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Memory, Community, and Textuality in Nonconformist Life Writings 1760–1810

Abstract: For religious dissenters, collective and individual records were crucial to sustaining their traditions. This essay pursues two related questions – why was memorial writing so important for dissenters in the eighteenth century, and what was the role of women in the production of nonconformist culture – by investigating the material circumstances of production, preservation, and dissemination of life writings. It introduces the editorial and commemorative activities of Mercy Doddridge and Jane Attwater, asks how a writer’s confessional identity might find its way into the structure and content of her writing, and compares processes of composition for printed texts with the compilation and preservation of manuscript records. The relationship between the archival practices of familial and religious communities over time and the content of individuals’ writings significantly shaped the culture of religious nonconformity into the nineteenth century, but the contribution of women to that process has been undervalued until now.

Ah my beloved Child! In vain I strive
To paint those virtues which in thee did live

Jane Attwater, “In Memory of her Daughter, Anna, c. 1811”¹

For the two nonconformist women at the centre of this essay, efforts to commemorate deceased family members and articulate the Christian commitments of those loved ones were lifelong projects that strongly marked each woman’s identity as a member of a religious community. Those efforts took various forms in print and manuscript. The striving of Jane Attwater (1753–1843) found textual expression in poetry, letters, and the epitaph she composed for her daughter Annajane, all of which combine delineation of the Christian’s best life, personal recollection, and exhortation to others to learn from the young woman’s example. But by far the fullest depiction of “those

virtues which in thee did live” is found in a diary Attwater kept during Annajane’s terminal illness in 1809. In the spring and summer of 1809, Attwater recorded the words and acts of Annajane who despite suffering from consumption and becoming ever weaker remained consistent in her Baptist faith and highly articulate in her expression of the orthodox doctrines of her confession. The diary entries became a source of emotional sustenance and factual detail in the period of bereavement that followed Annajane’s death.

Mercy Doddridge (1709–1790) did not know Jane Attwater, and any diary Doddridge might have kept during the final illness of her husband (the minister, tutor, and author Philip Doddridge) has not been located. Nevertheless, the situations and activities of the two women are comparable in terms of their commitment to memory work, understood here as the careful creation of written accounts of the deceased that situate them within larger religious and historical communities. Mercy Doddridge’s account of her husband’s final days and death (written for her children) was copied out, preserved, and read by others outside the immediate family circle. She sought to commemorate her husband’s achievements and secure his influence by publishing his works and contributing to his biography. But despite Mercy Doddridge’s energetic attempts to involve herself in the public painting of her husband’s virtues, she met with resistance from his friends and former students, who took public responsibility for preserving and broadcasting his memory.

These two women contributed to the production of life writing in ways that were both endorsed and challenged by other members of the orthodox nonconformist communities to which they belonged. The reasons for and consequences of those dynamics are presented here in order to argue that a closer attentiveness to female participation in the literary culture of commemoration is necessary for understanding the interrelations of writing and memory in the construction of collective and enduring group identities for English nonconformists. The repertoire of literary practices the women undertook encompassed various editorial activities, including collecting, extending, supplementing, editing, revising, retelling, and authenticating.

---

Given its focus on historicising written acts of commemoration, this essay is not directly concerned with the faculty of memory, its operation in a scientific or philosophical sense, or the rhetorical and educational uses of memorisation. Rather, it attends to the practices and processes whereby people, places, and events are recorded by minority groups in order to sustain their traditions and collective identities over time. The introductory section that follows considers three pairs of related terms—memory and history, women and men, and manuscript and print—in terms of the collective identity of religious dissenters.

Memory Places, Ministers, and Nonconformist Memorials

Theories of memory places and collective memory conceptualise memorial processes and their purposes in ways that can helpfully (albeit incompletely) be translated across nations and time periods. Maurice Halbwachs makes collectivity central to the operation of memorial, for it “confines and binds our most intimate remembrances to each other.”\(^3\) The locations for these acts are called *lieux de mémoire* by Pierre Nora, who claims these sites “where memory crystallises” are crucial for individuals to form a sense of the past shared with others.\(^4\) In this vision of collective remembering, Nora had in mind events, historical figures, and physical monuments, which act as “embriments of a memorial consciousness” and are increasingly important for the maintenance of unified national identity in our own late modern era when historical documentation overwrites “spontaneous memory.”\(^5\) Memory places can be smaller and more portable than Nora’s examples, and they can work at a more intimate level than that of national identity. For example, Sharon Achinstein examines the “construction through mourning of a community” that nonconformist ministers’ funerals effected in the Restoration period.\(^6\) By changing the scale in this way,

---


\(^5\) Nora, “Between Memory and History,” 12.

everyday materials of and for collective memorial come into focus: those things Paul Ricoeur says act as “clues that guard against forgetting.”

Books—be they handwritten or printed volumes—serve as strong “clues” to what must be remembered. In the case of English nonconformists, for whom memories of shared struggle were central to a corporate identity, each collectively and individually written record became “a paper monument” to the challenge of sustaining their traditions, understanding their place in national history, and connecting living dissenters with nonconformist forebears. Books were also important as a practical means of disseminating religious teaching when ministers were prevented from preaching.

