Mississippi State University

Scholars Junction

Theses and Dissertations Theses and Dissertations

5-1-2010

Gender and typology in John Milton's Paradise lost and Lucy Hutchinson's Order and disorder

Lauren Beth Shook

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarsjunction.msstate.edu/td

Recommended Citation

Shook, Lauren Beth, "Gender and typology in John Milton's Paradise lost and Lucy Hutchinson's Order and disorder" (2010). *Theses and Dissertations*. 2376.
https://scholarsjunction.msstate.edu/td/2376

This Graduate Thesis - Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at Scholars Junction. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Scholars Junction. For more information, please contact scholcomm@msstate.libanswers.com.

GENDER AND TYPOLOGY IN JOHN MILTON'S *PARADISE LOST* AND LUCY HUTCHINSON'S *ORDER AND DISORDER*

By

Lauren Beth Shook

A Thesis
Submitted to the Faculty of
Mississippi State University
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of Master of Arts
in English
in the Department of English

Mississippi State, Mississippi

May 2010

Copyright by

Lauren Beth Shook

2010

GENDER AND TYPOLOGY IN JOHN MILTON'S *PARADISE LOST*

AND LUCY HUTCHINSON'S *ORDER AND DISORDER*

By

Lauren Beth Shook

Approved:

____
Lara A. Dodds,
Assistant Professor of English
(Director of Thesis)

____
Thomas P. Anderson
Assistant Professor of English
(Committee Member)

____
Shalyn R. Claggett
Assistant Professor of English
(Committee Member)

____
Richard Patteson
Professor of English
Director of Graduate Studies in
the Department of English

____
Gary Myers
Dean of Arts and Sciences

Name: Lauren Beth Shook

Date of Degree: May 1, 2010

Institution: Mississippi State University

Major Field: English

Major Professor: Dr. Lara A. Dodds

Title of Study: GENDER AND TYPOLOGY IN JOHN MILTON'S *PARADISE LOST* AND LUCY HUTCHINSON'S *ORDER AND DISORDER*

Pages in Study: 88

Candidate for Degree of Masters of Arts of English

This study sets John Milton's *Paradise Lost* in dialogue with Lucy Hutchinson's *Order and Disorder*, concentrating on each poem's portrayal of the Christian redemption narrative as interpreted through typology. Specifically, I focus on the absence of a positive feminine type in Books 11 and 12 of *Paradise Lost* and relocate it in *Order and Disorder* in the characters, Sarah and Rebecca. In regard to typology, Milton adheres to a traditional typology steeped in patriarchy, which devalues women's participation, whereas Hutchinson recognizes both paternal and maternal types. Furthermore, Hutchinson views Sarah and Rebecca as vital to the redemption narrative and shapes them as types for Mary, therefore making an original contribution to typology. This study concludes with a reading of Hutchinson's use of typology through twentieth-century contemporary feminist theology and suggests that Hutchinson's role as theologian challenges that of Milton's.

DEDICATION

I would like to dedicate this thesis to my grandmother, Voncille Shook.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to acknowledge my thesis director and other committee members for their sincere support of me throughout my undergraduate and graduate career. I especially express gratitude to Dr. Lara Dodds, my thesis director, for her generous guidance throughout the entire thesis process, as she read and reread various drafts, and for her time spent teaching me a great deal about early modern women's writing and about writing on early modern women. Thanks, likewise, are due to Dr. Shalyn Claggett and Dr. Thomas Anderson who gave their time as readers for this thesis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DEDICATION ii

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS iii

CHAPTER

I. INTRODUCTION: Milton, Hutchinson, and Seventeenth-Century Typology ... 1

II. CHAPTER 2: "Just Abraham" and "Noble" Sarah: Milton's and Hutchinson's Account of the Covenant Narrative 17

III. CHAPTER 3: "Pious fraud": Rebecca and the Narrative of Divine Deception 42

IV. CONCLUSION 73

BIBLIOGRAPHY 84

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION: Milton, Hutchinson, and Seventeenth-Century Typology

In Book 11 of *Paradise Lost*, prior to Michael revealing God's prophecy, the archangel instructs Adam to "Ascend / this hill; let Eve (for I have drenched her eyes) / Here sleep below while thou to foresight wak'st" (11.366-68). While Michael provides Adam with "foresight" into the pending postlapsarian world, showing and relating scenes of death and destruction along with a promise of redemption through the second Adam named Christ, Eve dreams "gentle dreams" (12.595). With the relegation of Eve to sleep, what ensues is a near-complete female absence throughout Michael's prophecy. In fact, the only females that Adam does see are "a bevy of fair women richly gay / In gems and wanton dress," who are, as Michael explains, "[b]red only and completed to the taste / Of lustful appetence, to sing, to dance, / To dress, and troll the tongue, and roll the eye" (11.581-83, 618-20).[1] These women allude to Eve's role as seductress when she persuades Adam to partake of "the fair enticing fruit" by way of her "female charm" (9.996, 999), so when Adam recognizes the affiliation between the "fair women" and his wife, he hastily concludes that "man's woe / Holds on the same, from woman to begin" (11.632-63). Though Michael reproves Adam's erroneous assertion, Michael's continuing description of the feminine alludes to the poem's ubiquitously dismal view of

women: Sin is a nightmarish image, Eve suffers blame for the Fall, and now the "fair women" echo Raphael's view before the Fall, and Adam's view after, that women are Tempters of men, a mere "outside[,] Fair no doubt" (8.568).

Despite the postlapsarian image of woman in Adam's visions, Eve's dreams are hopeful. Though Eve claims that God sends her solace in her dreams, her succinct description of those dreams as "propitious, some great good / Presaging" invites a speculation about the particulars of what she sees (12.612-13). Possibly, she receives a different portrayal of the postlapsarian world, one that includes an improved image of postlapsarian women. For if Adam envisions redemptive patriarchs, such as Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, then perhaps Eve could dream of the complementary matriarchs, Sarah, Rebecca, and Rachel. Yet the suppression of Eve's dreams in the poem's narrative—and literally as she "sleeps below"—suggests that, unlike Adam's visions, the substance of her dreams is irrelevant to the history books of *Paradise Lost*; moreover, for Milton, Eve's dreams are extraneous to the Genesis narrative and the lineage of Christ.

Closely related in its theme to Milton's epic, Lucy Hutchinson's seventeenth-century epic *Order and Disorder* presents a detailed version of Adam's visions of Genesis in Books 11 and 12 of *Paradise Lost*, along with possible insight to Eve's dreams. Whereas Milton only includes the Old Testament patriarchs in *Paradise Lost*, Hutchinson represents both the patriarchs and matriarchs of Genesis, emphasizing the role of the matriarchs who facilitate the redemption of humankind. David Norbrook too notes Milton's and Hutchinson's disparate images of gender in Genesis, questioning if Hutchinson reveals Milton to be "unusually dismissive of women in his portrayal of

Eve?" ("*Order and Disorder*" xv). However, despite the overt differences in their relation of gender, the two Biblical epics share multiple characteristics, including an interest in charting the redemption narrative through typology as both explicitly link Old Testament narratives to New Testament analogues. Yet, a difference exists in their depiction of typology, one that coincides with gender. In *Paradise Lost*, Milton adheres to a traditional typology that is steeped in patriarchy whereas Hutchinson's use of typology in *Order and Disorder* stresses the importance of both paternal and maternal types in the redemption narrative. So, while Milton traces the lineage of Christ in Books 11 and 12 from Adam to Abraham to Christ, he leaves Eve's typological successors in the shadows of her unrelated dream. Consequently, Eve alone represents the possibilities for Genesis women's participation in Christian history. Furthermore, Milton relegates such women to a solely reproductive role, negating their spiritual value in the Christian narrative. Hutchinson, on the other hand, views Genesis matriarchs as equally vital as the Genesis patriarchs in the lineage of Christ. Hutchinson, therefore, represents Christ's maternal ancestry throughout her *Order and Disorder*, refiguring matriarchs Sarah and Rebecca as essential to the redemption narrative, particularly in relation to Mary, the "second Eve" (*PL* 10.183).

That *Order and Disorder* is a response to *Paradise Lost* has become commonplace among Milton critics. However, it has only been within the last decade that critics have begun to consider *Order and Disorder* as a "woman's version" of *Paradise Lost*.[2] Originally published anonymously in 1679 as a five-canto poem, *Order and Disorder* remained unattributed until 1691 when Anthony Wood falsely identified Sir Allen Apsley as the author. Almost three centuries later, Norbrook ascribed

authorship of the 1679 edition, along with an additional fifteen cantos, to Lucy Hutchinson, Apsley's sister.[3] In his introduction to *Order and Disorder*, he lists various reasons for believing Hutchinson to be the poem's author, starting with the poem's overt Republican and Puritan values, which match her own, as expressed in *Memoirs of the Life of Colonel Hutchinson,* her biography of her husband. Also, the poem has striking parallels to some of Hutchinson's other writings. In particular, her penchant for "self-deprecation" of her writing ability, such as is in the dedicatory material to her translation of Lucretius's *De rerum natura* and in *On the Principles of the Christian Religion,* a theological treatise for her daughter, mirrors that of the preface to *Order and Disorder*.[4] First, in the preface, Hutchinson presents her poem as a public apology for "busy roving thought" and "the vain curiosity of youth" that led her "to consider and translate the account some old poets and philosophers give of the original things," a reference that seems to allude to her translation of Lucretius (4); she then follows with a statement of self-abnegation of poetic ability:

> I know I am obnoxious to the censures of two sorts of people: first, those that understand and love the elegancies of poems: they will found nothing of fancy in it; no elevations of style, no charms of language, which I confess are gifts I have not, nor desire not in this occasion; for I would rather breath forth grace cordially than words artificially… And I acknowledge all the language I have, is much too narrow to express the least of those wonders my soul hath been ravished in the contemplation of God and his works. Had I had a fancy, I durst not have exercised it here; for I tremble to think of turning Scripture into a romance[.] (5)

Prior to Norbrook's attribution of the poem to Hutchinson, critical assessments of the two seventeenth-century poems deemed *Order and Disorder* as an inferior rewriting of Milton's masterpiece. For instance, C.A. Moore labels *Order and Disorder* as "both

an imitation of *Paradise Lost* and also a veiled rebuke of Milton," which he considers "second class" (321, 324). Additionally, John T. Shawcross dismisses it as "Influence from *Paradise Lost*, passim" (251). Probably the most interesting comment about the poem comes from Joseph Wittreich, who believes the poem "generates a revisioning of Milton" due to its overt support of patriarchy (250). Thanks to Norbrook, however, critics such as Shannon Miller, Joan Bennett, and Norbrook himself have recently returned to the parallels between *Order and Disorder* and *Paradise Lost* with an eye to the operation of gender politics. Redefining *Order and Disorder* as a woman's response to *Paradise Lost*, critics interrogate Hutchinson's presentation of patriarchy in Cantos 1-5, such as her account of the Creation and the Fall, and in the remaining cantos as well. As will be discussed, such critics realize the importance of the remaining fifteen cantos as a way to critique Milton's epic.

Despite Norbrook's identification of Hutchinson's authorship and the extended version of her epic, some scholars have resisted a completely inter-textual study of *Paradise Lost* and *Order and Disorder*. For instance, Robert Wilcher maintains that a comparison of the two poems should be confined to the 1679 version of *Order and Disorder* because, similar to *Paradise Lost*, it closes with Genesis 3.23-24. As a result, *Order and Disorder*'s first five cantos "play little part in the rest of her poem" (305). However, a similar charge could be made against Books 11 and 12 of *Paradise Lost* because even though they offer Adam solace in his and Eve's future exile from Eden, the postlapsarian content of the final two books seems vaguely connected to the rest of *Paradise Lost*, a fact that C.S. Lewis was quick to point out when he claimed Books 11 and 12 as "a grave structural flaw" and "an untransmuted lump of futurity" (125).

Wilcher also attacks Hutchinson's poetics, proclaiming her to be a self-regulating poet who remains staunchly conservative in her description of the Creation and the Fall and who "casts a disapproving glance at Milton's willingness to supplement his narrative with non-scriptural episodes" (312). Yet Wilcher's failure to probe the totality of *Order and Disorder* completely ignores Hutchinson's own invention of "non-scriptural episodes," such as the angel's visit with Rebecca in Canto 16 and Rebecca's parting with her beloved son Jacob in Canto 18. In referencing Hutchinson's prefatory manifesto of pious modesty, Wilcher asserts that Hutchinson remains "on the narrow path she has prescribed for herself" and does "little more than paraphrase the biblical text" in her account of heaven and hell and creation (310). That he readily accepts Hutchinson's preface as a rubric for evaluating her poetic worth demonstrates a disregard for both the formal and narrative innovations of *Order and Disorder* and the conventions of literary history, particularly women's literary history. However, Hutchinson does illuminate her "narrow path" by constructing a complex narrative that employs marginal glosses in the first five cantos in order to weave together the Old and New Testaments and by offering an extensive narrative of significant Genesis episodes in the last fifteen cantos. In regard to Hutchinson's preface, her self-abnegation of poetic skill positions her alongside fellow early modern women writers of Biblical narratives who often appropriate the *humilitas topos* as a signifier of their poetic authority.[5] For instance, in the prefatory dedication "To the Queene's Most Excellent Majestie" of her *Salve Deus Rex Judaeorum* (1611), Amelia Lanyer acknowledges her "weake distempered brain and feeble spirits" (139) and her text's inadequacies: her "rude unpollisht lines" (35) and "holy worke" dressed in "poor apparell" and "mean attire" (63, 65). Likewise, Rachel Speght in her prefatory

address to readers—"All vertuous Ladies…and to all others of Hevah's sex fearing God"—of *A Mouzell for Melastomus* (1616-1617) admits an "imperfection both in learning and age," and asks that readers will "be pleased, not to looke so much *ad opus*, as *ad animum*" (57-8, 64-5).[6] In both cases, Lanyer and Speght deliberately embrace their unworthy status as writers in order to enable their scripturally-based defenses of women. Though Hutchinson's preface never hints at a perceived gendered weakness, she does continue the tradition of Lanyer and Speght as she identifies her poetic inability and willfully submits her epic to Puritan asceticism, presumably so she may create a space for her own interpretation of Genesis.

One of the avenues of innovation in Hutchinson's Genesis epic comes through what Shannon Miller has identified as "the presence of the mother" ("Maternity, Marriage, and Contract" 342).[7] Miller views *Order and Disorder* as a political re-writing of *Paradise Lost* and as a response to other late seventeenth-century patriarchal political theories. According to Miller, Hutchinson develops a new political theory with matriarchy at its core—a new state where the mother has as much authority in the state as the father.[8] While I agree with Miller's political reading of *Order and Disorder*, I also feel that analyzing the epics of Milton and Hutchinson through a typological lens reveals another innovative function of the mother in *Order and Disorder*. Thus, whereas Miller believes that Hutchinson formulates the significance of a matrilineage that stems from Eve—Sarah, Rebecca, and Rachel—in the regeneration of mankind and governmental policy, the study explores Hutchinson's portrayals of the matriarchs as her contribution to typology, a mode of Biblical exegesis usually associated with patriarchal figures. In the following two chapters, I will concentrate on Sarah, wife of Abraham, and Rebecca, wife

of Isaac and daughter-in-law of Abraham and Sarah. Chapter 1 explores the figurative and literal depictions of Sarah that Milton and Hutchinson provide in order to illustrate Milton's adherence to a patriarchal typology as juxtaposed to Hutchinson's burgeoning interest in a matriarchal typology. Additionally, Chapter 2 interrogates Hutchinson's poetic ingenuity in *Order and Disorder* as she modifies Genesis to fit her reinvention of Rebecca as a matriarch who advances the feminine type, established in Eve and Sarah, and who anticipates Mary.

For seventeenth-century Protestant exegetes and poets, typology was a fundamental component of Biblical exegesis and often served as an organizing principle of history. At its most basic, typology is a method of interpreting the Old Testament through the New Testament, creating a connection of the type ("persons, events, and things of the Old Testament") to the antitype ("persons, events, and things of the New Testament") (Galdon 23). Adam, then, stands as the ultimate type for the antitype Christ who redeems mankind, but other types can include Noah, Abraham, Moses and David. Eve functions in the same way for Mary, but, unlike Christ, Mary does not have multiple types. Barbara Lewalski further defines typology as "a mode of signification in which both type and antitype are historically real entities with independent meaning and validity, forming patterns of prefiguration, recapitulation, and fulfillment by reason of God's providential control of history" (*Protestant Poetics* 111), thereby illuminating the intertwined relationship of religion and history. She also outlines the particular traits of seventeenth-century Protestant typology as influenced by theologian John Calvin who regarded Biblical verses as a "threefold reference—actually and literally to some historical situation in Israel, typologically to Christ, and (again typologically) to the state

of the contemporary Church" (119). Furthermore, he believed that the Old Covenant established between God and Abraham functioned as the type for the antitype of the New Covenant between God and Israel, "a figure of the Christian church" (Calvin qtd. in Lewalski 127). Therefore, the Protestants, who viewed themselves as the true Christian church, saw themselves as antitypes for characters in the Old Testament. They often applied "contemporary history—and even the lives and experiences of individual Christians—to the providential scheme of typological recapitulations and fulfillments throughout history" and located antitypes "in the continuing historical experience of God's elect," such as the English Civil War (129). In addition to type and antitype, historical events and persons could function as a correlative type, or a type that recapitulates an Old Testament type and shares with that type the anticipation of the "fulfillment of all of the types" (130-31). Oliver Cromwell, for example, becomes "a new Moses or Gideon or David" because he leads the Puritans, or the new Israel, in the English Civil War as they struggle for liberation from the tyrannous Charles I, a historical event that mirrors Israel's deliverance from the Egyptian Pharaoh's persecution. On a personal level, Protestant typology also related the individual Christian to figures in Scripture, which has roots in the moral or tropological level of Medieval typology; however, Protestants disregarded a strictly moral, "personal application" and used typology to highlight "God's activity" in individual Christians (131). The Protestant Christian can stand as antitype or correlative type for "the Old Testament Israelites" (132), as Calvin demonstrates when he describes himself as a correlative type for David: "„Like as hee was advaunced from the sheepfolde too the high estate of a kingdome: even so God drawing mee from base and slender beginnings, hathe vowtsaved me in this

honorable office, to make me a preacher and minister of his Gospel…'" (qtd. in Lewalski 133). Calvin simply parallels his experience to that of David's, both are leaders of men, and shows how the Christian individual could participate in providential history.

