THE LETTERS OF DOROTHY MOORE-DURY: DIVINE CALLINGS, COVENANTS, AND THE SEARCH FOR WOMEN'S VOCATION IN SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY ENGLAND

by

Laurel M. R. Wright

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Master of Arts

at

Dalhousie University
Halifax, Nova Scotia
August 2024

Dalhousie University is located in Mi'kma'ki, the
ancestral and unceded territory of the Mi'kmaq.
We are all Treaty people.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT

This thesis builds on the backs of studies that have moved beyond a secular definition of feminism by emphasizing the significance of religion in women's discussions of gender roles throughout the seventeenth century. It posits that between 1640 and 1661, Anglo-Irish intellectual Dorothy Moore-Dury used the Protestant doctrine of vocation to argue that women had a divine calling to serve the public in areas beyond the traditional roles of wives and mothers. Through close analysis of Dorothy's letters and publications from others within her circle, this thesis identifies vocation as the heart of her writings on women's roles and the principle by which Dorothy directed her life. After making a covenant of spiritual friendship with irenicist preacher John Dury that prioritized vocation above personal interests, Dorothy became convinced that the best way to serve her own divine calling was to marry and share a vocation with him. Through this union, Dorothy demonstrated that marriage had the potential to present more opportunities for women when interpreted through a vision of vocation. John and Dorothy's joint work as central members of the international correspondence network known as the Hartlib Circle makes this thesis a pertinent contribution to the discussion of the development of proto-feminism and women's agency within seventeenth-century intellectual societies.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS USED

HP	Hartlib Papers
KJV	King James Version

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This thesis would not have been possible without the support and expertise of my supervisor, Dr. Krista Kesselring. You were my academic Gandalf, Krista, and I thank you for your patience and mentorship. To my parents, your efforts to uplift me when I felt incapable of continuing served as my anchor, and the time you spent celebrating with me at every small triumph was my motivation. Thank you to my big sister, whose care packages and grand plans for the future encouraged me to push toward the finish line. I would also like to express my gratitude for all of the friends who feigned interest when I rambled on about my research, and who provided me with joyful distraction when I simply could not form a coherent thought anymore. A special thank you is owed to Bill and Cindy for filling my days with warmth, laughter, and prayer. I am so grateful to have been welcomed into your family this year and was infinitely blessed by your wisdom and generosity. And of course, thank you to Dorothy Moore-Dury, who inspired me to use my gifts, to serve selflessly, and to be a strong and faithful woman in a broken world more than three-hundred years after her death.

CHAPTER 1 – INTRODUCTION

In a letter written to a close correspondent in July 1643, widowed Anglo-Irish intellectual Dorothy Moore declared on behalf of the female sex that: "vntill you can proove us incapable of that honour of being Members of that body [of Christ] I must beleive that every Member in his owne station may be proffitable to the rest."[1] Taken from one of her earliest letters, this quote encapsulates the very core of Moore's writing: a belief in the capability and responsibility of women to serve their Christian community. Driven by her personal desire to discover a greater purpose for her talents, Dorothy Moore refused to allow the rules of human society to keep her from pursuing what she believed to be God's divine design for her life. In her fifty-two surviving letters, Dorothy adapted the same vocational theology that underpinned the fabric of seventeenth-century English social order to argue for broadened opportunities for women both within and beyond the realm of marriage.

In her early writing career, Dorothy Moore dreamt of becoming a teacher of young women and to serve publicly in the church. Armed with her substantial skills in languages and reasoning, she became part of the international intellectual network pioneered by polymath Samuel Hartlib in the tumultuous years surrounding the English Civil Wars. Although initially determined to remain single in the years following her first husband's death in 1635, Moore nevertheless married irenicist preacher John Dury in 1645. From 1641 to 1645, Dorothy maintained an intimate, covenanted friendship with Dury, formed to support their shared devotion to pursuing goals that they felt God had

[1] M. Greengrass, M. Leslie, and M. Hannon (2013) *The Hartlib Papers* [hereafter HP] Published by The Digital Humanities Institute, University of Sheffield. [available at: http://www.dhi.ac.uk/hartlib], 21/7/1A-2B.

specifically designated for them. At first glance, Dorothy's decision to marry Dury in 1645 appears to be a departure from her commitment to women's vocation. However, this thesis will demonstrate that the nature of the marital covenant taken by Dorothy and John was intimately tied with their beliefs regarding vocation. Dorothy's written defense of her own union redefined marriage as an institution created to serve a shared vocation, rather than one comprised of two individuals with separate callings. By building her writing and choices on the back of a theological understanding of vocation, Dorothy Moore argued that women could be called to greater public service *through* marriage rather than in spite of it. By sharing in her husband's vocation and pursuing it above all else, Dorothy effectively subordinated both marriage and gendered social convention more generally to the authority of divine calling.

1.1 Why Dorothy Moore?

Dorothy Moore (née King) was born in Ireland c. 1612/13 as one of nine children. Her Yorkshire-born father, Sir John King (d. 1637), served in a number of administrative roles in the Irish government throughout his life.[2] Her mother, Catherine Drury (d. 1617), was a relative of Sir William Drury, lord deputy of Ireland. The exact nature and extent of Dorothy's childhood education is unclear, but her talent in writing and languages became evident through her letter-writing.[3] Her reputation preceded even the earliest of her own surviving letters. In 1640, the famed Dutch intellectual Anna Maria van Schurman

[2] King served in an extensive number of positions, from deputy vice-treasurer of Ireland (c. 1601), clerk of the crown in chancery and clerk of the hanaper (1603), muster-master-general and clerk of the cheque (1609), and member of the Irish privy council (1609) and council of Munster (1615). For more on Sir John King, see: Gordon Goodwin and Terry Clavin, "King, Sir John (d. 1637), politician and landowner," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (2004).

[3] Carol Pal has speculated that it is likely that Dorothy and her sisters sat in on the lessons of their brothers – Carol Pal, *Republic of Women: Rethinking the Republic of the Letters in the Seventeenth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), 120-121.

heralded Moore as a learned woman with skills on par with those of Lady Jane Grey and Queen Elizabeth I.[4] Dorothy married into the Anglo-Irish aristocracy sometime in the late 1620s through her first husband, Arthur Moore, fifth son of the Viscount of Drogheda.[5] Dorothy gave birth to two sons – Charles and John – before Arthur died in 1635. In the late 1630s, Dorothy moved with her children to London. She was likely introduced to intelligencer Samuel Hartlib through the physician and natural historian Gerard Boate, in whose home Dorothy resided by 1641.[6] As a young widow who faced an uncertain future, it was in these first few years living in London that Dorothy began to question her next step, and started writing the letters that Hartlib preserved in his collection. Through her letter-writing over the next thirty years, Dorothy's name would gain international recognition in the realms of learning, piety, and reform.

The story of Dorothy Moore sits at the intersection of several significant conversations about the roles and writings of women in the seventeenth century. She was a proponent of reform in women's education and an intellectual who corresponded with others on an international scale. Samuel Hartlib welcomed Dorothy Moore into the group now referred to as the "Hartlib Circle" in the early 1640s, likely recognizing both the potential of her ideas and the advantages of her aristocratic connections. Hartlib's network of international correspondents worked toward the goal of sharing knowledge in all forms amongst the many Protestant divines of Europe, and sought the peaceful reformation of English society. The letters written by members of the circle encompassed

[4] See: Dorothy Moore and Lynette Hunter, *The Letters of Dorothy Moore, 1612-1664: The Friendships, Marriage, and Intellectual Life of a Seventeenth-Century Woman* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004), 1.
[5] Mark Greengrass, "Durie [née King], Dorothy (c. 1613-1664), writer on education," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (2004).
[6] Moore and Hunter, *The Letters of Dorothy Moore*, xix.

many subjects, from the irenic peacemaking mission of John Dury to the chemical advancements of Robert Boyle.

