Cincinnatus, but who left behind her the image of a successful active citizen who could act as a model for future generations of women (60).
Arguably therefore Hays rejects the negative view of the ‘petticoat ‘politician for something much more subtle in her portrait of Elizabeth Cromwell (61.). It is significant however that what Elizabeth Cromwell is not someone who resembles Queen Henrietta Maria at all (62). In fact, the latter contemporary character, wife and Queen to Charles I, is a significant absentee from Hays’s ‘Female Biography’ that needs some comment, especially in light of Elizabeth Cromwell’s presence in the volumes (63). For here we have a Queen of England who seems to have been written out of Hays work, but was by anyone’s account influential in the grand narrative of the period (64). Why was this? Clearly Henrietta Maria is missing mainly it seems because she was already considered a notable bad ‘petticoat’ court politician that provided an opposite for all that Elizabeth Cromwell is meant to stand for. And because, we must presume Hays also follows Catherine Macaulay’s line on the Queen, whose reputation, already tainted by her all too obvious Catholicism, was to the historian a bad one (65). Macaulay notes:

Thus, by these incendiaries, was the imagination of this weak woman the chief instrument to work effectively on the follies, prejudices, and vices of her husband, fed with hopes of power and conquest, to the stirring up all those bloody mischiefs which is the end proved so fatal to the deluded Charles (66)

VI

In her preface to the volumes, Hays made it clear she was ‘Unconnected with any party, and distain[ed]... every species of bigotry’ and that moreover she had ‘endeavoured to serve the cause of truth and of virtue’ in presenting her biographies. As this essay has shown, just how Hays actually represented these particular seventeenth-century women was not merely a reflection of the
contemporary ideas of the female biography, but was also in a historical tradition
that she mined, and has thus left behind it in her writings the trace elements of
republican discourse and the historical grand narrative of the period. These
particular biographies moreover were the outcome of both Mary Hays’s mediation,
reflections and reading of particular visions and historical views of the turbulent era
of the seventeenth-century.

(5296 words)
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