For Milton, Books 11 and 12 of *Paradise Lost* are a vast typological storehouse. When God sends Michael to banish Adam and Eve from Eden, he instructs Michael to "reveal / to Adam what shall come in future days" in which God will "intermix / [his] cov'nant in the woman's seed renewed" (11.113-114, 115-16). Indeed, his prophecy presents to Adam, the first type, prominent types and events in Christian history that await Christ, the ultimate antitype. Beginning with Adam, Michael constructs a typological patrilineage for Christ by naming key patriarchs; however, he generalizes Eve and Mary's participation in Christ's lineage as he refers to them only through Christ's epithet, "the woman's seed." For Milton critics, Michael's phrase "from shadowy types to truth," which describes the transformation of the Old Covenant ("shadowy types") to the New Covenant ("truth"), has been a key passage for assessments of Milton's use of typology (12.303). Like Milton, critics adhere to a patriarchal reading of typology, for they are always concerned with Michael and Adam—what Michael reveals and what Adam sees, how Michael reveals his prophecy and how Adam receives it. [9]

In regard to the lacuna that exists between Eve and Mary in Books 11 and 12, critics fail to recognize the lack of women's role in typology, a surprising discovery given the numerous feminist critiques of Milton during the 1970s and after.[10] In fact, only Mary Ann Radzinowicz's article "Milton on the Tragic Women of Genesis" would appear from first glance at the title to be helpful in locating other Genesis women in Milton's epic, yet her article looks outward from *Paradise Lost* and consults his Trinity

manuscript, in which Milton casts "four women in Genesis as heroines in tragedies he planned to write" (131-32). Though Radzinowicz mainly wishes to elevate Milton's status to that of proto-feminist in relation to his Biblical politics, she also very blatantly aims to deflate the prevalent typological studies of Milton's work for which she expresses a personal disgust: "I think that Milton disliked and avoided typological interpretation more than we have fully seen; I believe that over-Christianizing or under-Judaizing his way of interpreting is nearly over with, even in my generation of Miltonists, and I am glad of that, for it thinned the texture of his thought" (151). Although Radzinowicz's study of Milton's depiction of Sarah, Lot's wife, Dinah and Tamar presents Milton as a champion of women, she simultaneously excuses Milton's patriarchal interests by evading the question of why a lack of Genesis women exists in the very place one would expect to see them: Books 11 and 12 of *Paradise Lost*. In this study, I wish to revisit Milton's use of typology in Books 11 and 12 in order to employ typology as a new method of interrogating Milton's ever-shifting gender politics.

In recycling typology as a means of reading gender in *Paradise Lost*, we must also reconsider *Order and Disorder*, for it provides "Eve's version" of Genesis and is heavily influenced by typology.[11] The most obvious reference to typology appears in Canto 3 where Hutchinson's describes Eve's creation and her subsequent marriage to Adam: "So from the second Adam's bleeding side / God formed the Gospel Church, his mystic bride" (3.467-68). Using the conventional Protestant reading of Adam and Eve's marriage, Hutchinson presents Adam as type for Christ ("the second Adam") and Eve as a type for Christ's church ("his mystic bride").[12] Hutchinson later notes that Adam, Eve's "glorious Lord" stands "no more / Concealed in types and shadows as before" (3.

497, 3.497-98), a statement that resonates with Michael's well-known phrase "from shadowy types to truth."[13] Accompanying this description of Adam is a marginal gloss that refers to Hebrews 8.5, a verse that establishes context for the New Covenant of grace and references Moses, another type for Christ, as a priest "who serve[s] unto the example and shadow of heavenly things." The quoted verses of Canto 3 offer only a sampling of Hutchinson's use of typology throughout her epic. In fact, her greatest use of typology occurs during God's judgment of the serpent, Adam, and Eve. When God curses the serpent with "lasting enmity" between him and Eve's seed, Hutchinson remarks, "More various mystery / Ne'er did within so short a sentence lie" (5.65, 67-8). She then catalogues the various typological meanings of such a "sentence:" "The Father here the gospel first reveals / Here fleshly veils th'eternal Son conceals. / The law of life and spirit here takes place" and "Two sovereign champions here we find, / Satan and Christ contending for mankind (5.75-7, 85-6). Furthermore, as Hutchinson records God's consolation for Adam and Eve prior to their expulsion, she notes, "Before their necessary woes they felt, / Their feeble souls rich promises upheld / And their deliverance was in types revealed" (5.286-88). Like Milton, Hutchinson permits that God offers solace to Adam and Eve by informing them that Eve's seed will lead to redemption.

Though Hutchinson may appear to be in harmony with Milton's typological reading of God's punishment and consolation for Adam and Eve, she also overtly distinguishes herself from Milton and their shared Protestant background. As seen above, both poets acknowledge that the woman's seed will lead to the redemption of humankind (*PL* 10.179-91; *OD* 5.64-118).[14] But whereas Milton undermines women's participation in the redemption narrative by adhering to a patriarchal model of typology such as found

in Michael's prophecy, Hutchinson exalts women's roles as mothers and transfers the redemptive power to the womb:

> [M]others should maintain
> Posterity, not frighted with the pain,
> Which, though it make us mourn under the sense
> Of the first mother's disobedience
> Yet hath a promise that thereby she shall
> Recover all the hurt of her first fall
> When, in mysterious manner, from her womb
> Her father, brother, husband, son shall come. (5.221-28)

Most notably, the line "Of the first mother's disobedience" strikingly emulates the opening line of *Paradise Lost*—"Of man's first obedience." Just as Milton's "one greater man" will correct Adam's transgression and "[r]estore" humankind, Hutchinson's Eve will "recover all the hurt of her first fall" through her "posterity," an interesting parallel to Adam's posterity in Books 11 and 12 of *Paradise Lost* (*PL* 1.4, 5). Typically, the "father, brother, husband, [and] son" perpetuate the redemption narrative, but Hutchinson places power in the mother's womb, transforming it into the site of humankind's redemption. Hutchinson also equates childbirth and typology. By producing children, or fruit, "in mysterious manner," the womb rectifies Eve's fall via the fruit. Similar to the transformation of types to their antitypes, childbirth is also considered a "mysterious" process because "the pain" associated with childbirth corrects the "hurt" that Eve receives from "her first fall" and also offer redemption to humankind. Finally, the complex image of Eve's mothering "Her father, brother, husband, [and] son" anticipates Mary and exudes typological significance due to the various relationships that Eve and Mary share with Christ. Though a son, Christ paradoxically represents God, the father, in human form. He also stands as husband to the Christian church, an image that Eve prefigures.

At the passage's most hermeneutic level, Christ also becomes Mary's brother as reflected in the brother-sister relationship of their types, Adam and Eve. Indeed, Hutchinson has Adam first address Eve as "„My spouse, my sister'" after her creation (3.477). Hutchinson's densely rich one-line image creates the mother as an indispensable figure in the redemption narrative.

In the remaining fifteen cantos of *Order and Disorder*, Hutchinson presents the full effects of the mother's redemptive power that she has established in Eve through her characters Sarah and Rebecca. Her elevation of the mother's role in typology culminates in a "feminist appropriation of typology" that challenges the conventional patriarchal typology that often overshadows matriarchs such as Sarah and Rebecca.[15] Thus, in addition to becoming other types for Mary, Sarah and Rebecca propel the Old Covenant towards its fulfillment in the New Covenant, and they do so alongside and sometimes in spite of their husbands. As we turn from Eden and venture into Hutchinson's postlapsarian Genesis, we can see Sarah and Rebecca as mothers who offer redemption to women from "the first mother's disobedience."

Notes

---

[1] As will be explained later, in Book 11 Noah's and his sons' wives are briefly mentioned (11.736-37).

[2] Norbrook "A devine Originall."

[3] Norbrook charts his reasons for attribution to Hutchinson in three different articles: "„A devine Originall'"; "Lucy Hutchinson"; and "*Order and Disorder*."

[4] Norbrook "Lucy Hutchinson" 258.

[5] Woods 223.

[6] "**not…ad animum:** not to look so much to the work as to the intention" (Lewalski "Introduction" 5n64-65).

[7] Future references to Miller will be from her book *Engendering the Fall*, except where noted otherwise.

[8] Miller provides a concise overview of patriarchal theory and the leading supporters, such as Robert Filmer, and introduces contract theorists, such as Thomas Hobbes and John Locke, to show how the two theories differ in their theories of monarchial power. Hutchinson challenges Filmer while aligning herself with Hobbes and Locke (356). Though following the Biblical narrative, Hutchinson reworks Biblical language in order to give authority of children to mothers; no longer do the "women produce children for men," but both male and female share possession and dominion of children, such as the case with Sarah and Abraham ("Maternity, Marriage, and Contract" 366).

[9] See H.R. MacCallum's "Milton and Sacred History;" Barbara Lewalski's "Structure and the Symbolism of Vision;" Walker's "Typology and *Paradise Lost*;" and Regina Schwartz's "From Shadowy Types to Shadowy Types." For Milton and typology in general, see MacCallum's "Milton and Figurative Interpretation of the Bible" and William Madsen's *From Shadowy Types to Truth*.

[10] A comprehensive list of feminist readings of *Paradise Lost* would ideally require a much lengthier footnote; however, some of the most significant feminist assessments of the 1970s and 1980s can be divided into two camps: Milton as a misogynist or as proto-feminist. For the misogynistic Milton, see Christine Froula's "When Eve Reads Milton" and Sandra Gilbert's "Patriarchal Poetry and Women Readers." For studies that favor Milton as a champion of women, see Joseph Wittreich's *Feminist Milton*; Anne Ferry's "Milton's Creation of Eve;" and Diane McColley's *Milton's Eve*. Contemporary readings, however, embrace Milton's indeterminate portrayal of Eve, such as Elisabeth Liebert's "Rendering „More Equal'" and Peter Herman's "„The More to Draw His Love'" in *Destabilizing Milton.*

[11] I borrow the term "Eve's version" from a subheading in Norbook's introduction to *Order and Disorder*: "Eve's Version? Genesis, Women, and the Woman Writers."

[12] Norbrook "*Order and Disorder*" xxiii-xxiv.

[13] Norbrook *Order and Disorder* 47n97.

[14] Parenthetical citations that include *Order and Disorder* will be abbreviated as *OD*.

[15] Marie Loughlin employs the phrase "feminist appropriation of typology" to describe Amelia Lanyer's use of typology in *Salve Deus Rex Judaeorum* in which Lanyer constructs a women's literary history where her patrons become correlative types for Old Testament women (146).

CHAPTER 2

"Just Abraham" and "Noble" Sarah: Milton's and Hutchinson's Account of the Covenant Narrative

Gender politics are at the heart of *Paradise Lost*: in the creation scenes of Adam and Eve, in Adam and Eve's relationship, in their individual relationships with God, and, more importantly, in their postlapsarian roles as husband and wife and as redeemers of humankind. As a consequence of the Fall, God firmly establishes a gender hierarchy that incontestably signifies Eve's subordination to her husband, Adam. To alleviate Eve's condition, God informs Adam and Eve that she will redeem humankind through her womb. Eve prefigures "Mary second Eve" whose seed, Christ, will deliver a "fatal bruise" to Satan (10.183, 192). Twice, however, Eve questions her "worth" as regenerator and redeemer. When Adam hails her as "Mother of all Mankind," Eve promptly counters, "Ill worthy I such title should belong / To me transgressor, who for thee ordained / A help, became thy snare" (11.159, 163-65), a sentiment she repeats in her two final lines after receiving God's gift of "propitious, some great good / Presaging" dreams: "Such favour I unworthy am vouchsafed, / By me the promised seed shall all restore" (12.612-13, 622-23). That Eve voices discomfort with being labeled redeemer in her parting lines, the final speech of the epic, signals an overarching uncertainty about where Eve and other Biblical women stand in relation to the redemption narrative that

Milton depicts in Books 11 and 12. When coupled with Milton's subordination of Eve's dreams to Adam's visions and the absence of positive female types in Books 11 and 12, Eve's self-posed question of "worth" reveals a concern hidden behind the postlapsarian gender hierarchy that contributes to the complexities of Milton's gender politics in *Paradise Lost*: how can the "ill worthy" woman be spiritually equipped for the task of redeeming humankind, especially when compared to the "just" and righteous man?

Milton, however, was not the only seventeenth-century poet concerned with the redemption narrative. In *Order and Disorder*, Lucy Hutchinson offers a relatively short account of the Creation and Fall, which she follows with a highly detailed, comprehensive meditation on the postlapsarian world of Genesis. Her narrative specifically extends from the Creation in Genesis 1 to Jacob's flight from his father-in-law, Laban, in Genesis 30. Along the way, Hutchinson interrogates the role of women in the redemption narrative and seemingly addresses the lacuna that exists in *Paradise Lost* between Eve and her antitype Mary. One of the striking similarities between *Paradise Lost* and *Order and Disorder* is each poem's extensive focus on Abraham and Sarah, Genesis's other pair of first parents. Indeed, both Milton and Hutchinson elaborately rewrite the establishment of God's covenant with Abraham, a covenant which not only secures Abraham's role as father of Israel, but also anticipates the fulfillment of the New Covenant. In particular, each reworks Genesis 18.1-15, a chapter in which God confirms his covenant with Abraham by promising to make Sarah mother of Isaac, a type for Christ, and by association suggests that Sarah becomes a type for the mother of Christ, Mary. However, Milton's and Hutchinson's accounts of the covenant / redemption

narrative differ greatly. Whereas Milton provides two depictions of the establishment of God's covenant with Abraham—one prelapsarian and one postlapsarian—Hutchinson only relates it once. Milton's postlapsarian account of "just Abraham and his seed" and the covenant in Book 12 completely erases Sarah from the narrative (12.273), yet he includes her presence in his prelapsarian allusion to Genesis 18.1-15 in Book 5: Adam alludes to Abraham and, correspondingly, Eve alludes to Sarah. By figuratively inserting Sarah into the prelapsarian world through an allusion, Milton suggests that Old Testament mothers can only participate in the redemption narrative if they are purified through the Edenic Eve. In contrast, Hutchinson literally depicts the covenant narrative, from which she momentarily digresses to exalt Sarah, and illuminates the parallels between Sarah and Mary by casting Sarah as a "noble dame" who is spiritually equal to Milton's "just Abraham" in advancing the redemption narrative, despite residing in the tainted, postlapsarian world (*OD* 12.239; *PL* 12.273). Sarah then firmly secures for Eve the title of humankind's redeemer and, consequently, becomes another type for Mary.

As mentioned in the Introduction, Eve's exclusion from Michael's prophecy in Books 11 and 12 results in a postlapsarian world that is nearly devoid of females. In fact, the only women Milton depicts represent postlapsarian women as a "fair" Temptress, as a brief survey of Michael's relation of the antediluvian Genesis reveals. For instance, the first women that Adam sees are "a bevy of fair women, richly gay / In gems and wanton dress" who sing "soft amorous ditties" and cast "amorous nets" for men (11.582-83, 584, 586). "That fair female troupe," Michael explains, are descendants of Cain and "empty of all good wherein consists / Woman's domestic honour and chief praise" (11.614, 616-17). He later labels the women as "fair atheists" who lure in a "sober race of men," and

claims their unions result in “ill-matched marriages… / Where good with bad [are] matched” (11.625, 621, 684-85). Furthermore, the marriages produce male offspring who, when not delighting in war, participate in licentious activities: “marrying or prostituting” or “rape or adultery, where passing fair / Allured them” (12.716-18). As Michael continues to expound upon these “fair” women, he grammatically shifts his use of the word “fair” from adjective to noun, which serves to associate women with beauty but also equates the two. “Fair” then operates as synecdoche for the beautiful, sensual woman who leads to the destruction of humankind, for these women contaminate the “sober race of men,” thereby prompting God’s Deluge. In short, the antediluvian women are insufficient for the righteous task of redeeming humankind as promised to Eve in Book 10; rather, they only function to perpetuate the feminine type of the dangerously alluring Temptress, which Eve embodies in Book 9: Eve, the “fairest of creation,” offers Adam “that fair enticing fruit / With liberal hand,” and being “fondly overcome with female charm,” he accepts (9. 896; 9. 996-97, 9.999).

Yet even prior to Book 9 or Book 11, Milton’s word choice of “fair” inextricably links woman to sin and destruction in the first two books of *Paradise Lost*. For instance, Book 2 contains Milton’s grotesque allegory of Sin as a beautiful but frightening woman. As Satan approaches the gates of Hell, he recognizes a form that “seemed woman to the waist, and fair, / But ended foul in many a scaly fold” (2.650-51). Similarly, as Sin narrates her birth, she explains that she “sprung” “heavenly fair” from Satan’s head and was “once deemed so fair / In heaven” (2.758, 757, 748-49). Sin, like the “fair atheists” and the enticing Eve, has strong associations with destruction as her womb becomes a breeding house for “yelling monsters” who hourly repeat their conception and birth,

"bursting forth / Afresh with conscious terrors vex [her] round" (2.795, 800-801). As Miller argues, Milton offers the birth of Death and the hell-hounds "as a scene of horror," which exists as "the only account of female reproduction" in the epic, and connects the scene to "the final two books of *Paradise Lost*, where repression of the mother and her procreative power is most prominent" (111). By shaping Sin as an attractive yet destructive woman, Milton overtly connects the entrance of sin into the world to woman, both literally, as Satan promises that Sin and Death may return with him to the world after he corrupts man (2.838-44) and figuratively, as Eve's fair countenance helps to seduce Adam, which initiates the Fall. [1]

In addition to Sin who appears in Book 2, Milton offers an even earlier version of the "fair" woman in Book 1. In fact, the first appearance of "fair" in *Paradise Lost* comes as Milton catalogues the fallen angels, accommodating each to fit various Old Testament gods. [2] Milton writes of the goddess Astoreth that "Her temple on the offensive mountain, built / By that uxorious king, whose heart though large, / Beguiled by fair idolatresses" (1.443-45). Milton uses the reference to King Solomon, "that uxorious king" who is "beguiled by fair idolatresses," as an intricate foreshadowing of the future narrative events of his epic. The passage primarily prefigures Adam's yielding to Eve in Book 9. Like the "uxorious king" Solomon, Adam, the sovereign of Eden, is also "beguiled" by a "fair" woman. Alastair Fowler mentions in a footnote the typological connection to Adam and Solomon, stating that while "typology linked Solomon with both Adam and Christ[,]" in this instance, Solomon's "uxoriousness shadows Adam's" (85n403). If Solomon functions as a type for Adam, then the "fair idolatresses" that entice Solomon parallel Eve's negative type as the Temptress, as

aforementioned. In addition to the overt correlation between Solomon and Adam, the reference to the "fair idolatresses" simultaneously foreshadows and references back to the "fair atheists" found in Book 11. Though the "fair idolatresses" prefigure the "fair atheists" of Book 11 in the narrative of *Paradise Lost*, a closer analysis of where the "fair idolatresses" chronologically fit into the narrative of the Old Testament reveals that they are from 1 Kings whereas the "fair atheists" of Book 11 are in Genesis. Thus, Milton suggests that Old Testament women are *all* Temptresses. Milton capitalizes on a non-linear plot characteristic of the epic, strategically enclosing the prelapsarian Eden with postlapsarian images of "fair" impious women. As a result, Eve and other Old Testament women of the postlapsarian world are always already the fair Temptress. "Fair," then, denotes, not just connotes, an innately beautiful and sensual woman, suggesting that the postlapsarian world contains no fair women who are likewise righteous. The positive feminine type of the pure "fair" woman can only be located within Eden. Thus, when Eve wakes from her dream in Book 12, she unwittingly identifies the truth of future Old Testament women when she claims that she is "unworthy" to redeem humankind (12.622).