The members of the circle lived in a world fragmented by political and religious upheaval. The Thirty Years' War on the continent, rebellion in Ireland, and revolution in Scotland and England contributed to an environment of tension and anxiety all over Europe. Mark Greengrass has commented that the Hartlib Circle's shared interest in the creation of a better world through a reform in knowledge was "surely a response to the intense pressures they were under."[7] Though she left Ireland before the rebellion of 1641, Moore was the daughter of an English colonist during a time of great tension between Irish Catholics and the Protestant English. Moore spent her formative years in Ireland, lived in London during the onset of the English Civil Wars, and resided at The Hague concurrently with the exiled courts of the Protestant King and Queen of Bohemia. [8] Such environments gave Moore an acute awareness of the ways that debates over the intricacies of religion influenced discussions of the nature of politics and authority in the seventeenth century. These experiences would explain her devotion to the Hartlib Circle's pursuit of knowledge for the purposes of peace and reform.

Mutual commitment to the network likely served as part of the catalyst for the close friendship that Dorothy cultivated with Katherine Boyle, Lady Ranelagh. Ranelagh was also an Anglo-Irish aristocrat who moved from Ireland to London in the early 1640s, and shared many similar experiences and beliefs with Dorothy.[9] An aunt to Ranelagh

[7] Mark Greengrass, Michael Leslie, and Timothy Raylor, *Samuel Hartlib and Universal Reformation: Studies in Intellectual Communication* (Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 3.
[8] For more on the Exile Court, see: Pal, *The Republic of Women,* 33-35.
[9] For more on Lady Ranelagh, see: Michelle DiMeo, *Lady Ranelagh: The Incomparable Life of Robert Boyle's Sister* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 2021).

through her first marriage, Dorothy later came to value her as an intimate correspondent, friend, and spiritual advisor. Evan Bourke's work on women's roles in the Hartlib Circle has revealed both Ranelagh and Moore as central operatives of the network, both in terms of direct correspondence and as conduits for the flow of information.[10] Lynette Hunter has indicated that even the fact that the majority of Moore's extant letters were preserved by Hartlib indicates the degree to which Moore became an "intimate associate, someone upon whose advice he [Hartlib] relied."[11] Moore and her surviving correspondence have been explored in recent publications for their contribution to the ongoing investigation of female agency and involvement in the seventeenth-century republic of letters. [12] Carol Pal has shown that there existed an "international network of female scholars [that] flourished in the republic of letters" that included Dorothy Moore.[13] Felicity Lyn Maxwell has argued that Moore saw the input and collaboration of male and female scholars alike as essential to the development of her own ideas.[14] Dorothy's critiques of society were not attempts to break from a system that she believed to be wrong, but she was interested in contributing to the beliefs of a community that she was passionate about. Dorothy aspired that her fellow intellectuals would help her to advance what she saw as the natural next step to their reforming work: reconceptualizing the existing theological and social perceptions of women.

[10] Evan Bourke, "Female Involvement, Membership, and Centrality: A Social Network Analysis of the Hartlib Circle." *Literature compass* 14, no. 4 (2017), paragraph 21, 38.
[11] Moore and Hunter, *The Letters of Dorothy Moore,* xv.
[12] Bourke, "Female Involvement, Membership, and Centrality"; Pal, *A Republic of Women*; Felicity Lyn Maxwell, "Calling for Collaboration: Women and Public Service in Dorothy Moore's Transnational Protestant Correspondence." *Literature compass* 14, no. 4 (2017).
[13] Pal, *A Republic of Women*, 1.
[14] Maxwell, "Calling for Collaboration."

Dorothy Moore was a notably pious Christian, even by seventeenth-century standards, one who wrote about the relationship between marriage and the Christian faith, but she also founded much of her writing on her own lived experience. Dorothy knew what it was like to live as both a wife and a widowed mother under the existing social and moral expectations for devout women. While one of only a few women writing in the context of Hatlib's intellectual network, Moore was certainly not the only woman to begin asking theologically-founded questions about the potential and place of women. From prophetesses to petitioners, England saw a significant rise in women writers in the seventeenth century. The continued development and fragmentation of Protestant doctrines, political upheavals of the Civil Wars and Interregnum, and advancement of intellectual and scientific correspondence and publication produced a cultural environment that Michelle Dowd and Julie Eckerle have argued "privileged both self-reflection and an ideologically nuanced approach to individuality that set the stage for women's unprecedented production and publication of life writings."[15] Dorothy Moore's writing addresses many of these developments in English culture and politics from the distinctive perspective of a devout woman of high-standing, interested in neither wholly defending nor disregarding existing social conventions.

Patricia Crawford has argued that the increase of female piety in the seventeenth century was socially produced, and developed emphases that were distinct from the religiosity of men.[16] In Crawford's estimation, the devotion developed by women became "a source of strength in varying degrees, and…provided a justification for social

[15] Michelle M. Dowd and Julie A. Eckerle. *Genre and Women's Life Writing in Early Modern England* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007), 1.
[16] Patricia Crawford, *Women and Religion in England 1500-1750* (London: Routledge, 1993), 74.

and political action."[17] The relationship between prophecy and politics is emphasized in the work of Teresa Feroli, who has argued that the emergence of women prophets in separatist sects who believed they spoke as messengers of God can be seen as an "early phase in the rise of modern feminist consciousness."[18] The increased ability of women both to speak publicly and to publish on matters of political importance was supported by the emphasis placed on spiritual equality in sectarian circles. The inseparability of biblical understanding from realities of social hierarchy meant that arguments for a change in social convention needed to be supported by theology. This thesis builds on the backs of studies by Anne Hughes, Teresa Feroli, Hilda Smith, and Phyllis Mack, which have identified the significance of the religious basis in discussions of gender roles during the Revolution and Restoration. It argues that Dorothy Moore's use of vocation as the theological foundation for her effort to increase opportunities for women deserves more attention. Building on the work of scholars such as Hilda Smith, whose interpretation of Mary Astell's "radical Christian feminism" moves beyond a modern secular definition of feminism, this thesis continues to explore of the ways that seventeenth-century women used the cultural and religious building blocks of their own societies to understand the nature of, and possibilities for, women.[19]

Despite the growing presence of women in the public forum, the Revolution did not permanently alter many of the fundamental social constraints placed upon them. The increase in religious sects and radicalism provided greater opportunity for the public

[17] Crawford, *Women and Religion in England*, 74.
[18] Teresa Feroli, *Political Speaking Justified*: *Women Prophets and the English Revolution* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2006), 15.
[19] Hilda Smith, "The Radical Nature of Mary Astell's Christian Feminism," *Feminist History of Philosophy: The Recovery and Evaluation of Women's Philosophical Thought*, eds. Eileen O'Neill and Marcy P. Lascano (Springer International Publishing, 2019), 301-303.

expression of women's ideas. However, Phyllis Mack has noted that a contradiction between female spiritual equality and socially determined female subservience underlies the lack of any permanent changes to women's opportunities.[20] Mack argues that while sectarian women challenged the limits on women's participation in religious and social life, few made an effort to change traditional understandings of the nature of womanhood itself.[21] The same can be said of Moore, as she challenged the traditional restriction of women's influence to the home but also used traditional definitions of both femininity and vocation to do so. Even with John Dury's support of her belief that shared vocation served as an equalizer within the covenant of marriage, Dorothy faced criticism from her peers on many of her efforts to realize her vision for women's vocations. Dorothy's Hartlibian peers rejected the majority of her attempts to find new ways to serve her husband and community, and instead urged her to conform to more traditional duties in order to maintain both her own reputation and the reputation of the Circle.[22]

Hilda Smith has gone so far as to argue that the "impact of the revolution on feminist thought….was almost wholly negative, reminding these women who opposed its goals that the leaders of the revolution had little interest in improving the status of women, within either the home or the state."[23] As such, Smith sees feminist thought to