In his study of the written histories that articulated nonconformist identity in the eighteenth century, John Seed characterises dissent as “a fluid and unstable historical community” and suggests that it was through the textual transformation of memories into history that the community was made secure. Dissenting identity, argues Seed, was primarily constructed on shared experience of persecution: “Eighteenth-century Dissenters continued to disagree on many issues, but they shared a common experience of an injustice, which the Glorious Revolution and Act of Toleration had not remedied.” Seed does not overlook other features of collective identity that dissenters prized—such as their care for liberty of conscience or their commitment to social networks of family and friendship—but these identifiers are subordinate, in Seed’s argument, to the memory of persecution. This strongly political understanding of identity is paralleled by the highly professional terms in which authority to record dissenting history is understood. In this memory work it is the ejection of ministers from pulpits that must be remembered; it is tracking the names of ministers and the places they ministered that is the task of the historian of dissent; it is sermons preached at the funerals of dissenting ministers that provide the sources for published biographical accounts. These were all activities controlled by men.

The masculine character and ministerial domination of the official history of dissent left little space in the printed record for women to articulate the experience of living as lay dissenters. But women generally constituted at least half the regular attenders of nonconformist meeting houses for which records are available, and they
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8 Achinstein, 58.
were recognised as active members of congregations. The disjunction between women’s day-to-day participation in nonconformist religious practice and their relative absence from scholarly accounts of orthodox dissenting culture in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries creates a distorted picture of the meaning and operation of nonconformist memorial. To what extent did women participate in literary culture in the eighteenth century? How did they operate as authors and editors? What were the relations between printed works and manuscript writings? Exploration of these questions in cases of educated women has produced strong insights into the collaborative and heterosocial practices of elite literary production. Highlighting religious identity, scholarship that charts and analyses the intellectual culture of seventeenth-century Puritan women has emphasised “the cultural authority and extensive social and intellectual networks” of the highly literate, mostly elite women featured there. But scholarly attention to the literary practices of women associated with orthodox religious nonconformity fades for the period beyond Toleration.

Given the relative paucity of evidence about nonconformist women’s literary practices, describing a tradition of their writing and memorialising remains challenging, though Timothy Whelan’s account of shared religious and literary commitments traceable through the work of Anne Bradstreet and Elizabeth Rowe to

---


Anne Steele and Mary Steele is persuasive. Determining the extent to which continuities can be found in the practices and priorities of nonconformist women engaged in literary acts of commemoration from one generation to another is an ongoing project that can draw on Whelan’s presentation of the Steele circle (to which Jane Attwater belonged) as women who “never relinquished their prerogative to write their own lives and to bequeath that right to future generations.”

One category of text which richly details nonconformist literary culture and practice, including women’s words and experiences, is manuscript church books. Very few of these have been edited for publication and therefore they remain an under-studied source. While the extent to which they contain direct transcriptions of words uttered by female church members is debatable, it is evident that one of their primary functions was to write church members, including women, into nonconformist history. Most church records begin by saying that they constitute “[a] ‘book of rememberance’ that will serve generations to come, thus establishing a direct link between record-keeping and the writing of history” observes Anne Dunan-Page, in terms that highlight the continuities in purpose, if not form, between these manuscripts and formal histories of nonconformity, such as the ministerial productions surveyed by Seed.

The affinities between these two forms of representation can be viewed through N. H. Keeble’s understanding of the literary culture of nonconformity in the seventeenth century, many aspects of which in fact persist throughout the period in which religious dissent existed as a legal category. Keeble argues that nonconformity is literary in its construction and that the primary literary mode of its self-representation is historical writing. Notably, the histories out of which that identity is constituted operate on vastly different scales. Nonconformist identity was narrated in terms that encompassed a thousand years of church history, from identification with a long durational history of dissent within Christianity from the earliest Celtic church, through sixteenth-century Reformation history and the civil unrest of the
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14 Ibid, 21.
British Isles in the seventeenth century, to events of the immediate past (the ejection of nonconformist ministers after the Restoration of Charles II, for example, or persecutions imposed by the enforcements of penal legislation such as the Five Mile Act, or ongoing civil disabilities such as curbs on occasional conformity and restrictions on university matriculation and graduation). Importantly, it kept the future as steadily in view as it did the past.

A key figure in the construction of nonconformist identity through its written history was the minister Richard Baxter. He declared biography of exemplary figures to be an especially powerful way of securing collective memory for the future. This memorial mode had several positive functions, which he lists in his preface to Samuel Clarke’s compendium of *Lives of Sundry Eminent Persons* (1683). People benefit from good examples, says Baxter, and in “a time of mental War” such as the early 1680s, accurate accounts of the lives of suitable figures were necessary to combat ignorance and false knowledge. Biographical writing obeyed God’s instruction to “have the memory of the just to be blessed.” Furthermore, “the true History of exemplary Lives is a pleasant and profitable recreation to young persons.” Baxter calls attention to the educative function of godly biography in spiritual, intellectual, and moral terms, which, he argued, gave memorial acts great significance for future generations. For Baxter, biographical texts are memory places. Because of their existence and the positive exemplarity of their subjects, these texts respond to and guard against human weakness.