In contrast to the Old Testament women who fulfill the type of the "fair" Temptress, Milton casts the Old Testament men who participate in the redemption narrative as righteous and "just." In Book 11, after Michael discusses the "fair women," he reveals the Deluge that purges the corruptive postlapsarian world. He informs Adam that humankind depends upon Noah, the "one just man alive," an epithet that establishes Noah as a righteous redeemer of humankind (11.818). Adam echoes the epithet as he "rejoices" in Noah, the "one man found so perfect and so just, / That God vouchsafes to

raise another world / From him" (12.875; 876-78). Typologically, Noah recapitulates and supersedes Adam and anticipates Christ, for both the repopulation of the world and the redemption of humankind depend upon Noah.

Abraham serves as another key figure in typology of the redemption narrative since both Noah and Abraham function as typological forefathers in the lineage of Christ, an idea that Adam reinforces when he uses "just" to describe Abraham (12.273). After the Deluge, the world again regresses into a corruptive state, so God finds "one peculiar nation to select / From all the rest" and elects Abraham, the "one faithful man," with whom to establish his covenant (12.111-12, 113). Michael not only gives an account of the covenant but also explains its typological significance to Adam:

> [A]ll nations of the earth
> Shall in his seed be blessèd; by that seed
> Is meant thy great deliverer, who shall bruise
> The Serpent's head[.] (12.147-50)

As will be detailed, Michael's declaration of Abraham as father to the seed "who shall bruise / The serpent's head" echoes God's promise to Eve in Book 10—"her seed shall bruise thy [the Serpent's] head" (10.181). Thus, Michael elides the importance of the mother in his reference, giving redemptive authority to the patriarch. Additionally, while he incorporates "Just Abraham" into the redemption narrative, he neglects to acknowledge Sarah's role as bearer of the seed. Likewise, when Michael narrates that Abraham fathers "a son and of his son a grandchild… / Like him in faith, wisdom, and renown," he again fails to mention Sarah (12.153-54). Both instances suggest that reproduction and redemption reside solely in men's loins, creating an obvious typological gap between the type, Eve, and her antitype, Mary. Though Genesis incorporates Sarah

as essential to God's covenant with Abraham, for it is she and not the maid Hagar whom God ordains to bear Isaac, Milton simply elides Sarah's presence.[3] In an analysis of the covenant, Miller notes, "only at the point that the line to Mary and Christ is established can women's role in the production of humankind be acknowledged in Milton's poem," especially in the final two books (112). Extending this observation, Mary functions as a pure woman unlike the "bevy of fair women" or the "fair atheists" of Book 11, which allows Milton to acknowledge her role in the lineage of Christ: "A virgin is his mother, but his sire / The power of the most high" (12.368-69). Throughout the final two books, Milton sharply contrasts the "just" men, Noah and Abraham, with the "fair" irreligious women, and because he cannot seem to reconcile the differences—or possibly fathom another set of "ill-matched marriages… / Where good with bad [are] matched"—Milton envisions establishing a redemption narrative devoid of Old Testament women (11.684-85). Similar to the Deluge that God sends to purify the immoral world, Milton cleanses his account of the redemption narrative in Books 11 and 12 of women, depicting it as one solely dependent on the "just" patriarchs of the Old Testament.

However, before fully arraigning Milton for his elision of Old Testament women from the redemption narrative in Books 11 and 12, we must consider his earlier account of the same narrative in Book 5. When Michael declares to Adam that the "fair female troupe" of seductresses are "empty of all good wherein consists / Woman's domestic honour and chief praise," he indicates that a woman's righteousness stems from domesticity (11.614, 616-17). Taking Michael's advice, the reader should consult the most recognizably domestic scene in *Paradise Lost* to locate a "good" woman: Eve's preparation of a meal for Raphael's visit in Book 5. Paradoxically enough, it is within

the prelapsarian world where Milton authorizes the postlapsarian Sarah to participate in the redemption narrative, alluding to her through Eve's domesticity. Eve must figuratively represent Sarah because, as noted above, the only pure Old Testament woman found in *Paradise Lost* is the prelapsarian Eve.

In Book 5, Raphael's arrival in Eden and his interaction with Adam and Eve alludes to Genesis 18.1-15, in which the Lord visits Abraham to inform him that Sarah "shall have a son" (Gen. 18.10).[4] When Abraham sees the Lord, he rushes to greet him and offers to prepare a meal for his divine guest, which the Lord accepts. Adam then "hastens" to Sarah and commands her to "make ready quickly three measures of fine meal, knead it, and make cakes upon the hearth," never informing her why she is to prepare the food (Gen. 18.6). While Abraham and the Lord converse, Sarah remains in the tent and inwardly "laughs" upon hearing the Lord's promise that she will bear a son (Gen. 18.10-12). The Lord's stern reprimand of Sarah's questioning of him concludes the section.

In the prelapsarian allusion to a postlapsarian event, Milton adheres to the fundamental plot of Genesis but deviates in the specific details. Thus, Raphael visits Adam at noon, as Adam sits "in the door" of "his cool bower" while Eve remains "within," which mirrors the opening of Genesis 18 (5.299, 300, 303). Milton also records the preparation of the meal for the divine guest along with the conversation that takes place between guest and host. He even has Raphael address Eve, just as the Lord addresses Sarah. Milton, however, predominately digresses from Genesis in order to give Eve agency in the scene, which greatly distinguishes her from Sarah. For instance, when Adam spots Raphael, he tells Eve to "haste hither" to witness Raphael's entrance into the

garden and to “go with speed / And what thy stores contain bring forth and pour / Abundance” (5. 308, 311-15). Adam repeats the word “haste,” as found in Genesis 18.6, and requests that Eve gather food for a meal, just as Abraham asks of Sarah. Adam, however, does this prior to greeting Raphael, unlike Abraham, who meets the Lord first and then speaks with Sarah. Further, Eve challenges Adam’s request to prepare the meal with “abundance” whereas Sarah never questions Abraham (5.320-330).[5] Finally, unlike Sarah, who remains unseen inside the tent, Eve interacts with Adam and Raphael while performing her domestic duties of preparing the food and serving it to both.

Despite these minor variations, Raphael’s salute to Eve demonstrates the allusion’s most important departure from the source text, which carries significant implications in Milton’s version of the redemption narrative:

> …On whom the angel Hail
> Bestowed, the holy salutation used
> Long after to blest Mary, second Eve.
>   Hail mother of mankind, whose fruitful womb
> Shall fill the world more numerous with thy sons
> Than with these various fruits the trees of God
> Have heaped this table… (5.385-91)

Raphael’s greeting prefigures numerous postlapsarian events. Primarily, as already noted, Raphael represents the Lord of Genesis 18 who promises that Sarah “shall have a son” (Gen. 18.10) and alludes to God’s covenant with Abraham to make Sarah “a mother of nations” from whom “kings of people” will arise (Gen. 17.16). Raphael also shadows the angel Gabriel in the Gospel of Luke who informs Mary of her of her pregnancy with Christ. Additionally, his phrase “fruitful womb” references Elisabeth’s statement to Mary: “blessed is the fruit of thy womb” (Luke 1.28; 1.42).[6] In regard to *Paradise Lost*, Raphael acts as an inter-textual figure who anticipates two other characters. First, “the

oracle" in Book 10 refers to Jesus as "son of Mary second Eve" (10.182, 183); and second, Adam repeats Raphael's salute when he addresses Eve as such, "Hail to thee, / Eve rightly called, Mother of all Mankind" (12.158-59). Raphael subtly bridges the gap between Eve and antitype Mary by paralleling Eve to Sarah and, by extension, Sarah to Mary. Thus Milton's allusion to Sarah through Eve ostensibly elevates Sarah's participation in the redemption narrative and enables her inclusion in typology.

A closer reading of Raphael's "holy salutation," however, reveals a correlation of Eve to Abraham, which Milton champions. In particular, Raphael's promise that Eve will "fill the world more numerous with thy sons" than the amount of food that is on the table destabilizes her connection to Sarah, for the statement echoes God's promise to Abraham about his progeny being as numerous as the stars (Gen. 15.5). The ambiguous use of the plural form of "son" also signals a difference between Eve and Sarah. "Sons" could very well signify Eve's future generations, which does not differentiate her from Sarah, who God promises to make "a mother of nations" (Gen. 17.16). Or, quite literally, "sons" could refer to Eve's three immediate sons—Abel, Cain, and Seth—which would then align her with Abraham. Though Abraham and Sarah are married, Sarah only mothers Isaac while Abraham fathers sons by two different wives, Isaac (Sarah) and Ishmael (Hagar). Thus, combined with the abundant amount of fruit on the table, which mirrors God's reference to the numerous stars, the reference to Eve's "sons" strongly suggests a much more prominent connection to Abraham than to Sarah because both produce multiple heirs in two senses. In fact, Michael repeats Raphael's link between Eve and Abraham, which shifts our focus away from Eve's allusion to Sarah, in his relation of God's covenant with Abraham. By Abraham's "seed / Is meant thy great

deliverer, who shall bruise / The serpent's head," a promise God also makes about Eve's seed when he condemns the serpent—"Her seed shall bruise thy head" (12.148-50; 10.181). Thus, both Eve and Abraham redeem the world through their seeds. Here Milton fully disassociates Sarah from her type, Eve, and their antitype, Mary.

Milton's eagerness to hint at Sarah's participation in the redemption narrative, only to undermine it, becomes more apparent with a return to the covenant narrative in Book 12 that considers the full implications of Adam's identification of "Just Abraham" (12.273). When Michael concludes his account of the entrance of Abraham's descendants into Canaan, Adam exclaims,

> Enlightener of my darkness, gracious things
> Thou hast revealed, those chiefly which concern
> Just Abraham and his seed: now first I find
> Mine eyes true opening, and my heart much eased,
> Of me and all mankind; but now I see
> His day in whom all nations shall be blest,
> Favour unmerited by me, who sought
> Forbidden knowledge by forbidden means. (12.271-79)

While the phrase "Just Abraham and his seed" serves as an indicator of Abraham's and his male descendants' righteousness, it also signals the exclusive nature of Christ's ancestry in so much that only males, such as Abraham and his seed, can participate in the redemption narrative. In the passage, Adam's emphasis on his experience—"my darkness," "mine eyes," "my heart," "of me," and "unmerited by me"—combined with his references to men—"Abraham and his seed," "all mankind," and "his day"—stresses the patriarchy in which Milton steeps his account of the redemption narrative. By heralding the paternity of Christ, Milton refuses to acknowledge the maternal lineage of Christ and restricts the patriarchs' wives, such as Sarah, to a procreative role, which

Milton highlights when he mentions the "four wives" of Noah and his sons in the Flood narrative (11.737). Milton's passing reference to the wives serves to satisfy questions of regeneration, for the wives only appear in this singular line without any additional commentary from Milton, leaving the postdiluvian world seemingly devoid of women. Thus, while Milton's allusion to Sarah through the prelapsarian Eve certainly hints at the possibility of an Old Testament woman's participation in humankind's redemption, Eve undermines any such chance when she initiates the Fall. Interestingly, Adam's invective against Eve after the Fall resonates with his exultation of "Just Abraham and his seed" in Book 12. Adam denounces Eve as "crooked by nature" and desires disassociation from Eve: "Well if thrown out, as supernumerary / To my *just* number found" (10.885, 887-88 emphasis added). He questions why God created such a "fair defect" and did "not fill the world at once / With men" or "find some other way to generate / Mankind" (10.891, 892-93, 894-95). Within his diatribe, we see the creation of the postlapsarian types of "just" men and "fair" women and the incipient stage of a patriarchal redemption narrative that not only desires to exclude women but also yearns for a divorce from the essential reliance on women for procreation. Ultimately, in Milton's postlapsarian world, Old Testament women become a part of the "bevy of fair women," and Milton does not figure key matriarchs, such as Sarah, into the lineage of Christ (11.582). Like Adam claims of Eve, Milton casts Old Testament women as "supernumerary" to the patriarchs' "just number found" (10.887, 888).

Finally, Adam's praise of Michael's revelation of "Just Abraham" mirrors Eve's waking praise of God and the dreams he sends to her. While Adam foresees "gracious things," Eve's dreams are "propitious [and] some great good" dreams (12. 271; 12.612).

Likewise, his phrase “favour unmerited by me” certainly resonates with Eve’s final statement of “Such favour I unworthy,” both of which voice concern about their roles as redeemers (12.278; 12.622). Yet Milton’s placement of their concerns differentiates Adam’s and Eve’s security in their roles. Adam’s self-doubt precedes the completion of Michael’s prophecy and, thus, allows for Adam’s recantation whereas Eve’s concern is in her penultimate line, leaving her unsure about her position in the redemption narrative. As Adam and Eve venture out of Eden “hand in hand,” Milton leaves us wondering if the future Old Testament women could ever justifiably fill the lacuna that exists between Eve and Mary (12.648).

Shortly after the publication of *Paradise Lost* in 1667, Lucy Hutchinson returned to the Genesis story to propose an alternative ending for postlapsarian women.[7] Like Milton, Hutchinson, too, is interested in the Christian history as presented in Genesis and, even more so than Milton, seems intrigued by the postlapsarian world, which is the primary subject of *Order and Disorder*. As she interrogates the role of women in a world tainted by sin, she refigures the unfavorable image of the “fair women” that Milton provides in order to recast women’s role as central to the redemption narrative. In fact, she literally presents Sarah as an alluring postlapsarian woman who is also a “noble dame” sufficient for the covenant narrative, instead of eliding her presence or presenting her only through allusion as Milton does. Furthermore, though willfully confined by the narrative limitations of a direct retelling of the covenant narrative, Hutchinson capitalizes on key parallels that exist in the Bible between Sarah and Mary in order to shape Sarah’s active participation in the redemption of humankind and offers her as a parallel to Milton’s “Just Abraham.”

Interestingly, Hutchinson reinterprets Milton's image of woman as a "fair" Temptress who only leads to mankind's destruction. She narrates the same antediluvian world as Michael does in Book 11 of *Paradise Lost*, but Hutchinson is careful not to reinforce the idea that all women taint mankind. First, she recasts women as victims in Satan's plan to corrupt men. Whereas Michael shows that the "bevy of fair women" in the postlapsarian world actively pursue men by singing "soft amorous ditties" to lure them (12.582, 584), the women of Hutchinson's postlapsarian world are implemented by Satan who "calls his mates to arms, / Consults how to disturb the Church's peace" and determines that women are a "pleasant lure" for men (6.454-55, 465). Satan explains that man "is not flesh and blood that can endure the sweet attraction of their sparkling eyes" (6.467-68). Thus, the women who are a "sweet attraction" do not willfully ensnare men, but only do so because of Satan's influence. Even the women who do "from God seduce [men's] charmed hearts" do so because of "those subtle arts" which "the Devil taught them" (6.501, 502, 503). Though she does not totally excuse postlapsarian women from sin, she does not fully blame them either, creating a relatively innocent picture of the "fair" woman. Even more fascinating is Hutchinson's depiction of the union of "Cain's lovely daughters" and "the Sons of God" which produces "a brood / That stained the earth with violence and blood" (6.533, 534, 541-42). Similar to Michael's narration of Cain's female descendants, the "fair atheists," who pollute "that sober race of men" also called "the sons of God" (11.625,621, 622), Hutchinson shows that a union between sensual women and pure men does lead to a corrupted world that necessitates the Deluge, but she presents the interactions between women and men as different from Michael. Whereas Michael claims that men turned to "marrying or prostituting, as befell, / Rape of

adultery, where passing fair / Allured them" (12.716-18), casting women as the catalyst for corruption, Hutchinson once again presents women as victims of men's wanton desires:

> His neighbour's wife each potent lecher took,
> Each wild adulterer his own forsook;
> No more could modest flight secure from rape;
> Chaste virgins could not ravishers escape. (7.45-8)

Here, too, women are not the initiators of humankind's depravity, but are rather forced to participate in the downfall of humankind, which Hutchinson emphasizes through her phrase "chaste virgins." Unlike Milton's vision of an antediluvian world where only fair and innately sinful women exist, Hutchinson envisions a world which contains "modest" and "chaste" women who, despite their attempts, cannot "escape" brutish men.

Because Hutchinson can imagine "modest" and "chaste" women in the postlapsarian world, she need not suppress their presence in the redemption narrative or disguise them through allusions as Milton does with Sarah. Furthermore, she can imagine a new feminine type that modifies that of the "fair" Temptress. Sarah, for instance, is "fair" and can "enamour" men with her "sparkling eyes" (11.47, 49, 53). Furthermore, Sarah also becomes mother of Israel in God's covenant with Abraham, thereby suggesting an union of beauty and righteousness in women that Milton fails to represent. As a result, Hutchinson enthusiastically provides a literal depiction of a "fair" Sarah who is not tainted by the postlapsarian world.