[20] Patricia Crawford. "The Challenges to Patriarchalism: How did the Revolution affect Women?" *Revolution and Restoration: England in the 1650s*, ed. John Morill (London: Collins & Brown, 1992), 113, 119; Phyllis Mack "The Prophet and Her Audience: Gender and Knowledge in The World Turned Upside Down" in *Reviving the English Revolution: Reflections and Elaborations on the Work of Christopher Hill,* eds. Geoff Eley and William Hunt (London: Verso, 1988).
[21] Mack, "The Prophet and Her Audience," 146-147.
[22] Evan Bourke argues something similar in regards to the conflicting financial and moral expectations of women within the Hartlib Circle – Evan Bourke, "'I would not have taken her for his sister': Financial Hardship and Women's Reputations in the Hartlib Circle (1641-1661)." *The Seventeenth Century Journal* Vol.37, No. 1 (2022).
[23] Hilda L. Smith, *Reason's Disciples: Seventeenth-Century English Feminists* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1982), xi.

have only meaningfully taken root after the Restoration with figures such as Mary Astell, arguing that earlier female writers were more interested in improving the conditions for women so as to benefit society as a whole, but not women themselves.[24] As a woman writing outside of radical sectarian circles during the Revolution, Moore's attempt to imagine a unique space of increased opportunity for women within the confines of existing social and religious hierarchy makes her argument an interesting intervention into this conversation. Using much of the same scriptural basis as her more radical counterparts, Moore at once reaffirmed the calling of some women to be wives while also expanding the possibility of a calling beyond the traditional realm of marriage. Moore's defense of her own marriage to John Dury as secondary to and even *necessitated* by her vocation rather than social expectation serves as an apparent divergence from the writings of her contemporaries.

1.2 Sources and Methodology

The core of this thesis is based on a close reading of the sixty-three extant letters of Dorothy Moore, including those letters written to her as well as those fifty-two written by her own hand between the years 1640 and 1661. The death of Samuel Hartlib in March of 1661 means that any letters written by or about Dorothy do not appear to be extant after this year, despite the fact that Dorothy outlived Hartlib by three years.[25] As part of his mission to record and disseminate knowledge, Samuel Hartlib kept over 25,000 folios of correspondence (both originals and copies) from members across his epistolary network. The online edition of the Hartlib Papers was developed by the Humanities Research Institute at the University of Sheffield, to whom Hartlib's collection

[24] Smith, *Reason's Disciples*, 5.
[25] See: Greengrass, "Durie [née King], Dorothy."

came in the 1960s. Sixty letters written to or by Moore directly are available in the online Hartlib Papers collection.[26] These letters are also transcribed in Lynette Hunter's 2004 publication *The Letters of Dorothy Moore, 1612-64*, in addition to a letter written from Dorothy Moore to Lady Ranelagh titled "On the Education of Girles" (the original of which resides in the British Library), and two extant letters written to Moore from Anna Maria van Schurman (translated by Hunter from their original Latin and Hebrew).[27] The letters from van Schurman to Moore are also transcribed in the 1998 publication *Whether a Christian Woman Should be Educated and Other Writings from her Intellectual Circle*, a collection of van Schurman's defenses of women's education and her letters to other learned women.[28]

Although letters offer an unique view of the female realm, James Daybell has urged caution before assuming that women's letters accurately represent their writer's intimate feelings, when letters were often written with established convention in mind, and intended for wider readership than the addressee.[29] Gary Schnider has referred to the early modern letter as a "sociotext," in that letters are "social forms designed, understood, and expected to circulate within designated epistolary circles."[30] The seventeenth century saw a dramatic increase in female literacy and the numbers of women who were capable of writing their own letters and exercising greater control over their own correspondence.

---

[26] While only fifty-nine of these letters are listed under Dorothy Moore-Dury's name, Turnbull has suggested that HP 3/2/28A-29B was most likely also written from John Dury to Dorothy Moore, and has been included in this number. See: George Turnbull, *Hartlib, Dury, and Comenius: Gleanings from Hartlib's Papers* (Liverpool: University Press of Liverpool, 1947), 240-241.
[27] Moore and Hunter, *The Letters of Dorothy Moore*.
[28] Anna Maria van Schurman, *Whether a Christian Woman Should Be Educated and Other Writings From Her Intellectual Circle*, ed. and trans. Joyce L. Irwin (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998).
[29] James Daybell, *Women Letter-Writers in Tudor England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 17, 62.
[30] Gary Schnieder, *The Culture of Epistolarity: Vernacular Letters and Letter Writing in Early Modern England, 1500-1700* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2005), 22.

Lynette Hunter's analysis of Moore's letters reveals a sophisticated use of rhetoric and distinct conventions in letters with different goals or correspondents.[31] Notably, Moore's questions regarding women's vocation were, for the most part, not printed or made widely available to the reading public, but were likely only circulated through the relevant ranks of Hartlib's network. Though Moore sought trusted collaboration in the development of her ideas, she made little effort to begin systemic changes or to address a larger readership.[32] When Samuel Hartlib did print a few of the letters Moore wrote in defense of her marriage in 1645, he included them in a pamphlet along with several of John Dury's letters and published them under his own name.[33] Despite Hartlib's attempt at anonymizing the authors, Dury and Moore were well known within the Circle, and their peers had little doubt about who had written the letters. This incited ire in Moore, who maintained that her words were "rude" and "indigested," and therefore incapable of convincingly presenting her ideas to a critical readership.[34]

While it is clear that Moore did not shy away from asking difficult questions, her writing presents more of a genuine and personal search for answers rather than a fully-formed ideology or call for large-scale change. What Moore offers is an introspective; a look into the thought process of a learned woman in the seventeenth century with the unusual opportunity to converse and edit her ideas with the input of trusted correspondents and respected intellectuals. The lack of absolute conclusions to her questions makes Moore's correspondence an interesting representation of the effort to negotiate the belief that she had been equipped to serve her community within the

[31] Moore and Hunter, *The Letters of Dorothy Moore*, xxx.
[32] Felicity Lyn Maxwell, "Calling for Collaboration."
[33] John Dury, *Madam, although My Former Freedom* (London: 1645).
[34] HP 3/2/143A-144B.

confines of a society that did not allow for it. Daybell has suggested that "Where letters are analytical rather than merely descriptive, one can detect a degree of inwardness amidst the calculation, convention and projected personas, and observe the ways in which women comprehended and articulated thoughts, emotions, and experiences."[35] While keeping in mind the communal reading and wide circulation of letters within the Hartlib Circle, this thesis reads the letters of Dorothy Moore as intentionally curated representations of her unique voice and opinions.

In addition to the letters of Moore, this thesis draws upon letters in the Hartlib Papers written by other correspondents that concern Moore or her relationship with John Dury, as well as the letters of Dury himself. Born in Scotland and raised in the Netherlands, Dury met Hartlib in Poland and came to share his vision of universal reformation. Through the travels and experiences of his youth, Dury became a dogged proponent of Protestant unity as well as educational reform. The printed publications of Dury's letters and treatises are also considered. Throughout his life, Dury argued for the significance of his vocation in the negotiation of international ecumenical peace, which can be seen in tracts such as *Motives to induce the Protestant princes to mind the vvorke ecclesiasticall amongst themselves* (1639), and *A Motion Tending to the Publick Good of this Age* (1642).[36] Later in his life, Dury defended the particular relationship between his vocation and his work in politics that endangered his and Dorothy's ability to operate in their shared calling. This can be seen in pamphlets such as *The unchanged, constant, and*

[35] James Daybell, *Early Modern Women's Letter-Writing, 1450-1700* (Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire; Palgrave, 2001), 3.
[36] John Dury, *Motives to induce the Protestant princes to minde the vvorke of peace ecclesiasticall amongst themselves* (Amsterdam: 1639); John Dury, *A Motion Tending to the Publick Good of this Age and of Posterities Or, the Coppies of Certain Letters Written by Mr. John Dury* (London: 1642).

single-hearted peacemaker (1650) and *A declaration of John Durie* (1660), in which Dury declared that his ultimate mission was always peace, and never politics.[37] Given John and Dorothy's shared interest in educational reforms, *A Seasonable Discourse* (1649) and *The Reformed School* (1649) will also receive particular attention in the final chapter, in order to discern the nature of Dorothy's influence upon her husband's pedagogical works.[38]

1.3 An Introduction to the Protestant Theology of Vocation

The theology of vocation sat at the heart of Dorothy Moore's writings, and served as the compass by which she directed her own life. Paul Marshall begins his book discussing the relationship between vocation and early modern social order with this simple definition: "Vocation, or calling – [is] the idea that people are called by God to a specific mundane work or duty as a sphere and means of religious obedience."[39] While typically used in modern publications when discussing careers and occupations, "vocation" was a complex theological concept in the early modern Protestant world. It was a doctrine that encompassed almost all areas of both private and community life, from familial relationships to political obedience, hierarchical social order, and daily work. The uses of vocation in texts of the early modern period, as Keith Thomas has shown, contend that each person is divinely called to perform in a particular role and that this calling was to be pursued at all costs: "A person's talents were indicators of God's intentions for him and there was a duty to ensure that those intentions were realized."[40]

---

[37] John Dury, *The unchanged, constant, and single-hearted peacemaker drawn forth into the world* (London: 1650); John Dury, *A declaration of John Durie* (London: 1660).
[38] John Dury, *A Seasonable Discourse* (London: 1649); John Dury, *The Reformed School* (London: 1649).
[39] Paul A. Marshall, *A Kind of Life Imposed on Man: Vocation and Social Order from Tyndale to Locke* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1996), 3.
[40] Keith Thomas, *The Ends of Life: Roads to Fulfilment in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 87.