This view was not unique to Baxter or to English nonconformists. Memorial practices develop partly due to human anxiety about the fallibility of memory, which is not only unreliable but is overtaxed: it “reaches towards the future as towards the past,” as James Olney says. Reflection on the burdened relationship between too-brief human life and the need to secure particular memories for future generations is itself deeply rooted in the literary traditions of religious communities. One scriptural expression of this comes in Psalm 71:

... when I am old and grayheaded, O God, forsake me not; until I have

---


shewed thy strength unto this generation, and thy power to every one that is to come.\textsuperscript{19}

The anxieties aroused by these universally felt pressures were particularly acute for nonconformists, who had particular reason to doubt that the right memories would be remembered following the Restoration. The title of Samuel Clarke’s \textit{The Marrow of Ecclesiastical Historie} (1650) uses the word “marrow” to foreground the human bodies that create the stories of history and suggest the nourishment those stories can provide, and his \textit{Lives of Sundry Eminent Persons in this Later Age} (1683) establishes a registry of nonconformist heroes from the recent past. Baxter’s own autobiography included a chapter detailing the ministers who lost their livings following the Restoration of Charles II. This idea was developed and methodised by Edmund Calamy in successive versions of what he presented as an “abridgement” and “continuation” of Baxter’s work, published in two versions during the first three decades of the eighteenth century.\textsuperscript{20} In the late eighteenth century this register of ejected ministers was re-titled by its new editor, Samuel Palmer, who had updated the contents to include information about later generations of dissenting ministers. The title \textit{The Nonconformist’s Memorial} (1775; further updated 1802) declares unified collective purpose and recognition of shared history through its use of the definite article and Palmer’s resurrection of the denominating label “nonconformist,” which had been common in the seventeenth century but was rarely used by the 1770s, when “dissenter” was more usual.

The example of these dissenting works anticipates Nora’s claim about minorities in the twentieth century: “The defense, by certain minorities, of a privileged memory that has retreated to jealously protected enclaves . . . intensely illuminates the truths of \textit{lieux de mémoire}: that without commemorative vigilance, history would soon sweep them away.”\textsuperscript{21} Baxter, Calamy, and Palmer wrote as religious ministers excluded from the national church and compelled to form

\textsuperscript{19} Psalms 71:18.

\textsuperscript{20} Edmund Calamy, \textit{An Abridgment of Mr Baxter’s History of his Life and Times} (London, 1702), \textit{An Abridgement of Mr Baxter’s History of his Life and Times} (London, 1713), and \textit{A Continuation of the Ministers, Lecturers, Masters and Fellows of Colleges, and Schoolmasters Who Were Ejected and Silenced} (London, 1727).

\textsuperscript{21} Nora, “Between Memory and History,” 12.
“protected enclaves.” They defended “a privileged memory” in order to establish a coherent, continuous tradition linking present dissenting congregations to a past defined by survival in the face of persecution.

The ministerial dominance over the history of dissent outlined here is not only a historical problem. In scholarship on dissent, there is a tendency to give undue attention to the writings and experiences of ministers: as it was in the eighteenth-century world of print, so it is now. Rebalancing this requires investigating the methods taken by the dissenting laity, especially women, to remember themselves and their families. These were rather different to those methods favoured by the men from their community who dominated the printed record though the aims of preserving a tradition, remembering an individual, and promoting piety were in keeping with ministerially-led practices. To assess whether “commemorative vigilance” is as useful a way of understanding the memorial practices undertaken by nonconformist women as it is for understanding the practices of ministerial historians, this essay will now consider varieties of memorial practice in terms of genres, modes, and impulses for writing to delineate ways in which textual form affects the content and practice of memorial.

Mercy Doddridge’s Memories and Job Orton’s Memoirs

The first full biography of Philip Doddridge (1702–1751) was published in 1766 by a trio of dissenting booksellers working in partnership. Its author was Job Orton, Doddridge’s former student and assistant and the editor of his posthumous publications. Doddridge and his biography are presented as products of the dissenting community, and this book’s material existence is used to display that community as a professional, urban one, with strong links between London and provincial centres of print. The year of publication was fifteen years after Doddridge’s death. Though this felt to Mercy Doddridge like a long time to wait for a biography to be published, it is striking that it did not take centuries or even generations to determine that Doddridge was a notable figure deserving significant textual commemoration. Many people who

had known Doddridge were still alive and might well have been among the eager early readers of the book, contributing to its commercial success of five hundred copies sold within a couple of months. Shortly after the book’s publication, Job Orton informed Mercy Doddridge:

I printed 1000 Mr Eddowes kept 500 of which he hath sold above 300 – Mr Buckland had 500 of which he hath sold above 250. & saith his Sale continues. Perhaps a 2d Edition may be wanted soon.23