In fact, Hutchinson's depiction of Genesis 18.1-15 reverses Milton's placement of the postlapsarian allusion into a prelapsarian world when she extols the meal that Sarah prepares for her and Abraham's divine guest:

> How happy times that primitive age enjoyed!
> Nature was not with strange excess cloyed.
> Firm was their health then when their food was plain;
> By surfeits caused, diseases did not reign.
> O how sweet peace doth relish these plain fruits
> Which the poor rural garden contributes. (12.215-21)

Milton and Hutchinson's accounts are not without similarities. Hutchinson's languages echoes that Eve's objection to Adam's request to "pour / abundance" for the meal with Raphael (5.314-15). As Eve suggests that "small store will serve" and that they should "Save what by frugal storing firmness gains" (5.322, 324), Hutchinson too admires an thrifty, "plain" diet. Also, she refers to the prepared food as "fruit" as Raphael does, possibly a hint at Isaac as Sarah's "fruit." However, these are the only apparent similarities between Milton's and Hutchinson's accounts of Genesis 18. Hutchinson's postlapsarian world juxtaposes the one depicted by Milton. For example, her vision of a postlapsarian Nature devoid of "strange excess" and "diseases" contradicts the portrait that Milton gives in Book 11 where Michael shows Adam "a lazar-house" full of "numbers of all diseased" (11.479, 480). Thus, the "primitive" postlapsarian world possibly is not as tainted as Milton imagines. More importantly, as Hutchinson continues to describe the postlapsarian world, she also praises the "great women" who live in it:

> Great women were not delicate and nice,
> Bred up in idleness, the nurse of vice.
> Luxurious diet made them not unchaste,
> Nor did the stock of living creatures waste.
> Queens their own hands to housewifery applied,
> They spun the wool and they the scarlet dyed.
> They with the honourable ladies wrought,
> And by example the mean damsels taught. (12.227-34)

Hutchinson offers a different image of postlapsarian women than what Michael provides when he claims that the "fair female troupe" that Adam sees are "empty of all good

wherein consist / Woman's domestic honour and chief praise" (11.614, 616-17). "Great women" like Hutchinson's postlapsarian Sarah do embody "domestic honour," prompting Hutchinson's "chief praise" of a modest, "primitive" work ethic. Even postlapsarian "queens their own hands to housewifery applied." Though the prelapsarian world is lost, Hutchinson suggests that an honest work ethic even in the postlapsarian world can possibly recover Eden. Hutchinson establishes in this passage not only a juxtaposition of postlapsarian and prelapsarian worlds but of postlapsarian and contemporary worlds, as will be later discussed in Chapter 2. She ends her praise of domesticity by noting that the "honourable ladies" "did not flattering courtships attend, / Nor did the men their hours so vainly spend" (12.235-36). Thus, Sarah offers a model for seventeenth-century aristocratic women to imitate. In ending her interval of exultation, Hutchinson continues the Genesis episode with Sarah who, "though a noble dame, made bread" (12.239). Hutchinson's brief moment of praise refutes Wilcher's claim that she merely "paraphrases the biblical text" (310) and instead operates as a digression, a possibly transgressive one, that permits a new type for postlapsarian women to fill. In contrast to Milton who only commends Abraham's faith and uprightness in an unjust world, Hutchinson offers praise to the modest, domestic Sarah. In extension, similar to the "just" Abraham who operates as a type for Adam, Hutchinson's "noble" Sarah functions similarly for Eve. Indeed, it is this "fair" and "noble" postlapsarian Sarah that Hutchinson incorporates into a matriarchal typology.

In Canto 12 of *Order and Disorder*, Hutchinson recounts Genesis 15 through Genesis 18, in which she ascribes agency to Sarah's role in the salvation of humankind and weaves Sarah into a matriarchal typology in which Sarah recapitulates Eve and

prefigures Mary. First, Hutchinson uses the image of fruit as an example of typology to connect Eve, Sarah, and Mary. Just as Eve falls because she eats of "the fruit of the tree" (Gen. 3.3-6), Mary redeems the world by mothering Christ, "the fruit of [her] womb" (Luke 1.42). In Hutchinson's retelling of Eve's fall and God's punishment of her, she casts the mother's curse as part of woman's redemption. Because "Eve sinned in fruit forbid…God requires / Her penance in the fruit of her desires" (5.129-30). So, Eve's children Cain and Abel are both referred to as fruit: Cain is "man's first fruit" and Abel the "new fruit" (6.17, 6.27). More importantly, fruit takes on typological significance as Hutchinson further intertwines the fall and redemption of humankind through Eve when she claims "from [Eve's] womb / Her father, brother, husband, son shall come" (5.227-28). Thus, Eve can produce literal fruit in the births of her sons Cain and Abel, or her fruit can allude to humankind's future redemption through Christ, the "father, brother, husband, [and] son" of Eve's womb. Interestingly, Hutchinson uses the same related images of fruit and redemption when she relates God's establishment of his covenant with Abraham and his explanation that Sarah will be the mother of the covenant and not Hagar:

> „And now my promises shall take effect,
> Nor shalt thou long the blessèd seed expect.
> Yet not from Hagar's but from Sarah's womb
> The children of the covenant shall come,
> And ere twelve moons have compassed the earth
> Her ripe fruit shall receive a happy birth.' (12.167-72)

Here, Hutchinson uses a parallel structure and rhyme scheme to equate Eve's role with Sarah, casting both as mothers who redeem humankind through their children. God's statement that "from Sarah's womb / The children of the covenant shall come" precisely

mirrors Hutchinson's earlier claim about Eve that "from her womb / Her father, brother, husband, son shall come." Sarah becomes incorporated into a matriarchal typology as "the children of the covenant" she births represent the Old Covenant that waits fulfillment in the New Covenant, or Christ, the "father, brother, husband, son" of Eve /Mary.

Having employed the image of fruit to align Sarah with Eve and Mary, Hutchinson depicts the establishment of the covenant with Sarah in Genesis 18.1-15 as a prefiguration of the Annunciation narrative of Luke 1. Because Hutchinson confines her narrative to a literal translation of Genesis, she never directly mentions Mary in her account of the covenant narrative; however, underlying similarities exist between Sarah and Mary's pregnancies. For instance, Sarah and Mary share an improbability of conception. Sarah is old and barren while Mary is a virgin (Gen. 16.1, 17.17, and 18.11-12; Matthew 1.23, Luke 1.27). Hutchinson, too, notes the improbability of Sarah's pregnancy through both Abraham and Sarah's laughter at the possibility of birth (12.173-176; 251-252). The actual conceptions of Sarah's and Mary's sons are similar in that in both cases a divine presence appears before the women to announce their pregnancy, and in both instances, the women question the message brought to them. When Sarah hears of the Lord's promise to Abraham, she "laugh[s] within herself" and questions, "Shall I of a surety bear a child, which am old" (Gen. 18.12; *OD* 12.250-253). Similarly, when Gabriel hails Mary, she is "troubled at his saying, and cast[s] in her mind what of salutation this should be" (Luke 1.29). Due to the women's internal doubt of the messages they hear, the divine presence responds to them: the Lord rebukes Sarah while Gabriel consoles Mary, telling her to "fear not" (Gen. 18.13-15, Luke 1.30). Just as Mary

"sums up, perfects, and reverses the action of Eve in the Garden," Mary corrects Sarah's mistrust of the Lord.[8] Sarah represents faithlessness when she laughs at the thought of having a child at such an old age; Mary, on the other hand, faithfully believes Gabriel's message even though she is a virgin. Finally, as noted above, the sons of Sarah and Mary share an intricate typological relationship. Sarah mothers Isaac (*OD* 14.253-58), who then fathers Jacob (*OD* 15.307-08, 17.85-158), whose name changes to Israel (Gen. 32.28, 36.10-12)—the name for God's chosen nation and people. Mary's son Christ, in return, stands as antitype for Isaac, and Christ also delivers Israel (Luke 1.68). Throughout Hutchinson's account, Sarah stands as a mediator from Eve to Mary as she serves to facilitate the lineage of Christ, the seed that is promised to Eve.

After Sarah gives birth to Isaac, Hutchinson does not relate much else about Sarah, only returning to her where the plot of Genesis allows. We briefly get an account of Abraham and Sarah's travel through another kingdom, of Sarah's conflict with her maid Hagar and her son Ishmael, and finally of Sarah's death. Thus, we do not see her play any larger role in the covenant / redemption narrative than that of being mother to Isaac. However, prior to Sarah's death, Hutchinson does introduce Sarah's successors in the redemption narrative and in matriarchal typology: Rebecca and Jacob's wives. In relating the family of Abraham's brother, Nahor, and his brother's wife, Milcah, Hutchinson writes of Nahor and Milcah's sons and states that

> Of Milcah's eight sons Bethuel was one,
> The father of Rebecca, and his son
> Laban was father of both Jacob's wives,
> From whom great Israel's stock itself derives. (15.305-08)

Likewise, in the verses that precede Sarah's death, Genesis records Rebecca as part of Nahor's lineage, but does not mention Laban nor Jacob and Jacob's wives (Gen. 23.22-4). Thus, Hutchinson offers a rare moment of foreshadowing in her text, for in her description of Rebecca, she looks forward to Rebecca's son Jacob and his role in the covenant that God has recently established with Abraham and Sarah. Yet, she refigures the establishment of Israel through the wives of Jacob, claiming that from them that "great Israel's stock itself derives." Obviously interested in the postlapsarian mother's role in the redemption narrative, Hutchinson does not wish to undermine the matriarchal typology that she has begun to explore in her depiction of Sarah; therefore, she introduces Sarah's successors at the moment prior to Sarah's death as a way to emphasize the importance of wives and mothers in God's covenant and to also transfer Sarah's role as mother of Isaac to Rebecca, who becomes Isaac's wife and Jacob's mother. Essentially, where Sarah's life concludes, Rebecca's story begins, a story that I will turn to in Chapter 2.

* * *

In the closing moments of *Paradise Lost*, Michael and Adam descend from the mountain "of speculation," and Michael gives Adam authority to share "at season fit" the news of redemption with Eve (12.589, 597). An exuberant Adam rushes to Eve, only to "[find] her waked" and then listens as she informs him that she already knows his tidings of redemption, "For God is also in sleep and dreams advise / Which he hath sent propitious, some great good / Presaging" (12.608, 611-13), yet this information is all we get. Hutchinson's account of a postlapsarian Genesis supplies us with greater insight into Eve's dreams and into woman's role as redeemer, as evidenced through Sarah. First

described by Hutchinson as “fair” (11.47), Sarah has “sparkling eyes” (11.53) and possesses the ability to “enamour” men (11.49). She offers an alternative to Milton’s description of the “fair women richly gay” (11.582) that permits the possibility for a woman who can be attractive without being a Temptress. Furthermore, Sarah can begin to restore Eve’s sense of self-worth in the redemption narrative. She, in effect, becomes a “second Eve” who can rightfully assert her role as mother in the covenant narrative, which anticipates Mary and her son Christ, the mother-son pair of the New Covenant.

Joseph Wittreich once observed of *Paradise Lost* that “Milton’s poem depicts a man’s world but with the alarming sense that such a world may be finished; that certain forms of masculinity stand as a wall between this world and the promised paradise” (247). He explains that the responses to *Paradise Lost*, like that of Sir Allen Apsley’s *Order and Disorder*, signify Milton’s transgressive maneuvers in areas regarding gender, religion, and politics. In relation to Eve’s place in gender hierarchy, Wittreich asserts that Apsley felt threatened by Milton and used *Order and Disorder* to correct Milton’s transgressions such as “the representation of Eve as consoler and comforter, as the immediate agent in man’s redemption and in history’s restoration; the admission of Eve to the company of prophets and exaltation of her as bearer of both the seed and the word” (251-52). Though Wittreich cannot be faulted for his identification of the author of *Order and Disorder* as a man or his concentration on only the first five cantos of the epic given that his argument pre-dates Norbrook’s identification of Hutchinson as author and the addition of fifteen extra cantos, Wittreich’s argument calls for a reevaluation. His optimistic stance that Eve is elevated in the gender hierarchy through her role “as the immediate agent in man’s redemption and in history’s restoration” is subverted by

placing Hutchinson's the "fair" and "noble" Sarah in opposition to Milton's "unworthy" Eve (*OD* 11.47, 12.239, *PL* 12.622). Furthermore, Hutchinson's role as our "enlightener of [Eve's] darkness" (*PL* 12.271) enables us to fully see that while Eve might receive agency in "man's redemption," it is to Eve alone among the Genesis matriarchs like Sarah in *Order and Disorder* that Milton grants this reward. Milton's narrative of Christian history, indeed, remains "a man's world," but shows no signs that "such a world may be finished."

Notes

[1] Gilbert famously links Satan, Sin, and Eve in "Patriarchal Poetry and Women Readers." After tracing similarities between Satan and Eve, Gilbert suggests that Eve's associations with Sin strengthen Milton's deliberate equating of Satan and Eve: "For not only is Sin female, like Eve, she is serpentine, as Satan is and as Adam tells Eve *she* is….In addition, with her fairness ironically set against foulness, Sin parodies Adam's fearful sense of the tension between Eve's „outward show / Elaborate' and her „inward less exact'" (373).

[2] My reading of "fair" in this section largely comes from Madsen's chapter "Fair Eve" in *From Shadowy Types to Truth* in which he effectively traces Milton's of *fair*. He also references the "fair idolatresses" as the first instance of the word in the epic. By the end of his discussion, he connects the sinful Eve to Sin: "what began as „fair and good' ends „foul in many a scaly fold' (II.651)" (155).

[3] See specifically Genesis 17.15-21.

[4] Genesis 18.1 claims that the Lord visits Adam, but 18.2 states that three men address Adam. To avoid confusion, I will use "the Lord" in reference to this allusion. On Raphael's visit as an allusion to Genesis 18.1-15, see Alastair Fowler, who notes 5.299-300 as "imitating Abraham's entertainment of three angels [Gen.18:1]" (299 fn. 299-300). Additionally, in a footnote to *PL* 11.237, Fowler references 5.350-52 and writes, "Adam goes alone to meet the angel. Conferring on Eve behavior ascribed to Sarah; see Gen. 18:6-15" (610 fn. 237). In *Three Centuries of Commentary,* Earl Miner cites Henry J. Todd as stating, "The ensuing episode of food and hospitality is from Genesis 18 at large" and notes Patrick Hume as the first to recognize the allusion to Genesis 18.1 (215).

[5] Critics who argue in favor of Milton's depiction of Eve typically cite her domesticity in Book 5 as the place of her greatest agency. Ann Gulden, for instance, links Eve's preparation of the meal to her wisdom, suggesting that "through her domestic ability" Eve "can be seen to mediate the message Raphael brings" (137). She also identifies "commentaries on *Proverbs* 31, which are concerned with the elevation of domesticity to a form of wisdom" (138).

[6] Alastair Fowler does note the allusion to Luke 1.28 but not 1.42 (305 fn. 385-387).

[7] In his introduction to *Order and Disorder*, Norbrook suggests that Hutchinson could have began her epic as early as 1664 but more than likely, she started or, at least, resumed her composition of it post-1667. He bases his reasoning on the fact that Hutchinson would have been occupied with other various writings that she did in the early 1660s and that *Order and Disorder* shares "several apparent parallels with *Paradise Lost*" ("*Order and Disorder*" xvii; xvi-xvii).

[8] Galdon 75.

CHAPTER 3

"Pious fraud": Rebecca and the Narrative of Divine Deception

As seen in the previous chapter, Hutchinson embarks upon filling her postlapsarian Genesis with elaborate portrayals of Adam and Eve's progeny, such as Abraham and Sarah. Her attention to these other "first" parents establishes a gendered interest in the redemption narrative, which continues in her depiction of Abraham's extended family. Milton, on the other hand, avoids lengthy narratives of Abraham's direct descendants, Isaac and Jacob, two essential figures in the lineage of Christ. In fact, as Michael catalogues the numerous members of Abraham's holy descendants such as Moses and David, who are other types for Christ, he quickly dismisses Isaac and Jacob in two lines. From "*faithful* Abraham," claims Michael, only "a Son, and of his Son a Grand-childe leaves, / Like him in faith, in wisdom, and renown" (12.153-54). Though Michael later specifically names Abraham's "Son" and "Grand-childe" he does so very quickly, and only in reference to the Israelites inheritance of Canaan: "Till Israel overcome; so call the third / From Abraham, son of Isaac, and from him / His whole descent, who thus shall Canaan win" (12.267-69). Thus Michael confines Isaac and Jacob's participation in the redemption narrative to five lines, a mere blink of the eye in relation to *Paradise Lost*'s massiveness. True, the dismissal of Isaac and Jacob could

easily be explained by Adam's statement that Michael only relates events that "chiefly…concern / Just Abraham and his seed" (12.272-73), yet the fact remains that Abraham's "seed" does "chiefly" include Isaac and Jacob, who are crucial members of Abraham's family because they fulfill the covenant between him and God. Also, by quickly passing over Isaac's and Jacob's participation in the redemption narrative, Michael leaves unrelated key typological events, such as Abraham's sacrifice of Isaac and, more importantly, Isaac's blessing of his son Jacob, which secures Jacob's position in God's covenant and the redemption narrative. The implications of Michael's failure to relate such events and to negate Isaac and Jacob suggest a source of discomfort for Milton, one that, I believe, is not disconnected from the lack of positive female types in the final two books. In fact, the two exclusions coincide with one another other, for what lies at the center of the father-son relationship of Isaac and Jacob is a woman. For Milton, the anxiety over writing about Isaac, Jacob, and Rebecca and the blessing episode rests in a matriarch's ordained deception of a feeble, blind patriarch.

Simply put, Rebecca poses a threat to the lessons of patriarchy that Michael strives to instill in Adam as he relates the redemption narrative. Throughout *Paradise Lost*, divine authority figures constantly reinforce the gender hierarchy established by God and rebuke Adam for his desire to eagerly submit to Eve. Prior to the Fall, Raphael warns Adam of yielding his subjection to Eve. Likewise after the Fall, the Son repeats Raphael's idea during his judgment of Adam. Both Raphael and the Son clearly instruct Adam that though Eve is "lovely to attract / [Adam's] love," she must not attract his "subjection" (10.152-53; 8.568-70). The Son belittles Adam by questioning his masculinity and knowledge of gender hierarchy:

> [W]as she made thy guide,
> Superior, or but equal, that to her
> Thou didst resign thy manhood, and the place
> Wherein God set thee above her made of thee. (10.146-49)

As indicated in the previous chapter, Michael also admonishes Adam for stubbornly believing that women cause all "man's woe" and promptly deflects Adam's accusation by identifying "man's effeminate slackness… / … who should better hold his place" as the true source of sin (11.632, 634-35). In short, Michael's relation of a future event in which Rebecca, the wife, is providentially permitted to deceive her husband Isaac in order to secure the continuation of the redemption narrative would be to show Adam an exception in the lessons of patriarchy in which a husband's submission to his wife is justified. At the present moment, as the seeds of patriarchy begin to come to fruition, Adam, who is "to lead [his] offspring," must only see images of strong patriarchal leaders and types, such as Abraham, Moses, and David, who will insure the success of God's covenant with Abraham without either hindrance or help from women (8.86).