Dorothy Moore-Dury's writing reveals her belief that it was her responsibility to use natural reason to discern what God was calling her to, in order to make use of the talents that God had given her. While the word "vocation" appears sparingly in Moore's letters, her more frequent use of the word "calling," and the connotations that she assigned to it are reflective of the early modern understanding of vocation.

The theological concept of vocation, primarily associated for several centuries with ministerial and monastic roles in the Catholic church, acquired new meaning in the Protestant Reformation of the sixteenth century. The words of the Apostle Paul in I Corinthians 7:20 served as the basis for much of the resulting theology of vocation, instructions to "Let every man abide in the same calling wherein he was called."[41] Martin Luther's translation of the Greek word *klesis* (which was later translated to "calling" in English) to *Beruf* in the German New Testament was the root from which Protestantism developed a unique take on vocation, one that imbued worldly "calling" (or everyday work and social roles) with divine implications.[42] Luther and his followers denied that there was anything special about the priestly calling, and that instead, each person ought to see their distinct relationships, employments, and social obligations as duties given by God himself, meant to serve others in a peaceful, productive, Christian society.

In his influential work, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, John Calvin defined not only the nature of calling, but also the boundaries that each Christian must adhere to in the pursuit of the common good of the community as a whole:

> the Lord enjoins every one of us, in all the actions of life, to have respect to our own calling. He knows the boiling restlessness of the human mind, the fickleness

[41] I Corinthians 7:20, *King James Version.*
[42] The use of *Beruf* had, until this point, been restricted to the idea of clerical and monastic callings. As Marshall argues: "he [Luther] implicitly maintained that the role of husband, wife, peasant, or magistrate was a particular duty given by God." – Marshall, *A Kind of Life*, 23.

> with which it is borne hither and thither, its eagerness to hold opposites at one time in its grasp, its ambition. Therefore, lest all things should be thrown into confusion by our folly and rashness, he has assigned distinct duties to each in the different modes of life. And that no one may presume to overstep his proper limits, he has distinguished the different modes of life by the name of callings. Every man's mode of life, therefore, is a kind of station assigned to him by the Lord, that he may not be always driven about at random.[43]

God saved good Christians from succumbing to their own nature through restraints that placed upon them in the form of callings. This individual calling to serve others manifested itself through a person's work, unique to each individual but required of all, regardless of station in society. Each calling placed limits upon the Christian's ability to act or serve in certain capacities, and it was by adhering to these limits that a Christian could hope to serve their community well. Work itself became divinely ordained, which eventually led to the popular conception of the "Protestant work ethic," and the social condemnation of idleness commonly associated with Protestant Christianity.

The connection between relationships, employment, and vocation in Protestant doctrine found its conception in the reaction against and critique of traditional Catholic religious vows. As Christopher Lane has highlighted, in both Luther and Calvin's writings:

> [The monk] expected his asceticism and the dignity of his state to contribute to his salvation, and he was thus the prototypical example of seeking salvation by works. Furthermore, the monk made a vow to forsake the earthly work of loving [his] neighbor that Christ had given him – his true vocation.[44]

---

[43] John Calvin, *The Institutes of the Christian Religion*, trans. Henry Beveridge (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1970), 34; Note that the translation of "calling" by Beveridge comes from the original Latin "vocationem," and the French "vocations" – For Latin see: Jean Calvin, *Institutionis Christianæ Religionis…* (London: 1576), 103; For French see: Jean Calvin, *Institution de la religion chrétienne*. (Switzerland: Béroud, 1888), 333.

[44] Christopher J. Lane, "The Diversity of Vocations: Choosing a State of Life in Early Modern France." (University of Notre Dame: 2015), 66-67.

The Protestant idea that a person ought to remain in the position that God had placed them also came from the early reformers' treatment of I Corinthians 7:20. John Calvin devoted a whole section of Book IV in the *Institutes* to monastic vows, highlighting the fact that the vocation that one found oneself in, both in terms of duties to others and employment, was divinely ordained. For a Christian to reject their calling was to give in to human arrogance: "Beyond all controversy, we ought not to vow anything which will hinder us in fulfilling our vocation; as if the father of a family were to vow to leave his wife and children, and undertake other burdens; or one who is fit for public office should, when elected to it, vow to live private[ly]."[45] This was a distinct breaking away from the long-held view of life as having two roads, one in which a person separated themself from society and devoted himself solely to spiritual service, and one for the rest of society, who worked in farming or trades, married, and had children.[46] No "station" or "mode of life" was more important than another in the eyes of God, in the same way that no part in the body was insignificant.[47]

Vocational theology permeated the political, marital, and work cultures of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century England. Published sermons employed vocation as incentive for political obedience, justification for duties in marriage, and as a means to reenforce standards of work across class and gender lines. Its widespread application to all areas of society speaks to vocational doctrine's significance as a theological underpinning of the very fabric of the existing social order of the seventeenth century.[48] Dorothy Moore wholeheartedly embraced the existing theology of vocation. As a widow

[45] Calvin, *Institutes*, 475.
[46] Marshall, *A Kind of Life*, 18-19;
[47] I Corinthians 12:12-27, *KJV*.
[48] Marshall, *A Kind of Life*, 10.

without a clearly defined marital vocation, Dorothy devoted her early writings to discerning what her vocation beyond motherhood might be. Even after she remarried, Dorothy viewed her vocation as one beyond that of a wife or homemaker. The persistent effort to find new ways to serve her greater purpose became the very foundation on which Dorothy built all of her ideas.

While the concept of vocation has been mentioned in recent studies of Dorothy Moore and her contemporaries, it has not yet been identified as a framework or a foundation used by early English women to further the discussion regarding their opportunities.[49] In using vocation as her ideological cornerstone, Dorothy Moore attempted to locate and justify a new space both for herself and for women more generally, one that was based upon divine calling, natural reason, and the reading of scripture. Rather than attempting to open traditionally masculine spaces to women, Moore intentionally pursued roles that could be *unique* to her sex. Given Moore's aristocratic standing, her pious reputation, and her conservative political views, her effort to define this new space *within* the existing social and gender boundaries is a significant contribution to the current conversation about seventeenth-century women's employment, intellectual capabilities, education, and even marriage more generally.

1.4 Chronology and Thesis Outline

This thesis takes a chronological approach to the study of Dorothy Moore's letters to best track both the development of Dorothy's ideas regarding the potential roles of women and her consistent belief that vocation was core around which such changes should be built. The conviction that serving a community of believers ought to be the

[49] For example, Feroli uses the word "vocation" when speaking of the prophetic callings of Lady Eleanor Davies, Anna Trapnel, and Margaret Fell. – Teresa Feroli, *Political Speaking Justified*, 16.

ultimate aim for all Christians is what drove Dorothy's relationships, intellectual endeavors, and search for employment from her earliest letters to her death in 1664. Beginning in the year 1640, the second chapter focuses on Dorothy's first attempts to define women's vocation, which were born of her desire to discover her own personal calling. Moore outlined a doctrine of vocation that aligned with the existing Protestant theology, but did not stop there. In her correspondence with Lady Ranelagh and the French theologian André Rivet, Dorothy discussed not only the significance of vocation in the lives of both married and single women alike, but also sought to expand the existing applications of vocation to allow for the possibility of women working in a public spiritual calling. This chapter argues that rather than submitting wholly to the conventions of culture or breaking completely from theological tradition, Dorothy Moore sought a third way to expand women's opportunities. Building on a vocational foundation, Moore imagined a new and distinct form of women's education, one that would allow for the increased potential for women's agency beyond their designated duties as wives and mothers.