The work was commercially successful and remained in demand with readers. Surviving correspondence suggests, however, that the journey to successful publication and healthy sales was neither a simple nor a speedy one. Mercy Doddridge pushed hard to stay informed about the work’s progress. She had done this before during the publication of Philip Doddridge’s *Family Expositor* by communicating with different members of his circle to ensure that they worked hard to get his unfinished six-volume work of New Testament translation, paraphrase, and commentary into print.24 In several important respects, her role in the creation of the biography was even more active than it had been for *The Family Expositor*. In the earlier case, it was impossible for her to be involved in developing the work’s content. Doddridge’s manuscript was in his shorthand (which, lacking a dissenting academy education, she could not read) and the references were to books in the library now sited at Daventry Academy. A team of men who had attended and taught at dissenting academies completed the text of the posthumously published volumes. Mercy Doddridge concerned herself with all the business matters relating to *The Family Expositor* by cutting deals with booksellers, arranging subscription campaigns, and writing to the editorial team to check up on their progress. A similar range of duties pertained to the preparation of the edition of Doddridge’s academy lectures. But when it came to the Memoirs she provided material—both physical documents and her memories—and commented on editorial choices.

23 Job Orton to Mercy Doddridge, 15 February 1766, Dr. Williams’s Library, New College Library (hereafter DWL NCL), MS L1/8/61. The octavo cost five shillings bound. A duodecimo second edition was issued in 1767 priced two shillings and sixpence.

Orton’s biography is a labour of considerable research. Letters from Orton to Mercy Doddridge provide evidence about his research methods: he worked from primary materials as much as possible, including Doddridge’s diaries and letters, many of which Mercy Doddridge supplied.\(^{25}\) There appears to have been some agreement between the two on how to manage the material traces of his life in order to guarantee seemly commemoration: Orton writes in May 1764: “After I have made the proper Extracts, I should be desirous to destroy his early Diaries, for the reasons you yourself hint.”\(^{26}\) Orton consults Mercy Doddridge on matters of fact, such as “Whether it was not the late Earl of Halifax, who procured for him a Prohibition from the King, when he was prosecuted for teaching an Academy?”\(^{27}\)

However, while Mercy Doddridge’s interest in the work’s development is clear from Job Orton’s replies, the equality of their partnership or the cordiality of their relations should not be overstated. Orton frequently rejects Mercy Doddridge’s suggestions about the biography’s content. He says, “The Affair of ye Bedford Family I can do nothing with only the Duchess’[s] Proposal may be properly mentioned” (he is referring here to Lady Russell’s offer to fund Doddridge’s education at Oxford or Cambridge). Later in the same letter he asserts, “His Kindness to his Sister cannot be mentioned, without hinting at her Husband’s Conduct, w[ch] s[he]d not be done.”\(^{28}\) The result of this suppression is that the story of the lay dissenters Elizabeth and John Nettleton remains unknown. Mercy Doddridge tended to favour a deeper level of personal detail being included in the biography than Orton did, as this comment in a letter to her indicates: “as you observe it may be agreeable to those who knew him more intimately, to trace every circumstance relating to him.” She was told, however, that “as to many of ye particul[ar]s relating to ye Drs Fam[ily] & his cong[n]ect[i]ons. . . I don’t see yt they can with any propriety be inserted.”\(^{29}\) The question of who is authorised to decide on the degree of personal detail that is proper for a printed memoir to provide is a charged one here: the widow as keeper of personal memories battles with the biographer as custodian of the public memorial.

\(^{25}\) Job Orton to Mercy Doddridge, 14 May 1764, where he thanks her for a “parcel.” DWL NCL, MS L1/8/49–50.

\(^{26}\) Job Orton to Mercy Doddridge, 14 May 1764, DWL NCL, MS L1/8/49–50.

\(^{27}\) Orton to Mercy Doddridge, 1 September 1764, DWL NCL, MS L1/8/54.

\(^{28}\) Orton to Mercy Doddridge, 6 February 1765, DWL NCL, MS L1/8/58.

\(^{29}\) Samuel Clark to Mercy Doddridge, 11 February 1765, DWL NCL, MS L1/12/11.
Nor was it a fight between the widow and the biographer alone. A third correspondent penned the comments above about “many of the particul[a]rs relating to” the Nettletons and Elizabeth Russell. Samuel Clark’s involvement came about because Mercy Doddridge sought help from and gave instructions to several people simultaneously, as she had done during earlier publishing negotiations. Clark was the son of Doddridge’s mentor and was a former assistant tutor at Doddridge’s academy (like Orton) as well as a tutor at Daventry, and he was editor of Doddridge’s *A Course of Lectures*. He also was the great-grandson of the Samuel Clarke who compiled the biographical compendia commemorating nonconformist lives and Protestant piety. This familial connection between biographical writings in different forms and centuries highlights the point that remembered patterns for histories of dissent bore on specific acts of writing in the eighteenth century. As the only woman in a lineage of ministers whose ideas about nonconformist biography were held in common and based on ministerial precedents, Mercy Doddridge struggled to make a place for herself. Her activity was restricted to providing information despite her efforts to adopt a more creative role.