In contrast to Milton's circumscription of Isaac and Jacob, Hutchinson writes about them with great enthusiasm. She describes the births of Isaac and Jacob as important events. Isaac's birth, for example, denotes "a blessing…for the whole earth" (14.255). In regard to the births of brothers Jacob and Esau, Hutchinson identifies the benefits that all fathers receive from children, who "may their flesh from death redeem, / Retain their figures and defend their fame, / Preserve their memories and a lasting name" (17.66-68). Children such as Isaac and Jacob secure physical and spiritual redemption and a preservation of legacy for fathers. In the remaining five cantos of *Order and Disorder*, Hutchison demonstrates that Isaac and Jacob are not a son and grandson who

deserve a hasty disregard; rather, she fully depicts and greatly expands their narratives in order to highlight their fundamental presence in the preservation of Abraham's legacy and his covenant with God, along with the continuation of the redemption narrative. Indeed, Isaac and Jacob and their wives Rebecca and Rachel consume the remainder of *Order and Disorder*, thereby correcting Milton's unappreciative treatment of them. Moreover, if Milton indirectly expresses anxiety in his reluctance to write about Isaac and Jacob due to Rebecca's disruptive presence in the lessons of patriarchy, then Hutchinson's inclusion of the same characters reveals just the opposite. The very event that Milton hopes to negate through his dismissal is the one event in which Hutchinson revels in retelling: Rebecca's deception of Isaac. She constantly modifies and often reinvents Rebecca's narrative while also carefully adhering to Genesis in an effort to legitimize Rebecca's sin, and through her innovative portrayal of Rebecca, Hutchinson can freely elaborate on and reinforce the mother's importance in the lineage of Christ that she previously established in Sarah.

In Hutchinson's account, she must first justify Rebecca's deception of Isaac by emphasizing Rebecca's participation in Providence as a woman chosen by God. Both Joan Bennett and David Norbrook recognize how Hutchinson positions Rebecca as vital to God's covenant with Abraham. Bennett speaks of Hutchinson's belief in spiritual equality, which validates both genders as "active participants with Providence" (156). She remarks that Rebecca, specifically, is "entrusted with enormous responsibility for human welfare as executor with Isaac of the divine covenant with Abraham" and "is recreated by Hutchinson in a way that stresses her power to exercise right reason" (155). Likewise, Norbrook further illuminates Hutchinson's inclusion of Rebecca in conjunction

with the covenant when he claims, “For Hutchinson…there is no doubt that Rebecca is at this point [during the blessing of Jacob] more open to the divine image than Isaac” (“*Order and Disorder*” li). Bennett’s and Norbrook’s comments, however, only recognize Rebecca’s “active participation” in the covenant, but do not investigate Hutchinson’s complex method of establishing Rebecca as part of the covenant and, by extension, the redemption narrative. By simultaneously adhering to and elaborating upon the boundaries of the Genesis narrative which contains Rebecca, Hutchinson overtly and subtly fashions Rebecca as a matriarchal type who partakes in the redemption of humankind through her intricate relationship with Eve, Sarah, and Mary.

Surprisingly, Hutchinson first presents Rebecca as an integral part of the redemption narrative in her account of Eve and the “mother’s curse” in Canto 5. Her main goal is to demonstrate a mother’s postlapsarian world that Eve and, subsequently, all mothers must confront in pregnancy. Hutchinson refigures Sin’s hell-hounds, who periodically reenter her womb where they “howl and gnaw” at her “bowels” before “bursting forth / Afresh with conscious terrors vex [her] round / That rest or intermission none [she] find[s]” (*PL* 2.799, 800-02), as a “froward child” who intensifies the nightmarish process of pregnancy and childbirth (160):

> How much more bitter anguish do we find
> Labouring to raise up virtue in the mind
> Than when the members in our bowels grew:
> What sad abortions, what cross births ensue:
> What monsters, what unnatural vipers come
> Eating their passage through their parent’s womb;
> How are the tortures of their births renewed,
> Unrecompensed with love and gratitude. (162-68)

Thus, a “froward child” serves as a perpetual reminder of sin for the mother, both in the child’s habitually evil nature and in the birth of the child, just as Sin’s hell-hounds infinitely haunt and inflict her. Yet even children who should “be our crowns, joys, pillars, and delight” also prove a source of woe, for “all the ill / That on the children falls, the mothers feel” (170, 173-74). Hutchinson envisions a mother-child relationship in which the child’s actions greatly affect the mother, whether positive or negative. Furthermore, she utilizes marginal glosses to refer to Rebecca, Rachel, and Mary as further interrogation of Eve’s punishment and the consequences of it on a mother’s postlapsarian world, both in the continuing Genesis narrative as well as the overarching redemption narrative. For instance, she glosses her remark that “all the ill / That on the children falls, the mothers feel,” with Matthew 2.18, a passage that parallels Mary and the infant Christ’s flight from King Herod with Rachel’s lamentation over the death of her children. Likewise, Hutchinson completes her exploration of the child-mother relationship with “every mother’s cup tastes of the curse / And when the heavy load her faint heart tires, / Makes her too oft repent her fond desires” (178-80), glossing her poetry with Genesis 27.46: “And Rebekah said to Isaac, I am weary of my life because of the daughters of Heth: if Jacob take a wife of the daughters of Heth, such as these which are of the daughters of the land, what good shall my life do me?” The allusion to Rebecca proves multi-layered as Hutchinson refers to Genesis and two other passages in *Order and Disorder*. One is a direct paraphrase of Genesis 27.46, but the other is a dramatization of Rebecca’s inefficacy to “instruct” Esau’s wives, her daughter-in-laws, “in God’s worship” and “correct” their “vanities” (18.213-18; 17.523, 524). Here, too, Hutchinson reinforces the idea that the mother’s curse directly results from a woman’s

"fond desires," a reference to Eve's yielding to her desire to gain knowledge and also to her sexual desire. The very complexity that the gloss adds to the mother's curse section in Canto 5 indicates Hutchinson's interest in the mother-daughter relationship. Her innovative interpretation of the mother's curse establishes Rebecca, Rachel, and Mary as Eve's future daughter-in-laws. More importantly, through investigating the marginal glosses provided by Hutchinson, a reader might easily deduce the importance that Hutchinson places on Genesis mothers and Mary in relation to Eve, even if *Order and Disorder* would have remained as five cantos, as originally published in 1679.

In addition to her membership in the ancestry of holy matriarchs, Rebecca also shares with Eve, Sarah, and Mary her connection to Providence. In Canto 16, Hutchinson recounts Genesis 24, a chapter dedicated to Abraham's servant's selection of Rebecca as Isaac's wife. Abraham commands his servant to travel to Nahor (Abraham's native country) so he may select a bride for Isaac. Once the servant meets Rebecca, he negotiates an arrangement with her family to let her return with him. The chapter ends with Isaac and Rebecca's consummation of their marriage which occurs in Sarah's tent. Hutchinson capitalizes on the substantial plotline of Genesis 24 and slightly alters the narrative surrounding Rebecca so as to contextualize her justification of Rebecca's deception of Isaac. One of the ways in which she alters the narrative is to embed allusions to Eve, Sarah, and Mary within her account that serve to parallel Rebecca to these women and place her in connection to Providence. That the allusions appear throughout Canto 16 in a nonlinear fashion suggests Hutchinson's subtle transformation of Rebecca into a matriarchal type who follows Eve and Sarah's legacy, but who also anticipates Mary.

In relating Abraham's instructions to his servant, Hutchinson employs key words that carry connotations with Sarah and Mary; thus, before the reader even sees Rebecca, Hutchinson has already shaped her as a participant in typology. In Genesis, Abraham's instructions to his servant promptly follow Sarah's death and burial, and, though not explicit, the concern over selecting a proper wife for Isaac implies a desire to replace the Sarah with another woman who can carry forth Abraham's covenant with God. Hutchinson plays with this implicit desire by presenting an Abraham conscious of the implications of choosing the correct wife for his son. Genesis cites Abraham's stipulation that his servant "shalt not take a wife unto my son of the daughters of the Canaanites" (24.3). Hutchinson's Abraham, however, "for his son a virtuous wife desire[s]" and "cautions" his servant that he "should not link the holy seed / To any of the Canaantish breed;" rather, he should "elect [Isaac's] wife" from Abraham's family (16.12, 18, 19-20, 25). Here, Hutchinson takes the liberty to highlight Rebecca's importance in the redemption narrative by imposing a Calvinist doctrine of predestination onto Abraham's instructions. For the servant is to not merely select a wife, but "elect" one, signifying that Isaac's future bride should be part of the elect, God's chosen people. Rebecca is predestined for her role of bearing "the holy seed" of Jacob / Israel—God's chosen nation that Christ will redeem. In addition to using Calvinism to link Rebecca to Sarah as the next mother capable of carrying "the holy seed," Hutchinson subtly alludes to the narrative of Mary's conception of Christ in order to shape Rebecca as a type for Mary. After Abraham delivers his instructions to his servant, his servant worries that the chosen woman will not return with him; however, Abraham assures him that God "will command / His angel to prepare the way for thee / And make the virgin willing" (16.32-

34). The same verses in Genesis, on the other hand, only record Abraham's claim that God "shall send his angel before thee, and thou shalt take a wife unto my son from thence [Abraham's native country]" (24.7). While Hutchinson does not explicitly transgress her Biblical source, she does rearrange the events of Genesis 24. Thus, though Genesis identifies Rebecca as a virgin, that information appears later in Genesis when the servant first sees Rebecca, not during the instructions for selection. Hutchinson's careful rearrangement of Genesis 24 enables a link between Mary and Rebecca. Specifically, Abraham's reference to an angel who can "make the virgin willing" foresees Mary's conception of Christ: "the angel Gabriel was sent by God…to a virgin," (Luke 1.26-27). Though Gabriel is sent to prepare Mary to be Christ's mother while an angel is sent to Rebecca to ensure her return with Abraham's servant, the similarity between the episodes is viable because Rebecca will become wife to Isaac, a type for Christ, and a mother to Jacob, a type for Christ's church. In short, Hutchinson's use of predestination and rearrangement of Genesis 24 aligns Rebecca with the divine conception of a virgin mother, establishing a typological relationship between Rebecca, mother of Israel, and Mary, mother of Christ. The relationship, however, is one that also involves Rebecca's inheritance from her predecessors Eve and Sarah.

Rebecca's connection to Eve and Sarah becomes immediately evident in Rebecca's actual appearance in Canto 16. While Rebecca's correlation to Sarah is an underlying presence in Genesis, Hutchinson's identification of Rebecca with Eve is novel. First, Hutchinson directly presents Rebecca as a part of Providence when Abraham's servant first sees her. While the servant prays to God to reveal "‚the damsel whom [God] shalt design / For Isaac's wife,'" Rebecca appears at the well where the

servant stands (16.52-3). Astonished at the swift response and at Rebecca's beauty, the servant stands in awe, "wondering at this providence" (16.77). Later, as the servant explains to Laban, Rebecca's brother, his reasoning for choosing Rebecca, he claims, "„Rebecca seems by Providence / Marked forth'" (16.136-37). The association of Providence with a woman is a repeated concept, for when Hutchinson narrates Eve's creation, she labels Eve "A sweet instructive emblem…to us / How waking Providence is active still / To do us good" (3.458-460). The inclusive pronoun "us" is directed toward all humankind, but in particular to women who should learn from the newly formed, prelapsarian Eve; likewise, Rebecca becomes a part of such a tradition of imitable women. Also, it is "waking Providence" that obviously directs Abraham's servant to Rebecca.

In addition to their relationship through Providence, Rebecca and Eve are also connected through their beauty. In regard to Eve's creation, Hutchinson twice comments on Eve's beauty, labeling her "a fair virgin" and, inversely, "the virgin fair" (3.395; 474). Similarly, as Rebecca approaches the well and begins to draw water, Hutchinson reports,

> Pure were her thoughts, and beautiful her face,
> Her body ne'er defiled with man's embrace.
> Her chaster mind upon her work intent,
> … … … … … … … … … … … … … …
> The honest labours of those innocent times
> Kept honest women from adulterous crimes.
> The pride and idleness of our loose dames
> Are the lewd parents of those lustful flames
> … … … … … … … … … … … … … …
> While to the well her journey she pursues,
> Her fair form then he with much wonder views. (16.59-61; 63-7; 69-70)

Hutchinson also lauds Rebecca's intertwined beauty and virtue: "Such beauty joined with such humility" and "A damsel courteous, diligent, and fair" (16.80, 82). Within

Hutchinson's commendatory depiction of Rebecca, the image of a "fair virgin" as established in Eve is certainly extended to Rebecca. Hutchinson emphasizes Rebecca's status as a virgin, noting her "pure" and "chaster" mind, her "ne'er defiled" body, and her "honest" work. Overall, the portrait of a pure, chaste, and honest and productive woman reflects the ideal early modern, Puritan woman, certainly the paradigm into which Hutchinson fits Rebecca. Moreover, Rebecca stands in sharp contrast to Hutchinson's description of contemporary women, those "loose dames" who are prideful, "idle," "lewd," and "lustful."[1] Rebecca's beauty is equally important to Hutchinson's portrayal of her, as she employs the adjective "fair" at least two times along with directly referencing her "beautiful face" and her "beauty." Thus, the "fair virgin" type which Hutchinson founds in Eve continues in Rebecca, a vast juxtaposition to Milton's "bevy of fair women" as discussed in Chapter 1 (11.582).

The same passage in which Hutchinson lauds Rebecca's attractive virtues doubles as an extolment for her work ethic, mirroring Hutchinson's praise for Sarah and her preparation of food for Abraham and the visiting angel. Furthermore, Abraham's servant places her in direct relation to Sarah, a "fair" and "noble dame" (11.47, 12.239). For instance, when he first meets Rebecca, he "addresse[s]" her as "„Fair one'" (16.88, 89). Later, he informs Laban that "„God sent this fair and noble maid'" for Isaac (16.142). Hutchinson then presents Sarah and Rebecca as two women worthy of imitation due to not only their virtue but also to their work ethic. Just as Hutchinson momentarily digresses from Genesis in order to extol Sarah and her work, she does the same for Rebecca, and in both instances, Hutchinson locates a prelapsarian moment in a postlapsarian world. Concerning Sarah, Hutchinson exclaims "How happy times that

primitive age enjoyed!" (12.215). Likewise, Rebecca's appearance at the well sparks another meditative moment for Hutchinson, which she identifies as "the honest labours of those innocent times" (16.63). The idea of an "innocent time" where "honest" work can occur provides a fleeting glance at the prelapsarian world of easy work. Hutchinson establishes a model for prelapsarian work through her depiction of the Creation in Canto 3. God performs "honest labour" in his creation of earth, beast, and man and, by extension, desires "that our delight should be / The wages of our constant industry" and that he graciously "crown our honest labours with success" (3.527, 646-47, 649). Rebecca's virtue and spirituality, then, become rooted in her "honest labours." Hutchinson's prelapsarian work scenes also serve as a parallel to Milton's depiction of Adam and Eve's work in Eden (*PL* 5.209-19). In relation to Milton's Eve, Hutchinson's work scenes concerning Sarah and Rebecca offer to reverse Eve's initiation of the Fall due to her desire to work separately from Adam, thereby establishing work as pure again. Additionally, the motif of "honest labour" operates as Hutchinson's instructive guide for her female contemporaries (16.63). The work ethic of "honest women" like Sarah and Rebecca further contrasts with "our loose dames" whose "pride and idleness" instigate contemporary horrors such as "murders, hate, and civil wars" (16.64, 65, 68). Interestingly, the juxtaposition that she draws between "lewd" and "loose" contemporary women and the virtuous Old Testament matriarchs also has its roots in typology, for Renaissance exegetes commonly used typology as a way to provide moral commentary on a contemporary situation.[2] Thus, through the use of typology, Hutchinson links matriarchs Eve, Sarah, and Rebecca and also extends their significance to outside of her

epic, referencing them as role models for female readers, particularly irreligious female readers.

While Hutchinson's use of adjectives such as "fair" and "noble" signals Rebecca's relationship to her predecessors, it is Rebecca's preservation of her mothers' (Eve and Sarah) legacy that firmly secures her position as successor in the role to facilitate the fulfillment of God's covenant with Abraham, and, thus, the redemption narrative. In Canto 3, as Hutchinson depicts the marriage between Adam and Eve as necessary for regeneration and anticipates the benefits of mothers who produce female heirs:

> When the declining mother's youthful grace
> Lies dead and buried in her wrinkled face,
> In her fair daughters it revives and grows
> And her dead cinder in their new flames glows. (3.449-52)

In Hutchinson's passage, "Regeneration is gendered female as a line of mother to child—in fact, to daughters—is established" (Miller 122). Just as children, presumably sons, offer a preservation of their fathers by "retain[ing] their figures and defend[ing] their fame" (17.67), "fair daughters" "revive" a "mother's youthful grace" when she dies. Moreover, the mother's rebirth becomes figured through imagery evoking that of the Phoenix, the mother lying as "dead cinder" as her daughters offer regeneration in "their new flames." Likewise, just as sons "defend" their father's legacy, daughters do the same for mothers through grace, creating a lasting bond between them. Grace, then, extends to the next generation in order to preserve the memory of the mother.

Hutchinson does not leave her theory of maternal regeneration to be interpreted as purely hypothetical. Later, through Sarah's death and the ensuing selection of Rebecca,

Hutchinson demonstrates exactly how “a mother’s youthful grace” is regenerated through “her fair daughters.” In fact, the terminology surrounding the relation of Sarah’s death in Canto 15 resonates with the above mentioned section of Canto 3. Hutchinson delivers a moral lesson on external beauty to “fair” and virtuous female readers when she records Sarah’s death: “O boast not, fair ones, in the grace you have: / All beauty must be swallowed by the grave” (15.321-22). Although her statement, here, about grace and beauty seems contradictory to her previous statements in Canto 3, Hutchinson clarifies the difference between an external, fading beauty and an internal, eternal beauty, by focusing on the soul of a mother. The soul may conquer “the exterior fleshly house,” argues Hutchinson, “if the soul be beautiful within” (15.327, 325). Furthermore, the mother’s soul

> Mounting to heaven, leaves her immortal fame,
> While life itself is but a speedy race
> And human beauty lasts but half that space:
> We well may term it a short fading flower,
> Disclosed and withering in one hasty hour,
> Which only like a flash of lightning shines.
> But virtue is a sun that ne’er declines:
> This still preserves our memories alive,
> This glory human frailty doth survive.
> Wherefore here only is true beauty placed[.] (15.330-39)

While Hutchinson speculates about Sarah’s death, she also envisions the effects of the death on the body and soul and, consequently, on “beauty” and “virtue.” “True beauty” is found only through virtue because it is spiritual and not earthly. So, when Sarah dies, her “human [temporal] beauty” disintegrates, proving itself illusory, while her “virtue” remains as an agent of preservation that ensures an “immortal fame” and that “preserves our memories alive.” Fittingly, Canto 15 end with Sarah’s death and burial, and Canto 16

begins with Abraham's desire before his death to find "for his son a virtuous wife" (16.12); by extension, he also selects a "virtuous" daughter-in-law for Sarah who will be able to "revive" her "mother's youthful grace" and "preserve [her] memories" (3.449; 15.337). The intangible nature of Sarah's "true beauty," virtue, transcends the biological mother-daughter regeneration of Canto 3 and subverts the patriarchal redemption narrative that is rooted in the biological relationship of father and son. Thus, Isaac is always already a part of the redemption / regeneration narrative because he is Abraham's seed, so Hutchinson must create a way for Rebecca to participate in the redemption narrative as more than just Isaac's wife, which she does by shaping her as Sarah's daughter. In combining Hutchinson's sections on feminine, maternal grace, it is easy to see that Rebecca truly is the one to revive Sarah's and Eve's roles as facilitating redemption for mankind.