Although the ideas that Dorothy outlined in her early work were never completed nor fully realized, chapter three argues that they were conceived under and given new life through her relationship with John Dury, whom she met in 1641 and married in 1645. Through a series of covenants made over the course of these five years, John and Dorothy sought to prioritize pursuit of their vocations over personal interests and desires. Dorothy was initially determined to procced in her mission unincumbered by the social expectations of a wife. With the assistance of Lady Ranelagh, John eventually convinced Dorothy that the benefits of marriage outweighed the drawbacks. By examining their

covenants through the lens of vocation, it is clear that the marriage of John and Dorothy Dury was of a distinctive nature, one that incited protest from their peers. Arguing that her marriage to John was a necessary step in pursuit of her calling, Dorothy exposed the existing seventeenth-century values of marriage as socially rather than theologically constructed. Dorothy believed that subordinating marriage to the authority of vocation would allow for women to be true and equal partners in a shared purpose, and to operate in their spiritual gifts beyond the domestic sphere.

The fourth chapter of this thesis focuses on the last nineteen years of Dorothy's married life, from 1645 to 1661. In the years following their marriage, Dorothy and John moved back to England from the Netherlands and were forced to navigate a landscape in a constant state of political tension and flux. Through financial constraints, ill-health, and changing political regimes, Dorothy remained committed to her vocations, both as a wife and mother, and as John's partner in pursuing their shared mission. Although there are fewer extant letters written by Dorothy herself during this time, analysis of the letters and publications of John and other Hartlibians shows Dorothy's influence on the inner workings of the Hartlib Circle. Not only this, but Dorothy's efforts to push against traditional gendered constraints in marriage are also obvious in the written critiques from her peers. Dorothy's work and reputation through the last nineteen years of her life were both commended and criticized by her contemporaries. This chapter argues that despite the decline in the number of Dorothy's letters that have survived from the later years of her life, the extant literature written by her husband and peers speak of Dorothy as a woman who remained devoted to her calling until the very end. Dorothy prioritized her vocation, using the doctrine to justify the use of her talents in new ways while still

attempting to operate within the space that early modern English society had designated for her.

1.5 Note on Conventions

The "New Style" of dating had been used in this thesis, taking January 1 as the start of a new year rather than March 25. Transcriptions have retained their original spelling, punctuation, and mid-sentence capitalization. All biblical quotes have been taken from the King James Bible

CHAPTER 2 – DOROTHY MOORE AND A VISION FOR WOMEN'S VOCATIONS

2.1 Introduction

As Paul Marshall has shown, the Hebrew and Greek words of the Old and New Testament that have been translated to the words "call" or "calling" have a breadth of meaning and uses. From calling an animal, inviting or calling a person by their name, or feeling drawn to a particular role or task, "calling" is a word imbued with both practical and special significance not only by biblical authors, but also by later translators.[1] The majority of recent Biblical commentators (including Marshall himself) believe that "the exegesis of calling as one's social position, occupation, or indeed anything external, is untenable."[2] The early modern Protestant world understood differently. Despite few existing "systematic elaborations of the doctrine," sixteenth- and seventeenth-century English theology bound the concept of vocation directly to the contribution of an individual to the general functioning of society.[3] Vocational doctrine was rife with complexities in the range, application, and individuality of potential callings for men. However, women's expected contribution to their Christian community outlined in extant literature was both narrowly defined and relatively inflexible.

As a learned, widowed mother of aristocratic birth in the mid-seventeenth century, Dorothy Moore found herself in a position with more vocational ambiguity than the majority of women. As a result of the effort to discover her own purpose, Moore's early

---

[1] For example, the Apostle Paul uses what Marshall refers to as an 'external call' of universal repentance, and an 'effectual call' through which individuals are invited or drawn by God to specific roles or particular offices – Paul Marshall, *A Kind of Life Imposed on Man: Vocation and Social Order from Tyndale to Locke* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1996), 12-13.

[2] Marshall, *A Kind of Life*, 14.

[3] While Marshall observes that in general, many people using the term did not have a clear sense of everything that the words "vocation" or "calling" implied, there seemed to be consensus regarding their basic foundations and several of their larger facets – Ibid, 9-10.

correspondence is dominated by an detailed discussion of women's vocation. Moore used established doctrine not only as a helpful roadmap by which she could navigate her own journey, but also as a framework for new applications of vocation for women. The basic tenets of vocation that Moore outlined in her correspondence with Lady Ranelagh and the French theologian Dr. André Rivet were consistent with the vocational theology that had developed across most Protestant sects since Luther's initial schism from the Catholic church. Using logic to extend the complexities of the doctrine, Moore proposed that vocation justified women's ability to operate in a public spiritual calling rather than relegating them solely to the domestic sphere. This argument was unique, even amongst similar writings by female writers and intellectuals contemporary with Moore. Broadening the scope of the doctrine to include women in new ways, Moore attempted to apply Protestant theology more equally to the whole Christian body while also maintaining a conventional separation between male and female spheres of operation.

Recognizing and maintaining the orthodox belief that women were fundamentally different from men, Dorothy Moore intended to expand the application of vocation to include a new space for women that did not interfere with or upset conventional social structures of work, marriage, or community. This allowed for the potential of increased agency for women to make use of their unique talents and serve as equal members of the Christian community. Moore's argument gave femininity a distinct power and potential of its own and established the ideological foundation for a new kind of education formulated with women in mind. Her most developed presentation of this sophisticated system occurred in her correspondence with André Rivet in 1643, but it was her initial desire to

discover her own personal calling which first led her down the path of discussing and negotiating the use of vocational doctrine.

Copying portions of her correspondence to send to Samuel Hartlib, Moore showed that she recognized the cultural significance of her own ideas.[4] In an age rife with radical shifts in religious and political authority, as well as an increasing push toward the reform of education and social relations, Moore recommended new growth while also holding fast to both scripture and tradition. But to suggest a way that new spaces might be integrated under existing socio-religious convention, Moore first had to lay out her own understanding of correct vocational theology.

2.2 In Accordance with Protestant Doctrine: Moore's Theology of Vocation

Dorothy Moore's first discussion of vocation appeared in a letter written to Katherine Jones, Lady Ranelagh, in July of 1643. Moore's attention to the significance of calling in the Christian life echoed her Protestant predecessors and contemporaries' views of the theological implications of vocation. The foundation of Moore's ideology was remarkably simple. In her 1643 letter to Lady Ranelagh, Moore made the telos of her mission clear:

> …I will now declare my Intention, & the ground of it. I have beene long of this Opinion that every one whose conscience doth evidence in any Measure a Vnion with Christ ought to make it their principall aime & consequently their Worke to render themselves servicable Members to the rest of that body to which are conjoined with & by Christ the Head.[5]

---

[4] Lynette Hunter argues this in her introduction to Moore's works, noting that Moore copied each of her own and Rivet's letters to send to Samuel Hartlib for circulation and preservation – Dorothy Moore and Lynette Hunter, *The Letters of Dorothy Moore, 1612-64: The Friendships, Marriage, and Intellectual Life of a Seventeenth-Century Woman* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004), xxxviii-xxxix.

[5] M. Greengrass, M. Leslie, and M. Hannon (2013) *The Hartlib Papers* [hereafter, HP] Published by The Digital Humanities Institute, University of Sheffield. [available at: http://www.dhi.ac.uk/hartlib], 21/7/1A-2B

Moore's somewhat abstract desire to glorify God was one that she believed must be manifested by all Christians in a life of service.