Clark’s letters give the impression that he regards himself as a mediator between Mercy Doddridge and Orton. Clark carries out Mercy Doddridge’s instructions to a point, but he defends Orton from her criticisms about the way he has written the biography and he politely but firmly resists her call for fuller editorial collaboration. For example he acquiesces in Orton’s refusal to allow her to read the “last part” (chapter nine, on “His Last Sickness and Death”), saying “Mr. O. is quite averse to it”: instead, Clark himself will “compare it again wth your Narrative,” in accordance with Orton’s wishes. The transformation of a personal manuscript narrative to printed account is not one in which Mercy Doddridge was entitled to participate. Clark provides detailed reasons for rejecting her high level of involvement:

> I was concerned to find by Mr O[rtton].’s last L[ette]r. yt you had proposed to him my keeping ye MS, & sending it Chapter by Chapter with your Remarks on each, or at least, such of them as I shd judge proper. Beside the hazard of sending it in parcels, it wd occasion a great deal more trouble to each of us than

---

30 Clark to Mercy Doddridge, 23 January 1765, DWL NCL, MS L1/12/10.
perhaps you are aware of, & wou’d almost necessarily delay ye work, as a great deal of time wd be taken up in writing backwards & forwards, & ye opportunities of Conveyances wd often be very inconvenient. But it is a sufficient reason against it yt it wd create so much additional trouble to Mr O[rtton], yt he wd be tempted to lay ye whole aside. I thought ye Passages I transcribed in my last we ye only remaining Facts you were dissatisfied with, (I mean excepting those of wch I took an acc[oun]t.)

Mercy Doddridge’s suggestion that she might work as an equal partner and be granted full editorial oversight of the manuscript is overruled. The reasons given are logistics and postal security rather than any explicit articulation of the hierarchy of editorial authority. The threat that the book will not make it into print at all hangs over the end of the paragraph: if the group are not in agreement about the best way to compose the Memoirs then the final work is a hostage in these negotiations. The need for such a threat suggests that Orton’s control over the biography was not entirely secure. But though Mercy Doddridge apparently wanted a key role, she did not have the final power to direct the publication: the team of ministers, Doddridge’s acolytes, closed ranks against her incursions.

The ways in which Mercy Doddridge tried to assert authority over the printed commemoration of her husband’s life can be enumerated from letters written to her. She attempted to get sight of the manuscripts and to factor herself into an elaborate editorial procedure for reading of drafts; she wrote comments and tried to get them taken up; and she extended the editorial dialogue out beyond the author. However, she met with almost no success. The phrases she questioned can be found in the printed text, meaning that her editorial suggestions were not acted upon. The things she wanted to be added were not included. She drew up a document of “Remark[s]” but was not the one to present it to Orton. Clark sent them on, with further comments of his own (which were not revealed to Mercy Doddridge). Clark’s correspondence is very courteous in tone, but he did not support her proposals. The biography is produced as Orton wished and presented in the professional terms he favoured. His preface states: “The Lives of holy, zealous Ministers are particularly useful; as in
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31 Clark to Mercy Doddridge, 25 January 1765, DWL NCL, MS L1/12/10.
32 Clark to Mercy Doddridge, 2 April 1765, DWL NCL, MS L1/12/12.
them may be seen a Pattern of a Christian conversation for all, and of ministerial faithfulness and activity for their Brethren." In a memorial seeking to present the life of a minister, there is limited opportunity for family involvement, and the public presentation of the deceased minister prioritises his public role and is controlled by his professional associates.

Biographies of women written by husbands, fathers, and other male relatives are fairly common, but the inverse is far less so, particularly in the eighteenth century. Margaret Cavendish’s printed memoir of her husband and the information in Elizabeth Freke’s manuscript “Remembrances” are rare examples and come from an earlier period. Orton’s Memoirs of Philip Doddridge indicates some reasons for this paucity. Women faced difficulties trying to join male literary networks on equal terms. Expectations about the nature of the public record and who was entitled to shape it confined them to adjunct roles. The principal practical reason for Orton involving Mercy Doddridge in the composition of the Memoirs was that she held the papers he needed and had been present at Doddridge’s deathbed. Though the role of public memoirist was not available to women, the role of family archivist was. Marjorie Reeves observes that “the papers of humbler families . . . only survive by chance or through some special factor. Possibly Nonconformity itself could be regarded as such a special circumstance,” identifying “its instinct to preserve its own identity through its history” as a factor affecting the preservation of family papers.

Women played their part in keeping and circulating nonconformist memories, if not in the public dissemination of nonconformist history.

To explore another sphere of influence for nonconformist women in the culture of commemoration, this essay now moves from a woman attempting to act as editor and contributor in a public project to a woman who found ways of making her role of compiler, recorder, and preserver a creative one. This necessitates a shift in attention from printed work to manuscript writing.