Hutchinson, furthermore, emphasizes the transfer of maternal power from Sarah and to Rebecca by simply highlighting the apparent parallels found in Genesis between the two women. Her emphasis on their existing parallels is characteristic of her portrait of Rebecca, which so heavily depends on a method of composition that balances modification and adherence to the constrictive narrative boundaries of Genesis. As already established, Hutchinson portrays both Sarah and Rebecca as virtuous and fair. Genesis does the same. Similarly, both Abraham and Isaac fear for their lives, assuming that while traveling through other kingdoms, men will murder them in order to claim their beautiful wives. Isaac even repeats almost verbatim what Abraham asks of Sarah, which is to pretend to be his sister due to her beauty (Gen. 12.11-13. 26.7). Both women do attract the attention of men: Sarah is taken by Egypt's Pharaoh while Abimelech

detects that Rebecca is Isaac's wife before any man takes her as wife. Finally, both kings rebuke Abraham and Isaac for their careless decision of lying, expressing fear of divine punishment if any man would have consummated the relationship with Sarah or Rebecca (Gen 12.10-20; 26.1-11). Hutchinson records the same parallels (11.39-90; 17.201-78). Most importantly, Genesis and Hutchinson suggest a transfer of maternal power from one matriarch to the other in the holy covenant due to the place of consummation of Rebecca and Isaac's marriage: Sarah's tent. Abraham's instructions to his servant to select a bride for Isaac immediately follow Sarah's death and burial, and as we find out later, Rebecca is consolation for the loss of his mother Sarah. Yet Hutchinson does more than Genesis to signify the importance of Sarah as Isaac's mother and Rebecca's mother-in-law. In Genesis when the servant meets Rebecca's family, he explains that "Sarah my master's wife bare a son to my master" (Gen.24.36). Similarly, Hutchinson's servant explains Isaac as a gift that Abraham "received in his old age from Sarah's womb" (16.131). Hutchinson notably alters the phrasing of Genesis to emphasize Sarah's agency as mother. No longer is Sarah labeled Abraham's, or "my master's wife," as in Genesis; she has now become a source of creative power, subverting the traditional emphasis on Abraham's (and Adam's) loins and placing the creative agent of reproduction and redemption in the mother's womb.[3] When Rebecca agrees to return with Abraham's servant, the idea of her as a replacement for Sarah becomes fully apparent in Rebecca and Isaac's consummation. Genesis relates that "Isaac brought her [Rebekah] into his mother Sarah's tent, and took Rebekah, and she became his wife; and he loved her: and Isaac was comforted after his mother's death" (24.67). Hutchinson too narrates that Isaac "with open arms received" Rebecca "and led / Into his mother's tent" (16.257; 257-58). The

passage has a celebratory tone as Hutchinson elaborates on the effects of Rebecca's "unveiled beauty" on Isaac, who "since his mother's death found no relief" but finds solace "in the glad arrival of his wife" (16.262-63). The passage rejoices in a "chaste Love" and "a pure legitimate flame" that resides "in Isaac's virtuous bosom" for his wife Rebecca, yet another postlapsarian moment that captures a prelapsarian experience (16.282, 86, 87). Hutchinson has reestablished the lost innocence of sex in Rebecca and Isaac. After creating Adam and Eve and authoring them as stewards of the earth, God "did the first marriage celebrate / While man was in his unpolluted state, / And the' undefiled bed with honour decked" (3.433-35). With regard to Rebecca and Isaac, the location of their consummation in Sarah's tent becomes important, just as it is important that Isaac is born of Sarah. Scripture obviously finds maternal authority in Sarah, so Hutchinson is free to find a similar authority. Rebecca, therefore, receives not only Sarah's youthful grace but also receives a transfer of power as an active agent in God's covenant and the lineage of Christ. She will become, as Hutchinson's Abraham from the beginning states, responsible for bearing the "holy seed" (16.19).

Feeling ordained by Genesis to find a parallel between Sarah and Rebecca, Hutchinson begins to flex her own creative genius in making the parallels stronger and shaping Rebecca's portrait and experiences. The first avenue for divine transgression is in Rebecca's pregnancy, which makes a strong case for her status as a matriarchal type just as Eve and Sarah. Both Sarah and Rebecca experience a "fruitless bed" with their husbands and only receive heirs when Abraham and Isaac pray to God (*OD* 17.2; Genesis 25.20). Once Rebecca becomes pregnant, she experiences agonizing pains, which Hutchinson stresses. Whereas Genesis grants Rebecca's a mere question, "If it be so,

why am I thus?," Hutchinson invents a realistic miniature narrative about Rebecca's concerns. When "the wretched mother" Rebecca, grieves her "torment[ed]" pregnancy (17.91), she laments,

> "If these," said she, "be mothers' joys, ah why
> Am I a mother made if only I
> Must feel those tortures others never know?
> Why yet doth God let me continue so?
> Why sends he not Death to conclude my pain
> But makes me more than all my sex sustain?" (17.93-98)

Rebecca's sentiments are evidence to the mother's curse of Canto 5, where Hutchinson advices mothers to not be "frighted with the pain /…though it make us mourn under the sense / Of the first mother's disobedience" (5.222-24). Interestingly, Rebecca actually does seem to relive Eve's experience as she matches Eve's mournful request for Death soon after her and Adam's ejection from the garden: "Methinks I hear sad Eve in some dark vale / Her woeful state with such sad plaints bewail: / „Ah! why doth Death its latest stroke delay?'" (5.399-01). Rebecca's pain of pregnancy is excruciating, and death would prove a better state just as Eve welcomes death, which would end the torment of the knowledge of her destructive actions. The connection draws an apparent relationship between Eve's sin and her punishment and the consequences of her sin on future mothers, for Rebecca is the first and only woman in Hutchinson's account to express grief in pregnancy.

Though Rebecca's pregnancy links her to Eve and Sarah, it strongly anticipates Mary and strengthens Rebecca's participation in matriarchal typology. Just as a divine intervention is hinted at as Abraham promises his servant that God "will command / His angel to prepare the way for thee / And make the virgin willing," Rebecca's pregnancy

also involves divine mediation due to an angel's visit to Rebecca to comfort her (16.32-4). As discussed in the previous chapter, Sarah's and Mary's conceptions are paralleled by the fact that angels visit them to announce their miraculous, divine conceptions (*OD* 12.250-53; Gen. 18.12, Luke 1.29). However, the angel's visit with Rebecca is Hutchinson's "invention."[4] She completely transforms Rebecca's prayer to God as told in Genesis (Gen. 25.22, 23). Instead of God simply answering Rebecca's "anxious prayer," he sends one of the angels that surrounds his throne "To comfort this sad dame, doth swiftly glide" and upon coming to earth, "in a human figure shrouds / His angel's form, puts on a prophet's face" (17.108, 114, 116-17). Again, Hutchinson seems to nod at Milton's depiction of angels visiting Adam and Eve, specifically in regard to Raphael's intentions to speak "as friend with friend" and possibly Michael's offer of solace during the first parents' banishment (*PL* 5.229; 11.105-17). Unlike the slight alterations that Hutchinson has made in previous passages concerning Rebecca, here she fully asserts her creative license as a poet to invent a scene nowhere found in Genesis. Moreover, her invention functions as a reinforcement of Rebecca's ordained status in God's covenant with Abraham and the redemption narrative. As in the case of Sarah, the angel's visit with Rebecca alludes to Gabriel's visit to Mary; both Rebecca and Mary carry the "holy seed" and are connected typologically as mothers of Jacob/Israel (the Church) and Christ. Gabriel, for instance, explains to Mary that Christ "shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever" (Luke 1.33). Just as Gabriel informs Mary that her son will be the Savior of humankind, specifically those of Jacob's ancestry, or God's chosen people, the angel who appears to Rebecca, "puts on a prophet's face" and foretells the meaning of her suffering (17.117). He addresses her as "„Daughter'" and asks that she "„resume thy cheerful joy'"

before explaining that that “„two male twins struggle in thy womb’” and “„from them two mighty nations shall descend’” (17.121, 124, 127). The angel incorporates the discourse of predestination in his comfort to Rebecca by altering God’s message to Rebecca in Genesis that “the older shall serve the younger” (Gen. 25.23). Instead, the angel predicts that “„the younger’s happier destiny shall prevail,’” and the older brother’s “„courage and strength in vain oppos[es] fate / Fate whose irrevocable laws decree / The eldest must the younger’s servant be’” (17.136, 138-40). Similar to her account of Abraham’s instructions to his servant, Hutchinson directly injects the discourse of predestination into the Genesis narrative, implanting key words in the narrative that contains Rebecca—the woman who Abraham’s servant must “elect” (16.25) and who will give birth to a son with a “„happier destiny,’” which “„fate’” has ordained to become ruler over his elder brother. At this particular moment, Hutchinson cements Rebecca’s status as type for Mary, using the angel to foreshadow Gabriel and the angel’s prediction to authorize Rebecca’s active participation in Providence.[5]

Through her character sketch and expanded, innovative narrative of Rebecca, Hutchinson crafts Rebecca to be the quintessential matriarchal type and figure in God’s covenant with Abraham and in the redemption narrative, who simultaneously references former Old Testament types Eve and Sarah and foreshadows the New Testament antitype Mary. As I have shown, Hutchinson calculatingly links Rebecca to her predecessors Eve and Sarah through various methods, including key images, phrases, and words, and mostly subtle modifications of Genesis. For instance, the phrase “fair virgin” correlates Rebecca, Eve, and Sarah and proves applicable to Mary, as well. In regard to Eve, Hutchinson uses marginal glosses in her description of Eve and the mother’s curse in

Canto 5 to anticipate Rebecca and, similarly, uses Rebecca's pregnancy lament as an allusion to Eve's plea for a swift death that will end her sorrow. Concerning Sarah and Rebecca's relationship, Rebecca perpetuates the type established in Sarah of a humble, modest, "noble" woman and stands as a regenerator for Sarah, her mother-in-law and spiritual mother. Finally, the presence of the angel in Hutchinson's account of Rebecca's pregnancy repeats the angel's visit to Abraham and Sarah to announce Sarah's future conception of Isaac—Rebecca's future husband; more importantly, the visit prefigures Gabriel's visit to the virgin Mary to announce her conception of Christ. Rebecca, in short, becomes another matriarch in the tradition of Eve and Sarah who serves as a type for Mary. As a result, Rebecca is "a sweet instructive emblem" of Providence who justifiably deceives her husband Isaac (3.458). Hutchinson exercises immense precision and skill in her alignment of Rebecca with matriarchal types and antitype and with Providence to "introduce the story of the blessing with the readers already predisposed in Rebecca's favour" (Norbrook "*Order and Disorder*" li).

The Biblical story of Esau and Jacob was an important narrative for Republicans, such as Hutchinson and her husband, because it authorized a younger brother's usurpation of his elder brother, a direct questioning of primogeniture, and provided a basis through which to challenge the monarchy. Hutchinson too uses the story to critique early modern hierarchies. Aligning the story with the contemporary conflicts between church and state, she casts Jacob and Esau's struggle, "the war between the elect and the reprobate," as "an eternal civil war" (Norbrook "*Order and Disorder*" xlii). More importantly, for Hutchinson, though, the brothers' struggle offers a space to explore gender politics and to imagine what stipulations condone a wife's undermining of her

husband's authority. Indeed, she relates the divine intervention of Rebecca in the blessing narrative, suggesting that if not for Rebecca and her challenging of the hierarchy then Jacob / Israel would not have been established as the Christian church.

At the crux of the blessing narrative exists an overt contradiction: scripturally authorized deception of a husband by his wife. Though Rebecca schemes against Isaac and convinces Jacob to disregard patriarchal authority in order to deceive both father and elder brother, the deception is in accordance with Providence. With so apparent a paradox, most Genesis commentators, including John Calvin and the compilers of the Geneva Bible, seem to have felt that it was their duty to reconcile Providence and deception, as the Biblical account maintains a neutral stance on the matter, offering no official condemnation or justification. For instance, while the Geneva Bible glosses the episode with a marginal note pertaining to Isaac's "carnal affection" that "made him forget which God spake to his wife," the next gloss projects blame onto Rebecca and her command for Jacob to trick his father: "This subtiltie is blameworthy because she shulde have tarried til God had performed his promes" (Gen.27.4a; 9b). Likewise, Calvin's line-by-line commentary of Genesis 27 proclaims in the first verse that Jacob follows the "artifice of his mother," which results in obtaining "the blessing by a lie" (81, 82). In regard to Gen. 27.4, he too finds fault in Isaac's "inconsiderate carnal affection" for Esau and even uses Isaac as an example of how "holy men" can become tainted, identifying a spiritual blindness through Isaac's physical blindness; however, Isaac still maintains "the right of pronouncing a blessing," a gesture reserved for patriarchs (83, 84). Though Calvin identifies a fault in Isaac, he overtly imposes a sinful nature onto Rebecca, surrounding her with words that connote the infamous seductive feminine type

established in Eve: “cunning,” “stratagem,” “wiles” (84), and “deceit” (85). Even when he does find some redemption in her actions because they suggest her strong faith in God, Calvin declares “that her faith was mixed with an unjust and immoderate zeal.” He does, however, end his comment on Gen. 27.5 with a remark that signifies both Isaac’s and Rebecca’s sin—Isaac in loving Esau and Rebecca in her falsity. God validates and “vindicates” husband and wife through the blessing of Jacob (85). Thus, while the Geneva Bible and Calvin note Isaac’s mistaken affection for the wrong son, they still prefer to condemn Rebecca for asserting her control in the blessing narrative. Hutchinson, on the other hand, offers a defense for Rebecca. She never reprimands Rebecca but surprisingly condones her transgression. In the blessing narrative, more so than in her account of Rebecca’s pregnancy, Hutchinson finds authority and a space through which she can transgress the traditional reception of Rebecca. Here, Hutchinson contributes an original interpretation to the Genesis narrative and its commentaries as she extols a woman for an act of deception.

First, Hutchinson employs an extended metaphor of a military battle interspersed with Calvinist terminology of the elect and reprobate to relate the narrative of Rebecca’s deception. Rebecca and Isaac are not wife and husband but enemies who fight for their chosen sons, “her” and “his darling” (18.18, 110). Rebecca sides with Jacob, the elect, and Isaac sides with Esau, the reprobate; thus, Hutchinson aligns Rebecca with the predestined victor, which, correspondingly, makes Rebecca victor as well. Upon hearing about Isaac’s choice to bless Esau, Rebecca “forms a plot” to secure Isaac’s blessing for “her darling” and initiates the battle by “advising” Jacob to deceive his father (18.17, 18, 21). When Jacob objects due to fear of receiving a curse, Rebecca boldly declares, “„I

will between thee and danger stand: / Mine be the curse thou gain'st by my command'" (18.25-26). In comparison to Genesis's account of Rebecca's response—"Upon me by thy curse"—Hutchinson again clearly expands Rebecca's participation in the narrative (Gen. 27.13). Of Rebecca's seemingly selfless act of maternal protection, Calvin comments that "Rebekah sins again, because she burns with such hasty zeal that she does not consider how highly God disapproves of her evil course. She presumptuously subjects herself to the curse" (87). While Hutchinson's Rebecca does "subject herself to the curse" she is not "presumptuous" in her course of action; rather, she acts as a defiant mother who consciously invokes the mother's curse of Canto 5: "Death, danger, sickness, losses, all the ill / That on the children falls, the mothers feel / Repeating with worse pangs the pangs that bore / Them into life…" (5.173-75). Rebecca recognizes that the mother's curse does not reside solely in childbirth but continues throughout her lifetime as she is emotionally connected to her child, experiencing all of her child's afflictions. Particularly, Rebecca "feel[s]" the "danger" that Jacob would suffer if their deception of Isaac were to fail, so she assumes the role of a maternal military leader who promises protection to her son from any possible damnation. More significantly, Rebecca understands that the mother's blessing in children always results from the mother's curse of painful pregnancy, as we have seen in her pregnancy with Jacob and Esau in which she laments, "„If these…be mothers' joys, ah why / Am I a mother made if only I / Must feel those tortures others never know?" (17.93-5). For Rebecca, then, the curse of damnation that she promises to take upon herself is an essential sacrifice in the attempt to obtain God's blessing for her son Jacob.