Although framed as a personal opinion, Moore's idea that the faithful Christian was meant to be bound both corporeally and spiritually to their community can be linked to Protestant vocation since its initial conception. In his summary and analysis of Martin Luther's views on vocation, Gustaf Wingren clarifies that for Luther, there was a "decisive contrast between God's self-giving love and man's egocentricity."[6] In other words, although the nature of human beings was inherently self-seeking, God called them to be more like himself by serving one another. This was an objective most clearly demonstrated by the creator through the sacrifice of Christ for the sins of the world. Human beings were inextricably linked to one another through relationship, and had a duty to one another borne of this link. Society could not function without all people working to serve one another. No action, Wingren writes, fell outside the bounds of public vocation: "It is only before God i.e., heaven, that the individual stands alone. In the earthly realm man always stands…bound to one another."[7] Though people's individual places within society differed, God called all good Christians to contribute to the public good. It was by serving one another that Christians could best serve God.

The precise actions performed for the sake of the duty to interpersonal service were unique to each person, but all were ultimately ordained by God. No person could be fully aware of God's ultimate plan, but the knowledge that God placed each person in each mode of life with a purpose allowed individuals to contribute to their community with pride and contentment, no matter the difficulties of their work. Abiding within a

[6] Gustaf Wingren, *Luther on Vocation*, trans. Carl C. Ramussen (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1957), 6.
[7] Wingren, *Luther on Vocation*, 5.

unique calling was meant to bring satisfaction in spite of the restrictions and hardships inherent to each station of life. It meant committing one's life to God's service through service to the community. There was no more holiness to be found in one calling than another, a sentiment first voiced by Luther and Calvin and later echoed by Philipp Melancthon in his *Apology of the Augsburg Confession*: "…monasticism will be no more a state of perfection than the life of a farmer or mechanic. For these are also states in which to acquire perfection. For all men, in every vocation, ought to seek perfection, that is, to grow in the fear of God in faith, in love towards one's neighbor, and similar spiritual virtues."[8] The work that each person did was imperative to the maintenance of a Godly society, and one could not expect God's blessing or protection when operating outside of one's calling.[9] This aspect of vocational doctrine affirmed the necessity and holiness of every person's individual work while also maintaining traditional class divisions.

The efforts of early Protestant reformers to ground the doctrine of vocation in community service held true not only through the initial Protestant expansion on the continent, but also in England's formation of its own Protestant Church in the latter decades of the sixteenth century. In the centuries following the birth of the Church of England, English preachers printed many sermons that reaffirmed the importance for their congregants to serve one another. In his 1577 interpretation of the twelfth verse of Exodus 20, John Knewstub argued that the first four of the ten commandments given to Moses in the Old Testament outlined the spiritual duties that humanity owed directly to

[8] Philipp Melanchthon, *The Apology of the Augsburg Confession*, Project Gutenberg, trans. F. Bente and W.H.T. Dau, 2004.
[9] See: William Gouge, *Of Domesticall Duties* (London: 1622), 20; Robert Sanderson, *Tvvelve Sermons Preached…*(London: 1637), 364.

God. The following commandments, Knewstub continued, focused on the physical duties that one man owed to his neighbor: "[God] therefore (meaning to make a tryall of our loue towards him) hath commanded vs that we should not be altogether our owne men, closed vp within our owne profites and pleasure…but that we should go out of our selues at his commaundement, to the good of our breathren."[10] Forty-five years later, William Gouge expressed the same sentiment in a published sermon, claiming that it was due to God's completeness and perfection that humanity could give nothing to him that he did not already have. It was therefore by service to one's neighbor that the good Christian could honour God. So important was this duty that any Christian who claimed to love God without doing service for their community was seen by their peers as a slothful hypocrite.[11]

Vocational theology described service to one's community as submission: the giving up of one's own desires, time, and physical labour for the good of the whole. This duty that one person owed to another fell under the classification of the "general calling" – a responsibility that pertained to every person, regardless of their class, sex, age, or ability. Like many of her predecessors and contemporaries, Dorothy Moore couched her own discussion of this general calling within the biblical analogy of the "Body of Christ" found in I Corinthians. The passage asserts that just as the body is made up of many equally significant parts which are all required for the body to function, the church has many individual members with different callings. Even the weakest of members are

[10] John Knewstub, *Lectures of John Knewstub, Vpon the Twentith Chapter of Exodus…*(London: 1577), 77.
[11] Gouge wrote: "He [God] is so high aboue vs, so perfect and compleat in himself, that neither can be giue to him, nor he recieue of vs. But in his owne stead he hath placed our brother like to our selues; to whom, as we may doe hurt, so by our faithfull seruice we may doe much good: in doing whereof God is much honoured" – Gouge, *Of Domesticall Duties*, 3.

required for the church to function.[12] The Apostle Paul expanded upon this analogy of the church as a physical body with its members as the many corporeal parts in his letter to the Ephesian church, which proclaims Christ as the "head" of that body.[13] Moore echoed this metaphor in her own expression of general calling, concisely referring to the service that each individual contributed to the whole Body of Christ as their "principall aime & consequently their Worke."[14] By linking the primary goal of service with the concept of work, Moore began to move into the expression of the "particular calling." That is, the unique ways and positions through which God called individuals to serve, including their employment and physical work.

The idea that one's employment was ordained by God also manifested itself in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century manuals that outlined how each person in every unique estate might seek to walk faithfully in their calling. In 1549, Robert Crowley published *The Voyce of the Laste Trumpet…Callynge Al the Estates of Menne to the Right Path of their Vocation*, and organized it into chapters pertaining to physical employments from a beggar, servant, or scholar to a physician, lawyer, merchant, and gentleman.[15] The seventeenth-century Puritan writer Abraham Jackson provided an in-depth guide for servants and apprentices to happily (and productively) abide in their callings. Jackson

[12] See I Corinthians 12:12-27, *King James Version*: "For as the body is one, and hath many members…And if they were all one member, where were the body? But now are they many members, yet but one body. And the eye cannot say unto the hand, I have no need of thee: nor again the head to the feet, I have no need of you. Nay, much more those members of the body, which we think to be more feeble, are necessary…but God hath tempered the body together, having given more abundant honour to that part with lacked: that there should be no schism in the body; but that the members should have the same care for one another."; William Gouge uses similar imagery, going into detail about the nature of the nerves, arteries, sinews, and veins, of the body which are knitted together as analogy for the Body of Christ – Gouge, *Of Domesticall Duties*, 16.
[13] Ephesians 1:22-23, *KJV*.
[14] See: HP 21/7/1A-2B.
[15] Robert Crowley, *The Voyce of the Laste Trumpet* (London: 1549).

instructed that if one was unable to gain an honest living from the practice of the estate in which they were brought up or trained, they were permitted to seek out other work, but he warned that they ought to "take heed of abandoning your calling upon every idle fancy, or fond conceit, or sudden occasion, or humorous dislike, or malecontended sullennesse [*sic.*]."[16] The link between the Protestant idea of vocation and work was undeniable, and although there existed a general acknowledgement that each profession was important to the functioning of society as a whole, there also existed the possibility of mobility between professions. Such mobility was dependent on more complex factors such as education, family, and estate. God's intention in creating callings was not to chain an unwilling person to a certain employment or station, but to provide boundaries that would bridle the fickle human nature and lead to greater productivity and a society that functioned better as a whole.

In keeping with these popular publications, Dorothy Moore also aligned the idea of divine calling with employment in her correspondence. It was the duty of the Christian, Moore wrote, "as they find their spiritts fitted, soe proportionably must they Act, striving to abound in those graces, which may make them such an imployment, as in the discharge off [*sic.*] it, you may advance the Aime of Serving the Lord Christ, in his Members."[17] While there still existed an implied battle against human nature, if one found oneself in spiritual alignment with God, a desire to serve in the divinely ordained calling would manifest itself naturally. The discovery of a particular calling – of trying to distinguish into what employment God had called an individual – was closely linked with the early modern understanding of individual gifts and talents.