33 Job Orton, Memoirs of the Life, Character and Writings of the Rev. Philip Doddridge (Shrewsbury, 1766), iii–iv.
35 Marjorie Reeves, Female Education and Nonconformist Culture 1700–1900, (Leicester: Leicester Univ. Press, 2000), 5.
Jane Attwater’s Repositories

Jane Attwater Blatch was an affluent, long-lived woman from a Baptist family settled in the Southwest of England, near Salisbury. She married in her late thirties (in 1790) following a long courtship, characterised by resistance on Attwater’s part to both the idea of marriage in general and the character of her suitor in particular. The conjunction of writing and religion was a powerful source of creativity for Attwater, who was not writing in isolation and who did not abandon her writing following marriage and motherhood. She was close friends with the poet Mary Steele. The friendship between these women, and others in their circle, was rooted in their kinship and similar ages, and it flourished because of their dispositions and shared literary and religious interests. The rich manuscript collections of poetry, correspondence, and diaries written by a circle of nonconformists that included many women writers survives today thanks in large part to Attwater who was “a great collector of papers.” The importance of record-keeping in the dissenting network to which Jane Attwater belonged is remarkable. Timothy Whelan finds that Attwater’s diary “exemplifies the communal, collaborative nature of life writing among eighteenth-century nonconformist women”; for example, it expresses the influence of the older diarist Anne Cator Steele and directs future readers (especially her daughter) to find “pleasure or profit by reading” life writings.

Jane Attwater kept a diary for significant portions of her ninety-year life. Reeves calls this body of writing “a pile of breathless notebooks,” while Whelan notes its “massive size and scope,” which he describes as comprising “more than thirty thin notebooks as well as many loosely bound quires and scores of loose

39 Whelan, Other British Voices, 149, 153.
The thinness of those notebooks is important, as is their physical
distinctness as many notebooks, and their heterogeneity in comprising notebooks,
quires, and sheets of paper. In contrast to the massive folios containing the public
records of nonconformist memorial (such as Samuel Clarke’s Lives), the smallness
and separateness of these physical forms suggest, as Felicity Nussbaum puts it, that

Diary, unlike more finished forms of narrative, need not display “the coherence,
integrity, fullness, and closure of an image of life that is and can only be
imaginary.”

The emphasis on open-endedness in Nussbaum’s analysis is a productive way of
understanding the significance of drafting and rewriting as women’s literary activities.
A diary’s unfinished state can be a creative opportunity for rewriting (as Elizabeth
Freke does for key events such as her husband’s and grandson’s death) or for
collecting and collective rewriting (as with successive generations of Evelyn women
keeping, transcribing, and commenting on each others’ papers). Attwater and her
descendants kept their family papers carefully, for they valued them as memorials.
But they did not bind them into volumes, provide titles or summaries, or give them
library shelf marks as more formal collections might, nor did they consolidate
different records into a single version of events.

Nussbaum’s point about need is also pertinent. Attwater needed, urgently and
repeatedly, to record her responses to her environment (the natural environment she
lived in, the sermons she heard, her family work, and her private devotions). But she
did not need to cohere to that commemoration of her own experiences or to
monumentalise or publish it. She called the diary her “repository” more than once,
invoking the idea of an ongoing collection of miscellanea, emphasising the secure
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40 Reeves, Female Education, 44. Whelan, NWW, VIII, 105–6. See also Whelan, Other British Voices, 149.
188.
keeping of that collection and perhaps implying that the diary enabled relatively easy retrieval of the memories so stored. Attwater’s use of the very ancient metaphor of “repository” supposes “a direct relation between space and mental categories” and “the physical reality of memory traces,” as John Frow has noted. When Attwater called her diary a “repository” she was not, however, merely recycling a well-established image for understanding the operation of recollection but was making it true. For this writer, memory had to be understood in material terms. The existence of her collection of notebooks attested “the physical reality of memory traces” over decades as she first wrote in them, then read and reread the contents. The wrappings for those notebooks, which included illustrated sheets previously owned and annotated by her daughter Annajane, bound up memories of the dead in vestigial traces of the activities of those lives.

The diary Attwater kept in the summer of 1809 recorded the final months of her daughter’s life in extraordinary detail. Annajane Blatch was the only child of the marriage. She contracted consumption (which had also caused Philip Doddridge’s death) and died on 28 July, soon after her sixteenth birthday. During Annajane’s final illness, her mother recorded events in a separate notebook to the one she had been using so far that year. All the material in this paginated gathering of thirty-five pages is about Annajane, unlike the pattern of Attwater’s other diaries which record a variety of circumstances but are primarily structured around Sundays and sermons. By creating a new repository for this period, Attwater temporarily constructs a slightly different form and function for her diary. She details her daughter’s words as fully as she does her symptoms. Sweats, coughs, vomit, and phlegm are here amid prayers and hymns recited among the family, Annajane’s words to visiting friends, her choice of reading material, and her reflections on death, heaven, and the state of her soul. This section of the diary begins in the midst of a bout of sickness that prompts submissive striving for spiritual comfort: “W[he]n violently reaching [retching]—‘ah what is this to what I deserve . . . .” This conjunction of physical description and direct speech from Annajane is typical of the sequence as a whole. Chronological accounting is not the primary mode of narration in this closely written

45 MS 19/1, Reeves Collection, Bodleian Library. “Reaching” is understood to mean “retching”.
document. The pages are mostly numbered, but entries are rarely dated. Sometimes temporal markers are given, but these are not afforded a new line of text. The mode of narration and physical appearance of this segment of the diary resemble a verbatim record kept by a close observer rather than a reflective, personal record of the writer’s life. The diary begins to resemble materials for a biography.