In addition to Rebecca's status as the elect's mother and military advisor, Hutchinson continually portrays the weakened patriarch Isaac as complicit with the reprobate Esau and unable to recognize that Jacob is the elect. Like Calvin, Hutchinson transforms Isaac's literal blindness into a figurative one that demonstrates his inability to see God's plan. Thus, when Rebecca "disguises" Jacob "in a rich suit of Esau's clothes," Isaac's blindness makes him vulnerable, for he cannot fully distinguish Jacob from Esau: "„'Tis Esau's hands', said Isaac, „but I hear / The voice of Jacob: is there no deceit?'" (18.32, 31; 18.46-7). Jacob responds with a blatant lie, "„I am Esau really,'" that results in his acquirement of the blessing (18.49). Thus, due to Isaac's "darkened" eyes, he must trust in his son's word, even though he perceives the difference in voice (18.2). In fact, Isaac only realizes his mistake when Esau later approaches him for the promised blessing:

> Isaac too late doth now the fraud perceive;
> But pious fraud whereby his zealous wife
> Strove to correct the errors of his life
> Who, governed by a partial blind affection,
> Stuck to that choice which was not God's election[.] (18.74-78)

Though the act is one of "fraud," the blame clearly lies with Isaac who allows himself to be "governed by a partial blind affection" for his son Esau, "not God's election." Additionally, Isaac acts antagonistically toward God; he allows his "affection" and not his faith to "govern" his actions. Later, when Isaac fully recognizes his mistake, he begins to "recover sight" and deeply mourn that he has blessed Jacob (18.107). Hutchinson again invokes military images by using an epic simile to compare Isaac with "a stout man who with prevailing might / In civil war had slain his opposite" only to realize that he has murdered "some dear friend" (18.111-12, 115). Isaac's blessing of

Jacob becomes construed as figurative murder to his first son, and as the "stout man" who kills a "dear friend," he defeats his own cause. On the other hand, Rebecca remains fully cognizant of her "pious fraud," an oxymoron that further indicates Rebecca's righteousness. Hutchinson, in fact, continually deflects the notion of Rebecca's fault and projects it onto Isaac, making Rebecca open to God's prophecy while Isaac is limited by his physical blindness. Rebecca's fraud is "pious," or virtuous, suggestive of obedience to God. As the "zealous wife," she must act upon her inclination to "correct" her husband's "errors"—his love for Esau. The *OED* cites *zealous* as "connoting puritanical zeal during the seventeenth century;" unlike her husband who lets false affections govern him, Rebecca allows her religious fervor to direct her subversion.[6]

Rebecca's "pious fraud" sparks a lengthy meditation on predestination, thereby authorizing a slight digression from Genesis. As with her previous employments of Calvinist doctrine, Hutchinson uses it to her advantage in order to support Rebecca's deception. In fact, Hutchinson's explanation on the operation of predestination provides an indirect exultation of Rebecca through a deprecation of Isaac. Hutchinson mainly claims that "with their maker sinful men contend, / As if their narrow hearts could comprehend / His boundless power…" (18.89-91). Isaac, who loves Esau, parallels one of those "sinful men" who cannot fathom God's intentions or his "boundless power." Instead, "according to their measures" sinful men attempt to "make him just" (18.92). Thus, Isaac ignorantly intends to bless his favorite son despite God's plan. In opposition to a sinful man, a "happy" man "on the Lord depends," an implied parallel to Rebecca (18.101). Hutchinson lengthens her discussion of the blameworthy Isaac: "he / might have his firstborn blessed (had he been free, / Not acted by a secret Providence / Whose

workings were not obvious to his sense)" (18.139-42). So as to not present Isaac as fully separated from God, Hutchinson assures readers that he is not "free" but that "a secret Providence" governs him, ensuring the blessing of Jacob. "Secret Providence" acquires a double meaning in connection with the previous discussion of Providence's relation to matriarchs Eve and Rebecca. Eve, for example, is a "sweet instructive emblem" of "how waking Providence is active still / To doe us good, and to avert our ill / When we locked up in stupefaction lie" (3.458, 459-61). The description of Eve resonates with Isaac's personalized moment of "stupefaction"—his own lack of senses (physical and spiritual blindness) and the bewildering shock he receives from blessing Jacob. Rebecca, as Abraham's servant notes, "seems by Providence / Marked forth" (16.36-7). In regard to Isaac, Rebecca acts as both "waking Providence" and "secret Providence," stealthily arranging Jacob's usurpation of Esau's blessing, which "wakes" Isaac to his errors.

As Hutchinson finishes her account of Genesis 27, she highlights yet another instance of Rebecca's trickery of her husband. Following Isaac's blessing of Jacob, Esau vows to murder Jacob, and when Rebecca "[was] told" of Esau's murderous intension, she asks that Jacob flee to her brother Laban and wait in hiding until "thy brother's fury turn away" (Gen. 27.44). However, she falsely informs Isaac that Jacob must leave in order to marry a proper wife: "And Rebekah said to Isaac, I am weary of my life because of the daughters of Heth: if Jacob take a wife of the daughters of Heth, such as these which are of the daughters of the land, what good shall my life do me?" (Gen. 27.46). With Rebecca's final plea to Isaac, Genesis concludes the blessing narrative, and with that Rebecca fades from Genesis. In contrast, Hutchinson presents an alternate ending, transforming the scene into another military expedition for Rebecca. For instance,

Rebecca's "spies" inform her of Esau's plan to murder Isaac, so Rebecca "doth advise / Jacob to make a politic retreat" (18.209, 210-11). Similar to her actions in the blessing narrative, she "advises" and uses her craftiness to find safety for Jacob, God's elect. She then "pretends to" Isaac that Jacob cannot marry a Hittite as it "might add to the affliction of her life" (18.214, 218). Thus, where Genesis never directly states Rebecca's transgression, Hutchinson does. Even more astonishing, Hutchinson has come full circle in her presentation of Rebecca. Her introduction of Rebecca through the marginal gloss of Gen. 27.46 in her discussion of Eve and the mother's curse in Canto 5 now meets the actual passages for that allusion. Yet, the cyclical nature of Hutchinson's narrative is no mere happenstance of plot. In Canto 5, the mother's curse ends with an allusion to Rebecca, and Eve and Rebecca meet, per se, after the Fall; in Canto 18, they meet again, for Rebecca's final act of deception ends with an allusion to the typical Eve:

> What power like that of subtle women when
> They exercise their skill to manage men,
> Their weak force recompensed with wily arts!
> While men rule kingdoms, women rule their hearts.
> Her good persuasions happily succeed. (18.219-23)

Hutchinson's praise complicates the traditional feminine type of woman as inferior and scheming. Though she admits that women are weaker than men, she offers an unconventional praise of "subtle women" and their "wily arts." As evidenced in the Geneva Bible's marginal glosses and in Calvin's commentaries, male commentators refigure Rebecca as another Eve: a "subtle woman" whose fault resides in her wiles and deception of her husband. Hutchinson too refigures Rebecca as another Eve, but Rebecca's sinful nature is commendable. Through Rebecca Hutchinson defiantly appropriates the traditional damning characteristics of women, redefining them with

positive connotations. Thus, at this moment of a self-referential allusion, the positive type meets and re-shapes the negative type of woman because Rebecca represents a laudable amalgamation of virtue and sin. The “wily arts” of fair, pious women are gifts given to women “in recompense” for their inferiority to men. Sometimes women must and are permitted to resort to “pious fraud” for the benefit of their husbands and for the overall benefit of humankind, as in Rebecca’s case. Indeed, Rebecca’s “good persuasions happily succeed” as she secures Jacob his father’s blessing and sends him to her brother Laban where he will meet his future wives Leah and Rachel, who will eventually become mothers of the twelve tribes of Israel and, thus, carry forth God’s covenant.

While Hutchinson certainly challenges the commentaries of the Geneva Bible and Calvin, through her innovative and vindicated reading of Rebecca, Hutchinson challenges literature’s most renown Genesis commentator: John Milton. Hutchinson’s celebration of “subtle women” and their “wily arts” primarily answers the question as to why Milton largely evades Isaac and Jacob in Michael’s prophecy and narrative of patriarchal history. Their story cannot be told without including Rebecca as conductor of “pious fraud,” and Rebecca’s piety closely resembles sin and the first deception story of the Fall.[7] In addition to praising fraud, Hutchinson also subverts Milton’s ideas of gender hierarchy as established in his memorable lines concerning Adam and Eve’s roles in nature: “For contemplation he and valour formed, / For softness she and sweet attractive grace: / He for God only, she for God in him” (4.297-99). Rebecca possesses both the feminine “sweet attractive grace” and the masculine “contemplation” and “valour.” Like Eve and Sarah, she is beautiful and pious, and she demonstrates “contemplation” and “valour” in

her strategic, military-like plots against Isaac. Unlike Milton who shapes Adam as "for God only" and Eve as "for God in" Adam, Hutchinson permits Rebecca to have direct contact with God, as evidenced through the angel who visits Rebecca to relate to her, not Isaac, the future antagonistic relationship of Jacob and Esau. The angel's visitation easily inverts Raphael's and Michael's arrivals in Eden where they are to relate God's message to only Adam: God informs Raphael to "Go therefore…as friend with friend / Converse with Adam" and Michael to "reveal / To Adam what shall come in future days" (5.229-30; 11.113-15). However, in the angel's visit with Rebecca, Rebecca gets sole knowledge of God's plan for Jacob to reign over Esau. Hutchinson, then, depicts Rebecca to be "for God only" and Isaac "for God in" her precisely because Rebecca is fully receptive of God's intentions and facilitates Isaac's blessing of Jacob through "secret Providence" (*OD* 18.141).

In thinking about the implications of Hutchinson's defense and exultation of Rebecca, we must consider the author herself. Hutchinson carefully crafts Rebecca's participation in Providence by rearranging, altering, and reinventing Genesis, with each step of the composition process slightly more transgressive than the one before. Thus, by the end of Rebecca's narrative, we can accept the transgressive implications of her "pious fraud." Furthermore, we become receptive of Hutchinson's unconventional retelling of the blessing narrative as a woman writer celebrating the "wily arts" of women. Essentially, Hutchinson is Rebecca. She is the "subtle woman" who "exercises [her] skill" in her "wily arts"—poetry. By remaining within the narrow confines of Genesis, Hutchinson is able to keep her account of Genesis 24 and 27 affiliated with Providence

and can create a space that allows for the modification of the blessing narrative. She, thus, ordains her own "pious fraud."

Notes

[1] Norbrook "*Order and Disorder*" l.

[2] Lewalski *Protestant Poetics* 130-32.

[3] See Miller's discussion of Eve and Hutchinson's usage of the womb, pages 123-24 and also her discussion of Sarah's agency in creation, pages 127-28.

[4] Norbrook *Order and Disorder* 216n38.

[5] Bennett 156.

[6] In regard to the adjective "pious," the *OED* cites various definitions. One is "of 1.a. "of an action, thought, resolve, etc.: characterized by expressing, or resulting from true reverence and obedience to God; devout, religious" (1.a); this definition applies directly to Rebecca. Yet, another definition complicates Rebecca's action: "Of a fraud or deception: practiced for the supposed benefit of those deceived, or to further what is considered a virtuous aim; (in a negative sense) intended to exploit religious credulity" (3).

[7] In fact, Milton's use of "subtle" and "wily" most always are associated with Satan and Eve. Remarkably prior to the Fall, as Satan prepares to take the form of the serpent, Milton writes, "His head the midst, well stored with subtle wiles" (9.184).

CHAPTER 4

CONCLUSION

> [I]t is the councell of the wisest King, not to despise the instructions of a mother; and it was his practice, too, to record, notwithstanding his owne exterordinary inspired wisdome, his mothers holy instructions.—Lucy Hutchinson, *On the Principles of the Christian Religion, Addressed to Her Daughter*

"Lucy Hutchinson read and wrote," states Joan Bennett, "as a liberationist" (154). As Bennett attempts to alleviate the resulting dilemma that she believes "twenty-first century feminist readers" face when engaging with Milton, she champions feminist liberation theology as an useful tool for challenging Milton's reputation as a misogynist and for recovering Eve's agency in *Paradise Lost*. She uses the same theological model to interrogate Hutchinson's *Memoirs of the Life of Colonel Hutchinson* and *Order and Disorder*, tracing the topos of "mutual help" between wife and husband in *Memoirs*, which she then applies to *Order and Disorder* (149). Such a critique makes Hutchinson's characters a reflection of Hutchinson herself. Thus, just as Hutchinson willfully accepts her subordinate position in the marital hierarchy but still operates freely within patriarchy, her characters Sarah and Rebecca do the same. Sarah's meal preparation for Abraham and their divine guests, for instance, does not signal her inferiority but rather denotes her mutual participation alongside her husband in their service to God; Sarah serves through her domestic abilities (150). Additionally, Bennett reads Rebecca and her execution of the blessing narrative through the lens of feminist liberation theology in

order to demonstrate that Rebecca plays an equally fundamental role in establishing Israel, as Isaac does.[1] Bennett concludes her section on Hutchinson by calling for future scholarship to "develop more fully" "the feminist liberationist approach" to Hutchinson's writing (157).

Indeed, the parallels between Hutchinson's work and feminist liberation theology warrant a closer investigation of her dedication of Sarah and Rebecca. By aligning my reading of Hutchinson's feminist appropriation of typology with Bennett's assertion that Hutchinson was a liberationist, I want to reinforce and extend Bennett's claim by first considering *Order and Disorder* as a precursory text for feminist theology. However, I wish to resist combining Hutchinson's feminist typology with twentieth-century feminist theology in order to exculpate Milton from the charge that he is a misogynist. Instead, this move ultimately reinforces this charge. Thus, Hutchinson's reinsertion of Sarah and Rebecca into the Christian redemption narrative by casting them as types for Mary highlights and critiques Milton's stubborn denial of their presence and his channeling of the narrative through a patriarchal typology. The tension that exists between the two poems due to their respective antagonistic models of typology hints at an overarching theological conflict. Specifically, the inchoate form of feminist theology found in *Order and Disorder* directly challenges the "misogynistic theology" that Sandra Gilbert locates in *Paradise Lost* (369). Indeed, both Hutchinson and Milton authored theological treatises, so, in moving away from the biographical reading that Bennett imposes upon *Order and Disorder,* I want to draw yet another comparison between the two seventeenth-century poets, one that sets their poetry in dialogue with their respective theological treatises.

In her interaction with seventeenth-century Protestant Biblical exegesis, Hutchinson practices a feminist appropriation of typology in two ways. First, she successfully subverts the stereotypical depictions of postlapsarian women, such as Sarah and Rebecca, as repetitions of Eve, the feminine type of the innately sinful woman. Additionally, Hutchinson's depiction of Sarah and Rebecca adheres to the typological pattern of "prefiguration, recapitulation, and fulfillment" (Lewalski 111).[2] Sarah and Rebecca recapitulate Eve in so much as the three women share similar attributes and experiences and all prefigure Mary; however, Sarah and Rebecca supersede Eve as each increasingly propels the redemption narrative as they await perfect fulfillment through their antitype, Mary. Sarah is simultaneously beautiful and virtuous. She can "enamour" men while also anticipating Mary through her role as mother of Isaac, a type for Christ (11.49). Likewise, Rebecca is also fair, but Hutchinson mainly exalts her "wily arts," praising her calculated deception of Isaac that places Jacob in line for the father's blessing, an act that secures the advancement of the redemption narrative (18.221). Hutchinson provides an innovative response to Eve's absence in the majority of Books 11 and 12 of *Paradise Lost* and restores Eve's — and Sarah's and Rebecca's—spiritual, not just reproductive, role to these books by supplanting the negative type of woman as Temptress and replacing it with a positive type that unites feminine virtue with beauty and wiles. Hutchinson also rectifies Milton's depiction of Eve as inherently linked to the "fair enticing fruit," which causes the destruction of humankind (*PL* 9.996). More importantly, she enables the Genesis matriarchs to embody once again Milton's Edenic model of "sweet attractive grace" that offers a welcoming participation for them in the lineage of Christ (4.298). Whereas Milton represents Eve as abnegating her role as

“Mother of Mankind” and her title as facilitator of humankind’s redemption, “Ill worthy I such title should belong / To me transgressor,” Hutchinson’s Sarah and Rebecca reverse Eve’s incertitude (*PL* 11.159; 11.163-64). As mothers who bear “the holy seed” (*OD* 16.19), they are “worthy” of “such [a] title.”

In addition to elevating the mother’s role in the redemption narrative, *Order and Disorder* also serves as an experiment in feminist theology. Hutchinson’s feminist appropriation of typology combined with the marginal glosses of Scripture that populate the first five cantos of *Order and Disorder*, such as the mother’s curse section in Canto 5 that threads together Eve, Rebecca, Rachel, and Mary, indicate Hutchinson’s curiosity about a woman’s role as theologian. Can a woman like herself be authorized as a theologian, and if so how can she reconcile her faith with a Pauline doctrine of subservience? Surprisingly, Hutchinson’s poem anticipates twentieth-century feminist theology, which also finds “reading the Bible from the perspective [role] of the oppressed” woman to be problematic (Letty 12). Interestingly, both *Order and Disorder* and feminist theology offer a radical reevaluation of Old Testament women and their subordinate status in patriarchy that often negates the crucial role that women such as Sarah and Rebecca play in Christian history. Prominent feminist theologians, such as Phyllis Trible, and seminal texts, such as the *Feminist Interpretation of the Bible*, aim to liberate Biblical women from the patriarchal perspective that would circumscribe them.[3] While such work relates broadly to Hutchinson, feminist theologian J. Cheryl Exum’s identification of the “paradox” of the “mother in Israel” specifically relates to *Order and Disorder*: “Though frequently ignored in the larger story of Israel’s journey toward the promise, the matriarchs act at strategic points that move the plot, and thus the promise, in

the proper direction toward its fulfillment" (76). For instance, she notes Rebecca's "pivotal role in obtaining for Jacob the patriarchal blessing" and claims, "Israel (Jacob) sets out on its journey toward fulfillment of its destiny, on a course chartered by its mother" (78). Exum's statements undeniably echo Hutchinson's Sarah and Rebecca and the essential role she creates for them to play in typology. They, in fact, do "move the plot" and direct the "fulfillment" of "the promise" and, thus, reclaim an active participation in Christian history.

The notion that *Order and Disorder* acts as Hutchinson's experiment in feminist theology may seem like a reading that superimposes twentieth-century feminist ideals onto Hutchinson—a reading that fashions a proto-feminist out of a highly conservative early modern woman who presents herself in the *Memoirs* as "embra[cing] a misogynistic tradition that militated against the very idea of a woman having a life of writing" (Mayer 306). However, Hutchinson was not unfamiliar with theology. In fact, she very much engaged with and wrote religious texts. David Norbrook claims that from 1667-1668, during her composition of *Order and Disorder*, Hutchinson was also "engaged in a detailed study of Calvin's *Institutes*, to which she added a statement of her own religious beliefs" ("*Order and Disorder*" xvi-xvii).[4] Furthermore, she completed a partial translation of theologian John Owen's *Theologoumena Pantodapa*, which is attached to her own theologian treatise: *On the Principles of the Christian Religion*. Though preserved in manuscript until its publication in 1817, *On the Principles of the Christian Religion* was written around the 1670s, and Hutchinson addressed it to her daughter, Barbara, after her marriage. Interestingly, Norbrook speculatively corresponds the date of completion of *On the Principles of the Christian Religion* (1673?) to that of

Hutchinson's resumption of *Order and Disorder*. Thus, given that Hutchinson composed *Order and Disorder* during the same time frame as her various religious writings, the idea of Hutchinson as a proto-feminist theologian does not sound so anachronistic.