---

[16] Abraham Jackson, *The Pious Prentice* (London: 1640), 115-116.
[17] HP 21/7/1B.

Attention to the word "Tallents" in particular, both in the writing of Moore and her contemporaries, invokes the New Testament parable that shares its name. In the parable of the talents, several servants are given money while their Master is away and are expected to show how they were able invest and grow the riches they were given upon the Master's return.[18] The use of this allusion adds a dual meaning to the use of talents to find one's calling: (1) that each individual possessed unique abilities that were directly and intentionally bestowed by God, and (2) that they shared a duty to use those abilities in service of the community. This was God's intention, Moore argued, "which hee manifests by the Union [of the Body of Christ] itself & by the imcapacity [*sic.*] and impossibility Wee find in ourselves of serving him any other way then by the vsing of all spirituall gifts & graces."[19] If one's calling was unclear, Moore went on to write, it was from their talents that a person was able to use their "Naturall Reason," (which was also a gift of God,) to deduce the divine design for their life: "Indeed there is a prudencie to bee used in decearning and judging our Inclination & Qualitification, that soe with lesse difficultie & more easiness we may prosecate constantly the Worke intended."[20] God bestowed talents with a purpose, and therefore one could use one's talents to logically deduce one's unique calling. In this as well, Moore's conception of vocation aligned with the established Protestant doctrine.

The emphasis placed on attending faithfully to one's work can also be seen in Dorothy Moore's distinct desire to remain of service to the church community and to avoid idleness:

[18] See Matthew 25:14, *KJV*; Luke 19:11-27, *KJV.*
[19] HP 21/7/1A-1B.
[20] HP 21/7/1B.

> I am wholly unsatisfied with an Idle life, which neither proffitts others nore my selfe, that is in regard of Conscience. For otherwise I can find private Exercises, which aboundantly sattisfies my owne Inclinations, & from which to bee entirly withdrawn would be an intolerable as I think it absurd, for any to seeke knowledge without an Aime of using it prudently to the service of others (for without that end vaine Glory is the mover, which is unprofitably base)…[21]

The emphasis that Protestant authorities placed upon employment made idleness and slothful behaviour among the deadliest of social sins in seventeenth-century England. Marshall articulates that the "emphasis on the division of labour complemented an intense preoccupation with work and its virtues…No idleness was allowed, and all time and effort were strictly organized to achieve the maximum service."[22] This reflected the initial Protestant reaction against monasticism and the mendicant orders, which were viewed as leeches upon those godly members of society who toiled in their vocations to support their families and serve society at large. Such revulsion extended beyond traditional Catholic orders and toward any idle behaviour that kept individuals from serving others. In his 1577 *Treatise Against Dicing, Dancing, Plays, and Interludes*, John Northbrooke asserted that any man who did not work for the benefit of others was "a wolfe to a man, that is, a devourer one of another…It is a blessed thing to giue rather than to receyue [*sic.*]."[23] Idleness not only kept someone from serving their community, it also opened the door for this kind of leech-like behaviour and other sinful conduct. In his book on the roads to fulfillment in early modern England, Keith Thomas labels idleness as the "mother of all vices," one that was accompanied by early modern preachers' "deeply pessimistic conviction that only labour could keep away all the foul desire to

[21] HP 21/7/2B.
[22] Marshall, *A Kind of Life*, 39.
[23] John Northbrooke, *A Treatise Against Dicing, Dancing, Plays, and Interludes. With Other Idle Pastimes* (London: 1577), 57.

which the heart of man was subject."[24] Work itself may not have the ability to gain a person salvation, but the obedience, submission, and contentedness that a Christian showed in serving their family and community was a reflection upon the faithfulness and desire to glorify God more generally, and an effort to avoid a sinful life.

The doctrine of vocation applied not only to the idea of physical work, but also to the areas of relationships and family. Just as John Calvin loathed to see a man whom God had ordained for public office withdraw into the cloister and forsake his political calling, he also lamented a husband or father leaving his family for the sake of taking priestly vows. For Calvin, knowing that God had placed the individual in the position in which he naturally found himself meant that he was required to honour it, in spite of what he might selfishly desire in his own heart: "The magistrate will more willingly perform his office, and the father of a family confine himself to his proper sphere. Every one in his particular mode of life will, without repining, suffer its inconveniences…persuaded that God had laid on this burden."[25] Calvin argued that leaving one's family to 'serve God' as a monk was actually a selfish attempt to secure one's personal salvation without a care for the rest of the Christian community. The duty to family, classified by William Gouge as part of one's "priuate vocation," (meaning outside the general view of society) was seen as equally necessary for the obedient and faithful Christian as the public vocation of employment: "for the family is a seminary of the Church and common-wealth."[26] The domestic roles of both men and women as spouses and parents were perceived as callings

[24] Keith Thomas, *The Ends of Life: Roads to Fulfilment in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 88.
[25] John Calvin, *The Institutes of the Christian Religion*, trans. Henry Beveridge (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1970), 35.
[26] Gouge, *Of Domesticall Duties*, 17.

that coexisted with employment, and each person could – and in fact should – be living out multiple callings at one time.[27] Not only were people meant to take on multiple vocations, but to refuse to perform them well directly reflected upon the condition of their soul: "A bad husband, wife, parent, childe, master, seruant, magistrate or minister, is no good Christian."[28]

Aware of the duty that she owed to her family, Moore expressed the desire to care first for her children while discussing the possibility of finding an acceptable form of work: "my present condition requires endeavours for an honest subsistence for mee and myne [children]…"[29] In searching for employment by adhering to a wider understanding of Protestant vocation and the need to refrain from idleness, while at the same time seeking the best for her sons, Dorothy Moore declared not only her adherence to cultural expectations, but also her piety. But while Moore made a clear effort to frame her search for calling within the definition of a widely acknowledged Protestant understanding of vocation, she simultaneously pushed at the boundaries of social convention by suggesting that this framework be applied not only to men, as all of the contemporaries presented thus far had, but also to women.

2.3 Women's Place Within the Existing Vocational Framework

[27] Christopher Lane summarizes after a brief analysis of Luther's choice to use of *Beruf* (vocation) rather than *Stand* (meaning 'state, 'estate', or 'station'), that: "not only were there many possibly lay vocations, but the average individual Christian had several different callings at one time. One man might be son, husband, father, subject of civil authorities, hearer of the preacher, and wage laborer all at once, and all of these were vocations from God." – Christopher J. Lane, "The Diversity of Vocations: Choosing a State of Life in Early Modern France." (University of Notre Dame: 2015), 80.
[28] Gouge, *Of Domesticall Duties*, 16-17.
[29] HP 21/7/2B.

Following her use of the analogy of the Body of Christ to endorse the necessity of service, Dorothy Moore qualified that this particular aim applied to *all* Christians, including women. She asserted the following in her July 1643 letter to Ranelagh:

> many are apt to thinke us [women] alltogeather incapable of such service as I now speake off [*sic.*], but vntill you can proove us incapable of that honour of being Members of that body I must beleive that every Member in his owne station may be proffitable to the rest (although wee be judged the weakest & meanest) & therefore bound to intend the imployment of our best strength spirituall & corporall in this service which to mee is very evident may be attained vnto all sorts in some Measure.[30]

This explicit and specific statement made an effort to rest within the definitions of existing doctrine, and to stretch rather than break its boundaries. The idea that all members of the Body were required to be of service, regardless of station or particular ability, was one confirmed by Moore's theological predecessors and contemporaries. But in the very suggestion that the nuances of vocation discussed in the first section of this chapter applied equally to women as well as men, Moore broke from a long-held understanding of a what vocation meant for women.

While men were expected to operate in many different physical callings, Protestants presented women's vocation as simple, straightforward, and indisputable: to be a wife, mother, and domestic labourer. In 1624, Thomas Gataker wrote in his pamphlet on marriage that:

> it is a *womans trade* so to be [housewifely]; it is the *end* of her *creation*; it that that she was made for. She was made for man, and giuen to man, not to be a *play-fellow*, or a *bed-fellow*, or a *table-mate*, onely with him, (and yet to be all these too,) but to a *yoke-fellow, a worke-fellow, a fellow-labourer* with him, be an

[30] HP 21/7/1B-2A.