“The Antidote to Death”

Several different documents written in Attwater’s hand describing the events of the day of Annajane’s death survive. These are to be found in different places among Attwater’s papers. Even though they unquestionably form parts of “Jane Attwater’s diary,” they complicate notions of sequentiality, chronology, and even of the meaning of “diary” itself, as some of the documentary fragments may be drafts of letters. That said, these records are all typical of the detailed method of Attwater’s diary as a whole: they privilege the direct speech of Annajane, attend to orthodox Reformed doctrine, and place the textual resources of Baptist faith at the heart of Annajane’s experience. The very end of the shorter of these accounts represents Annajane’s final moments thus:

in ye beginning of her being taken worse she said I am affraid — after a pause she throw’d out her Arms as Expressive of her desire & repeated jesus* I throw my arms arround & Hang upon thy Breast without one gracious smile from Thee My spirit cannot Rest — this blessing seemed to be granted for afterward with ye greatest composure she repeated what I have above recited & even smiled.46

At this point, as throughout the account of Annajane’s final months, Attwater’s picture conforms very closely to the prescriptions for a good death provided by printed manuals such as William Perkins’s A Salve for a Sicke Man (1595). The penitent Christian should “die readily, in submission to God’s will,” and should

46 Attwater Papers, acc. 76, I.A. 26, RPC AL.
“render up his soul into God’s hand.” These features are present in Attwater’s accounts of Annajane’s death. The generic framework familiar from printed sermons and conduct books is recast as precise personal observation. The sequence of events and the gaps between them are carefully noted, and the way Annajane throws out her arms is specified and interpreted. Attwater evidences her daughter’s perfect adherence to the template of a virtuous death, but writing as a mother, her account is descriptive and affective. Giving a personal aspect to the general prescriptions creatively animates the structures of retelling a death. This is deeply poignant, for the imaginative and documentary acts commemorate a daughter now newly absent. The death has been constructed as an exemplary one through structural and intertextual resources. Attwater’s representation conforms to familiar patterns, attests to her daughter’s piety, and provides a model for future youth, especially members of the family.48

The retelling of Annajane’s final moments is not completely fixed, however. As well as rewriting her account of the final hours in different places, Attwater amends this particular portion of it by pinning a note written on a small piece of paper to the bottom of the page. The scrap of paper provides a postscript:

* I was mistaken in ye Hymn she wishd to repeat — I am well convinced it was yt Hymn of Dr Dodridges of wch she was so fond off “jesus!’ I love thy Charming Name[”] but her throwing out her Arms in ye manner she did made me think of yt verse in Dr Watts wch I repeated & asked her If yt was what she ment[.] she did not say yes but ‘that will do’ - but I am well convinced the verse she refer[re]d to was ‘Ill speak ye honors of thy name
With my last Labouring breath
And dying clasp thee in my arms
The Antidote of Death’


I was grievd I did not think of it till afterwards as her action was so Expressive & her frame of mind bespoke it to be ye triumphant feeling of her exulting Heart.49

Having already transcribed her daughter’s final moments more than once, Attwater decides that the pattern she originally employed was imperfect. Both the Watts and Doddridge lyrics figure the personal relation with Jesus as an embrace, an act of physical intimacy. Both would be appropriate to the moment. But Attwater acknowledges that by reciting Watts’s lines she misinterpreted Annajane’s action. Adding the Doddridge hymn to this version of the account restores Annajane’s wishes to the scene of her death.

The revision also writes Annajane into a developing tradition to which Attwater bears witness. Doddridge’s hymn had special significance for Attwater, who notes that it was the last hymn her own mother learned on her deathbed in 1784.50 In 1817, Attwater quotes the lines at the end of an account of the death of her friend, a church deacon, in a letter to her sister Marianna.51 Attwater’s family and friends repeatedly returned to one particular hymn by a minister from a religious denomination close to their own, which they found in John Rippon’s printed hymnal, produced specifically for their own denomination.52 This highlights the way that print culture enabled the production of nonconformist patterns of grief, comfort, and prayer at real deathbeds. It also attests to the memorial function performed by human witnesses.