In fact, *On the Principles of the Christian Religion* only further illuminates what is in operation in *Order and Disorder*. Both texts explore the mother-daughter relationship and signal a direct interest in theology. Being addressed to her daughter, Hutchinson's theological treatise ostensibly places the work in the genre of mother's advice books, a genre in women's writing through which "writing mothers assumed the role of redeemer—Mary rather than Eve" in their religious instructions for "only their children or other women," as Elaine Beilin claims (248). Beilin links the gendered genre of mother's advice books to woman's place in typology, implying that for early modern women, the mother becomes the antitype Mary who acts as a spiritual guide for her children and, furthermore, serves to redeem the fallen Eve. Hutchinson, likewise, parallels herself to Mary as she addresses her daughter:

> I know you may say you can read the word, and make collections thence yourselfe, as well as I; but when you doe, you will find it my duty to exhort and admonish you according to the talent entrusted with me, and to watch over your soule….it is your duty to heare and receive my instruction, and obey it so farre as it is corrospondent to the comands of God: it is the councell of the wisest King, not to despise the instructions of a mother; and it was his practice, too, to record, notwithstanding his owne exterordinary inspired wisdome, his mothers holy instructions. The sence of my owne duty carries me on in this worke, against all discouragements from myself or otherwise, to give you my light in Christian practise, as well as in the doctrine of the faith of God in Jesus Christ. (90)

Hutchinson's tract fits the basic criteria of a mother's advice book, which is most recognizable in that she dedicates it to her daughter. In this section, which oddly enough comes some ninety pages into the tract, Hutchinson begins her address to her daughter by

apologizing for insulting her daughter's intelligence, acknowledging that she "can read the word," or the Bible, and "make collections" just "as well as" her mother. Then, she identifies her "duty" as a mother, which is to "exhort and admonish" her daughter "according to the talent entrusted with" her. Furthermore, she parallels her role as mother to Mary and, correspondingly, her daughter to Christ. Just as Christ listened to and "recorded" "his mothers holy instructions" in addition to "his owne exterordinary inspired wisdome," so should Hutchinson's daughter heed the spiritual instructions that her mother provides for her. Interestingly, Hutchinson identifies an ambiguous point of conflict regarding her tract: "the sence of my owne duty carries me on in this worke, against all discouragements from myself or otherwise, to give you my light in Christian practise, as well as in the doctrine of the faith of God in Jesus Christ." Here, the word "worke" takes on two meanings—the task of instructing her daughter and the actual book itself. Her "sence of duty" motivates her instructions and also her recording of those of instructions. Thus, Hutchinson validates her compiling of the tract as a part of her "duty" as mother and, secondly, as an exercise of her writing. Possibly the "discouragements" that she feels result from the two-fold nature of her "worke," which claims to be part advice on "Christian practise" and part "doctrine" of Christianity. Indeed, within the tract, Hutchinson does not merely address the spiritual life of her daughter; rather, she instructs her daughter in theology, which shows a separation from the mother's advice book. Whereas mother's advice books often counsel daughters on trivial matters such as naming children, Hutchinson takes the opportunity to addresses doctrinal topics such as the Trinity or the Fall.[5]

Moreover, Hutchinson's *On the Principles of the Christian Religion* vastly departs from the overtly feminine genre of mother's advice books and finds a place in the masculine genre of theology. Hutchinson's role as theologian strengthens a comparison of her with Milton who also authored a theological treatise, *De Doctrina Christiana*. So not only does Hutchinson use *Order and Disorder* to challenge *Paradise Lost*, a work that is also in the masculine genre of the epic, she also parallels Milton's theological tract *De Doctrina Christiana* with her *On the Principles of the Christian Religion*. Both poets' theologies were published posthumously, but with disparate receptions. Though the publisher of *On the Principles of the Christian Religion* recognized the work as worthy enough to "rescue from oblivion another most eminent proof of [Hutchinson's] singular talents and virtues, that they may bloom anew for the future edification of her sex," Hutchinson's work has actually receded into "oblivion" (iv). In contrast, Milton's *De Doctrina Christiana*, published in 1825, shattered the image of "Milton as a poet impeccably sound of faith" but has become a theological framework for interpreting *Paradise Lost* (Kelly 3).[6] Maurice Kelley claims that "as a conceptual statement of that dogma, and as a formative force in the creation of the epic, the *De doctrina* offers the beginnings of that knowledge; and the treatise becomes, consequently, a document indispensable for an appreciation of Milton's art..." (217).

In extending Kelley's belief that *De Doctrina Christiana* allows for "an appreciation of Milton's art," I suggest that an investigation of the relationship between Hutchinson's *On the Principles of Christian Religion* and her epic *Order and Disorder* will prove a fruitful direction for future scholarship on Hutchinson that allows us to gain a larger "appreciation" for her epic. Explicit connections exist between her poetry and

theology. For example, when God in *Order and Disorder* foretells the serpent's defeat by Eve's seed, Hutchinson writes, "More various mystery / Ne'er did within so short a sentence lie" (5.67-8), a sentiment mirrored in *On the Principles of the Christian Religion:* "in that promise, that the seed of the woman should breake the serpent's head, which text hath more grace and mistery in it, then is generally taken notice of" (52). In both instances, Hutchinson elucidates the sentence's typological significance. Similarly, in addition to the figure of the mother, the mother's curse that I have traced in my study of *Order and Disorder* can also be found in Hutchinson's theological tract. In her epic, Hutchinson describes the painful process of childbirth as a universal plight for mothers because "though some may have more / Of sweet and gentle mixture, some of worse / … every mother's cup tastes of the curse" (5.176-79). Likewise, in her theological tract, Hutchinson links the spiritual pain associated with "the manner of the worke of regeneration" to the physical pain of childbirth. Spiritual rebirth "is different almost in ever child that is borne to God; as in the naturall birth some have longer, some more paynfull pangs, some more desperate hazards and fainting, so according to the severall naturall constitutions…of various persons and the force of the Spiritt wounding the soule more deepely or indulgently…" (66). Thus, Hutchinson again employs the trope of childbirth to correlate spiritual and physical regeneration, viewing Eve's typological "birth" of Christ as the first site of humankind's redemption: "she shall / Recover all the hurt of her first fall / When, in mysterious manner, from her womb / Her father, brother, husband, son shall come" (5.225-28). Finally, Hutchinson's advice to her daughter to "not despise the instructions of a mother" (90) carries significant weight when read alongside her representation of Rebecca who instructs Jacob in acquiring the blessing and

who “doth *advice* / Jacob to make a political retreat” to avoid his brother Esau’s wrath (18.210-11 emphasis added).

Though Hutchinson’s theological tract remains predominately conservative, it can be a lens through which to view *Order and Disorder*. The theological beliefs found in *On the Principles of the Christian Religion* only reinforce the transgressive nature of her epic when the two are placed beside one another, showing her epic to be a space of experimental theology. In her theological tract, she identifies the mother as crucial for her child’s spiritual life and redemption, which she can further interrogate in her epic through Sarah and Rebecca who she has shaped as types for Mary. Indeed, by situating her narrative of Genesis in the genre of the epic, a genre that necessitates poetic innovation and succession, Hutchinson can creatively explore her interest in theology by reinserting the mother as quintessential to humankind’s redemption, thereby offsetting the “misogynistic theology” of *Paradise Lost* which channels redemption through only Old Testament patriarchs. Hutchinson’s “advent’rous song” of feminist typology truly “pursues / Things unattempted yet in prose or rhyme” (*PL* 1.13, 15-16).

Notes

[1] In the conclusion of her book *Women and Religious Writing in Early Modern England,* Erica Longfellow also draws parallels between early modern women writers, including Hutchinson, who produced religious texts and modern feminist theologians: “For the attempt to define what it is to be female and a disciple of Christ is as crucial to feminists seeking to reform modern Christianity as it was to Amelia Lanyer” (213). Like Bennett, Longfellow’s assertion relies on feminist liberation theology and Elisabeth Schüller Fiorenza, along with Phyllis Trible and Rosemary Radford Ruether. However, Longfellow hesitates to proclaim that early modern women writers of religious texts *were* feminist theologians (216).

[2] Marie Loughlin notes a similar pattern in typology: "promise, fulfillment, and supersedure" (135). Whether one chooses Lewalski's identified pattern or Loughlin's, both models imply that the type serves as a promise for the fulfillment of an antitype. Also, the antitype and sometimes types recapitulate previous types. In fulfillment process, the antitype supersedes the actions of the type.

[3] For Trible, see *Texts of Terror* where she confronts the profoundly disheartening Genesis narratives of Hagar, Tamar, "an unnamed" concubine, and Jephthah's wife (1). In the introduction of the collection of essays that comprise the *Feminist Interpretation of the Bible*, Letty Russell explains that feminist theology calls for a radically new approach to the Bible. Feminist theologians must recognize and accept that oppression, including patriarchy, does exist in the Bible. In response, theologians renegotiate what is considered as authority within scripture and offer a challenge to such authority through what Elisabeth Schüller Fiorenza "calls a „paradigm of emancipator praxis'" (qtd. in Russell 16). Also see Frankiel's *The Voice of Sarah*, for a great study of Sarah and other Israelite women.

[4] Norbrook dates Hutchinson's composition of her epic as from 1660 to around 1673; see "*Order and Disorder.*"

[5] Beilin's discussion of mother's advice books sets them in conversation with the various defenses of Eve that were popular in the early modern era; she claims that both genres have the same goal, regardless of the method of practice, which is to redeem Eve. For the genre of mother's advice books, Beilin analyzes writers Elizabeth Grymeston, Elizabeth Jocelin, Dorothy Leigh, Elizabeth Clinton, Countess of Lincoln, and M.R., author of *The Mothers Counsell*. Along with spiritual guidance, the mother's advice book typically addressed feminine and domestic topics, such as naming children, household management, etc.

[6] See Campbell, Gordon, et al., for a concise overview of the controversy surrounding Milton's theology and the specific theological topics addressed in *De Doctrina Christiana* (89-120).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

The Bible, King James Version. *Electronic Text Center*. University of Virginia. n.d. Web. 30 May 2009.

Calvin, John. *Genesis*. Trans. and Ed. John King. 1965. Edinburgh: The Banner of Truth Trust, 1992. Print.

The Geneva Bible: A Facsimile of the 1560 Edition. Madison: U of Wisconsin P, 1969. Print.

Hutchinson, Lucy. *On the Principles of the Christian Religion, Addressed to Her Daughter and On Theology*. London, 1817. Print.

---. *Order and Disorder*. Ed. David Norbrook. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 2001. Print.

Lanyer, Amelia. *The Poems of Amelia Lanyer: Salve Deus Rex Judaeorum*. Ed. Susanne Woods. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1993. Print.

Milton, John. *Paradise Lost*. Ed. Alastair Fowler, 2nd ed. Harlow, England: Longman, 1998. Print.

Speght, Rachel. *The Polemics and Poems of Rachel Speght*. Ed. Barbara Lewalski. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1996. Print.

Secondary Sources

Beilin, Elaine V. *Redeeming Eve: Women Writers of the English Renaissance*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1987. Print.

Bennett, Joan S. "Mary Astell, Lucy Hutchinson, John Milton, and Feminist Liberation Theology." *Milton in the Age of Fish: Essays on Authorship, Text, and Terrorism*. Ed. Michael Lieb and Albert C. Labriola. Pittsburg: Duquesne UP, 2006. 139-166. Print.

Campbell, Gordon, et al. *Milton and the Manuscript of* De Doctrina Christiana. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2007. Print.

Exum, J. Cheryl. "„Mother in Israel': A Familiar Figure Reconsidered." *Feminist Interpretation of the Bible*. Ed. Letty M. Russell. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1985. 73-85. Print.

Ferry, Anne. "Milton's Creation of Eve." *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 28.1 (1988): 113-32. Print.

Frankiel, Tamar. *The Voice of Sarah: Feminine Spirituality and Traditional Judaism*. New York: Harper San Francisco, 1990. Print.

Froula, Christine. "When Eve Reads Milton: Undoing the Canonical Economy." *Critical Inquiry* 10 (1983): 321-47. Print.

Galdon, Joseph A. *Typology and Seventeenth-Century Literature*. The Hague and Paris: Mouton, 1975. Print.

Gilbert, Sandra M. "Patriarchal Poetry and Women Readers: Reflections on Milton's Bogey." *PLMA* 93.3 (1978): 368-82. Print.

Gulden, Ann Torday. "Milton's Eve and Wisdom: The „Dinner-Party' Scene in *Paradise Lost*." *Milton Quarterly* 32.4 (1998): 137-42. Print.

Herman, Peter. *Destabilizing Milton:* Paradise Lost *and the Poetics of Incertitude*. New York: Palgrave Macmillian. 2008. Print.

Ingram, William and Kathleen Swaim, eds. *A Concordance to Milton's English Poetry*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1972. Print.

Kelley, Maurice. *This Great Argument: A Study of Milton's* De Doctrina Christiana *as a Gloss upon* Paradise Lost. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1941. Print.

Lewalski, Barbara Kiefer. Introduction. *The Polemics and Poems of Rachel Speght*. By. Rachel Speght. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1996. xi-xxxvi. Print.

---. *Protestant Poetics and the Seventeenth-Century Religious Lyric*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1979. Print.

---. "Structure and the Symbolism of Vision in Michael's Prophecy, *Paradise Lost*, Books XI-XII." *Philological Quarterly* 42 (1963): 25-35. Print.

Lewis, C.S. *A Preface to 'Paradise Lost': Being the Ballard Matthews Lectures Delivered at University College, North Wales, 1941.* London: Oxford UP, 1942. Print.

Liebert, Elisabeth. "Rendering „More Equal': Eve's Changing Discourse in *Paradise Lost.*" *Milton Quarterly* 37.3 (2003): 152-165. *EBSCOhost*. Web. 24 Oct. 2009.

Longfellow, Erica. *Women and Religious Writing in Early Modern England*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2004. Print.

Loughlin, Marie. "„Fast ti'd unto them in a golden Chaine': Typology, Apocalypse, and Woman's Genealogy in Amelia Lanyer's *Salve Deus Rex Judaeorum*." *Renaissance Quarterly* 53.1 (2000): 133-79. *JSTOR*. Web. 25 Oct. 2009.

MacCallum, H.R. "Milton and Figurative Interpretation of the Bible." *University of Toronto Quarterly* 31 (1962): 397-415. Print.

---. "Milton and Sacred History: Books XI and XII of *Paradise Lost*." *Essays in English Literature from the Renaissance to the Victorian Age*. Ed. Millar MacLure and F.W. Watt. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1964, 149-68. Print.

Madsen, William G. *From Shadowy Types to Truth: Studies in Milton's Symbolism*. New Haven and London: Yale UP, 1968. Print.

Mayer, Robert. "Lucy Hutchinson: A Life of Writing." *The Seventeenth-Century* 22.2 (2007): 305-35. Print.

McColley, Diane K. *Milton's Eve*. Urbana: U of Illinois P, 1983. Print.

Miller, Shannon. *Engendering the Fall*: *John Milton and Seventeenth-Century Women Writers*. Philadelphia: U of Penn P, 2008. Print.

---."Maternity, Marriage, and Contract: Lucy Hutchinson's Response to Patriarchal Theory in *Order and Disorder.*" *Studies in Philology* 102.3 (2005): 340-77. *EBSCOhost*. Web. 30 May 2009.

Miner, Earl, ed. Paradise Lost*, 1668-1968: Three Centuries of Commentary*. Lewisburg: Bucknell UP, 2004. Print.

Moore, C.A. "Miltoniana (1679-1741)." *Modern Philology* 24 (1927): 321-39. Print.

Norbrook, David. "„A devine Originall': Lucy Hutchinson and the „woman's version.'" *Times Literary Supplement* 19 March 1999: 13-15. Print.

---. "*Order and Disorder*: The Poem and Its Contexts." Introduction. *Order and Disorder*. By Lucy Hutchinson. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 2001. xii-lii. Print.

---."John Milton, Lucy Hutchinson and the Republican Biblical Epic." *Milton and the Grounds of Contention*. Ed. Mark R. Kelley, Michael Lieb and John T. Shawcross. Pittsburg: Duquesne University Press, 2003. 37-63, 292-93. Print.

---."Lucy Hutchinson and *Order and Disorder*: The Manuscript Evidence." *English Manuscript Studies: 1100-1700 Volume 9: Writings by Early Modern Women*. Ed. Peter Beal and Margaret J.M. Ezell. London: The British Library, 2000. 257-91. Print.

"Pious." *Oxford English Dictionary Online*. Oxford English Dictionary. 2009. Web. 4 February 2010.

Radzinowicz, Mary Ann. "Milton on the Tragic Women of Genesis." *Of Poetry and Politics: New Essays on Milton and His World*. Ed. P.G. Stanwood. Binghamton, New York: Medieval & Renaissance Texts & Studies, 1995. 131-51. Print.

Russell, Letty M, ed. *Feminist Interpretation of the Bible*. London: Westminster John Knox Press, 1985. Print.

Schwartz, Regina. "From Shadowy Types to Shadowy Types: The Unendings of *Paradise Lost*." *Milton Studies* 24 (1988): 123-39. Print.

Shawcross, John T. *Milton: A Bibliography for the Years 1624-1700*. Binghamton, New York: Medieval and Renaissance Texts & Studies, 1984. 251. Print.

Trible, Phyllis. *Texts of Terror*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984. Print.

Walker, William. "Typology and *Paradise Lost*, Books XI and XII." *Milton Studies* 25 (1989): 245-64. Print.

Wilcher, Robert. "„Adventurous song' or „presumptuous folly': The Problem of „utterance' in John Milton's *Paradise Lost* and Lucy Hutchinson's *Order and Disorder*." *Seventeenth-Century* 21.2 (2006): 304-14. *EBSCOhost*. Web. 30 May 2009.

Wittreich, Joseph. *Feminist Milton*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1987. Print.

---. "Milton's Transgressive Maneuvers: Receptions (Then and Now) and the Sexual Politics of *Paradise Lost*." *Milton and Heresy*. Ed. Stephen Dobranski and John P. Rumrich. New York: Cambridge UP, 1998. 244-66. Print.

Woods, Susanne. “Narrative Poetry.” *The Cambridge Companion to Early Modern Women’s Writing*. Ed. Laura L. Knoppers. New York: Cambridge UP, 2009. 222-234. Print.

“Zealous.” *Oxford English Dictionary Online*. Oxford English Dictionary. 2009. Web. 4 February 2010.