The compulsion to correct the account has a generative function in the extract quoted above, for it serves to expand the repertoire of Annajane’s exemplary behaviours. The words in the Doddridge hymn are matched by the moment of Annajane’s passing: the correspondence between literature and life in Annajane’s ideal moment of recitation is even closer than in the Watts stanza that was previously

49 Attwater Papers, acc. 76, I.A. 26, RPC AL.
50 NWW, VIII, 547, n. 67.
51 NWW, VIII, 189.
recited. By adding Doddridge’s words, Attwater constructs Annajane’s death as being exemplary of the fulfilment of the promise articulated in the lyric: Jesus’s sacrifice as the antidote to death. This intensifies the portrayal of Annajane as following Puritan guidelines for a good death, which, says Houlbrooke, prized “playing an active role in the drama of their deaths.” Annajane composes a deathbed prayer, which “wove together scriptural phrases, sentences, and verses in extemporary combinations.” Jane Attwater’s editorial intervention seeks to provide a strong positive example of the unity of sentiment and doctrine—the pattern that religious literature can bring to the narrated moment of death. Attwater’s memorial to her daughter is self-reflexive, interpretive, and embedded in literary forms. The materiality is significant too: Attwater does not delete or replace the full account, for that has its own authenticity, but she supplements it retrospectively.

The Future of Nonconformist Memorial

Attwater’s diary entries are not the only textual record of Annajane Blatch’s life and death. Attwater’s lifelong friend Mary Steele wrote this poem in Annajane’s honour:

Sweet Excellence! thy opening virtues shone
    Fair as the loveliest morning of the Spring,
Though to a busy thoughtless world unknown
    And in the Shelter of a Parent’s Wing.

Thy useful life, the dying smiles attest,
    The sacred Spring from whence those Virtues sprung.
And this last Record bears at thy request
    This awful admonition to the Young –

Amos Prepare to meet thy God
Corinth[ians:] For we must all appear before the Judgment Seat of Christ
&c  

---

54 NWW, III, 164–5.
The personal testimony of esteem for the deceased that is confidently traced from the opening apostrophe “Sweet Excellence!” was presumably offered privately to Attwater (perhaps within a letter or written out on a separate leaf), but that version has not been located. Steele’s memorial poem for Annajane survives because it is neatly transcribed into a small notebook with other poems she wrote. This mode of collection indicates that the poem was considered suitable for reading alongside other Steele poems and was possibly passed around, and certainly kept. It has a textual history and meaning beyond the private grief of one who provided “the Shelter of a Parent’s Wing.”

The communal dimension of Annajane’s commemoration is constructed through the poem’s language as well as its means of collection. The poem itself, at its conclusion, asserts the religious example that Annajane sought to fashion through her deathbed instructions. Steele’s piece ends with a summary of 2 Corinthians 5:10, the text preached on the day of Annajane’s burial at her own request. The inclusion of that summary in the transcription keeps Annajane’s choice alongside the poem, while emphasising “this awful admonition to the Young” at the close of the poem confirms the educative function that Annajane imagined to be her legacy. As an act of nonconformist memorial, Steele’s poem declares and contributes to sustaining the public service of Annajane’s life and death in terms that her community of faith would value as Annajane had. Not least, it insists that “the Young” are the primary audience for the lessons Annajane’s example might teach. In this it echoes many decades of justification for public biographical acts such as those articulated by Richard Baxter.

This essay has sought to show that for the nature of literary practices within religious communities to be fully understood, the relations between writing, editing, and preserving requires greater attention. Literary production, often treated as a creative activity undertaken by an individual that ends with a finished piece of writing, might be better understood in terms of collaboration. This is especially important when treating commemorative activities, since they so often have a collective purpose and a dual aspect, looking both to the past and the future. The writing and editorial activities of nonconformist women from a fifty-year period
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suggests that a diverse range of activities and texts can be classified as memorial. Women were deeply involved in making and keeping a rich literary culture of commemoration, notwithstanding the unbalanced nature of the printed memorial record that favoured ministerial lives, accounts of ejected ministers, and male-dominated funeral sermons. As Amy Culley has suggested, for the works of Methodist women, such life writings become “a form of resistance against their erasure from the historical record.”

The activities discussed here have important commonalities. Both Mercy Doddridge and Jane Attwater saw memorial of their loved ones as something intensely personal and believed that the record of that person’s experiences merited a detailed account, but they had a sense of a wider, collective purpose to their individual commemorative acts. The lives they wanted to describe offered lessons to the future, for those lives could tell their community of faith something about itself. To understand these women’s roles not only as archivists and commemorators of their own family members but as participants in a broader nonconformist memorial culture requires repeated, sustained reengagement with the range of texts produced by that community, as well as continued efforts to push across period boundaries and link women across generations. As Ricoeur says, “the support of writing provides materiality to the traces preserved, reanimated, and further enriched with unpublished materials.” Here I have taken this “support” to encompass activities (retelling, transcribing, preserving, and so on) and resources (such as hymns that are printed, read, and sung, and diaries that are written, read, and kept). By attending closely to the material and imaginative processes by which memorials are constructed, we can better understand how memories are changed by their treatment in different hands and how versions of the past circulate, are fixed, or are forgotten.

---