> *assistant* and *an helper* vnto him, in the managing of such *domesticall and houshold affaires*.[31]

Being a wife was the divine purpose that was designated and expected of most women. It was ordained by God, the very the reason for which woman had been created. Ultimately, Gataker and his contemporaries argued, God planted the desire to serve in this capacity in the hearts of young girls from childhood.[32]

This understanding of women's divine role was perpetuated in the manuals written to aid in the faithful abiding within their callings. While Robert Crowley outlined numerous different callings for men, taking into account class distinctions and talents, only one chapter in his guide devoted itself to women, separated only to address the differences between the married and unmarried woman. Entitled "The womans lesson," even Crowley's instructions for single women pertained solely to their ability to attract a good husband: "Be thou modeste, sober and wise / And learn the poyntes of houswyfry / And men shal haue the in such price / That thou shalt not need a dowry…god wil some good mans hert moue / to set on the his whole delyte."[33] Advice for the woman following her matrimony pertained mainly to her duties in minding her behaviour so as not to provoke her husband, and acknowledging that he was her head, "And that thou must of him be led."[34] Robert Snawsel's *A Looking Glasse for Maried Folkes* tells the story of Abigail (or "the father's joy,") who refers to her wifely role as her "calling." Abigail's

[31] Original emphasis; Thomas Gataker, *A Mariage Praier, Or Succinct Meditations Deliuered in a Sermon...*(London: 1642), 19.
[32] Gataker instructed parents to train up their young daughters to be sufficient and productive wives. – Gataker, *A Mariage Praier*, 19.
[33] Crowley, *The Voyce of the Last Trumpet*, A29r.
[34] Ibid.

main duties are to avoid idleness and frivolity, and to be wary of envy toward other wives (whom she refers to as "other of my calling").[35]

William Gouge boiled his assessment of the distinct duties divinely assigned to husbands and wives into the ideas of love and fear: "*Loue* as sugar to sweeten the duties of authoritie, which appertaine to an husband. *Feare* as salt to season all the duties of subiection, which appertaine to a wife."[36] Although Gouge hoped that a husband's lordship over his wife was softened by love, he argued that the wife ought to act in submission regardless of the husband's adherence to his own domestic calling: "Let this be noted against the common vaine apologies which are made for neglect of duty…when a husband doth his dutie, I will doe mine, saith the wife…This looking for of dutie at others hands, makes vs more carelesse of our owne." [37] The burden of authority belonged solely to the husband, and for the wife, calling was grounded in submission. Just as the Christian church was meant to submit to God's headship and love, by abiding within her calling, the wife was called to submit to her husband in the same way.[38] This was the ultimate realization of women's service, and therefore their vocation, in Dorothy Moore's world.

2.4 The Inciting Question: Women as Equal Members of the Body

The seventeenth century saw the rise in women's push to be included in traditionally male spaces, including the intellectual world. Access to more extensive

---

[35] Robert Snawsel, *A Looking Glasse for Maried Folkes…*(London:1610), A9r-A9v.
[36] Gouge, *Of Domesticall Duties*, 128.
[37] Ibid, 131.
[38] The instructions given by the Apostle Paul to the Ephesian church painted marriage between a husband and wife as a microcosm of the Christian church's relationship with God: "Submitting yourselves one to another in the fear of God. Wives, submit yourselves unto your own husbands, as unto the Lord. For the husband is the head of the wife, even as Christ is the head of the church…Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the church, and gave himself for it." – Ephesians 5: 21-25, *KJV.*

education in many subjects was still largely unavailable to most women except the wealthy, whose daughters were often privately tutored in arts and languages.[39] Dorothy Moore herself likely learned the majority of her skills in childhood, her father John King having been invested in education.[40] Moore read in several languages, though some, such as Hebrew, were likely acquired in her adulthood.[41] It was this proficiency in language that eventually drew the attention and comradery of Dutch intellectual Anna Maria van Schurman.[42] The increase in female literacy and the formation of letter-writing networks such as the Hartlib Circle allowed for connected and learned women (few though they may have been) to communicate with both men and each other with increasing regularity. Van Schurman was intentional about seeking out other learned women with whom build intellectual connection through correspondence, which Carol Pal has referred to as a kind of "republic of women."[43] In 1642, Anna Maria van Schurman's friendship with, and admiration of, Dorothy Moore led her to make a significant introduction. In a letter to her theological mentor and close correspondent, Dr. André Rivet, van Schurman wrote:

---

[39] Anna Maria van Schurman, *Whether a Christian Woman Should Be Educated and Other Writings from her Intellectual* Circle, ed. and trans. Joyce L. Irwin (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998), 3.
[40] See Moore and Hunter, *The Letters of Dorothy Moore*, xvii-xviii.
[41] Carol Pal writes that while other contemporaries such as Bathsua Makin and Anna Maria van Schurman likely acquired all of their language skills in childhood due to unique educational opportunities, it is more than likely that Dorothy Moore did not learn Hebrew until adulthood. She may have learned this skill while living with the Boates, as Gerard Boate's brother Arnold was a "noted Hebraist," and lived with his brother at the same time that Dorothy Moore did. – Carol Pal, *Republic of Women: Rethinking the Republic of Letters in the Seventeenth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), 158.
[42] In a letter to Moore in 1640, van Schurman introduced herself with much enthusiasm and praised the learned reputation of Moore: "I am delighted to have heard about you and your reputation and thank heaven for know a lady like yourself, such a respected lady of your people, because owing to my ignorance, I thought that no clever woman had remained in England after the death of Jane Grey and Queen Elizabeth." – Moore and Hunter, *The Letters of Dorothy Moore*, 1; van Schurman's comparison of Moore to Jane Grey and Elizabeth I was particularly significant considering the letter that she wrote to Princess Elisabeth of Bohemia in 1639, in which she claimed that she "would dare to set a single Elizabeth in her life as Queen of England and a Jane Grey over against all the illustrious women of ancient Greece and Rome." – van Schurman, *Whether a Christian Woman,* 58-59.
[43]See: Pal, *The Republic of Women.*

> The Most Noble Matron, Lady Moore, would have given you this letter of mine, had it not been necessary for her to leave [Utrecht], too quickly in my view. Indeed, if she could stay with you at yours at some time in the future, I very much want you to welcome her into the sacred intimacy of your Friendship: first because I know full well how much she would come to love and cherish you and your virtues; and second, due to her uncommon piety, the gentleness of her disposition, and the other extraordinary gifts of her intellect, my friendship with her is not an ordinary one.[44]

As far as obtaining a theological correspondent to consider her ideas regarding vocation, Moore could not have hoped for a more promising connection. A prominent professor of Reformed theology at Leiden, Rivet was also a vocal supporter of van Schurman's own intellectual pursuits and her questions regarding the education of women.[45] In the year following van Schurman's introduction, Moore and Rivet began corresponding on the subject of women's roles in the church. The ensuing five letters exchanged between them show Moore's development of a sophisticated argument regarding the potential for women's vocations. It began with a simple question: whether or not Rivet believed that Christian women should be of service to the Body of Christ.[46] Rivet responded in the affirmative, and it was from there that Moore was able to use the doctrine of vocation to logically progress the argument toward the possibility of an increased public role for women within the church.

Moore's initial interjection into the conversation about vocational doctrine came from her search for her own personal calling as a single mother. Her status as a widow threw a wrench into the traditional assignment of women's vocation as wives and

---

[44] Anna Maria van Schurman, André Rivet, Anne R. Larsen, and Steve Maiullo, *Letters and Poems to and from her Mentor and Other Members of Her Circle* (New York: Iter Press, 2021), 183.
[45] It is significant to recognize that although Rivet supported van Schurman's intellectual endeavors, he saw her as extraordinary amongst women – an *exception* to the "female norm." – van Schurman, *Whether a Christian Woman*, 5.
[46] Moore also couches this question in a desire to maintain her feminine modesty and avoid idleness – HP 21/3/1A.

homemakers. While she put clear effort and care into raising her sons, having both enrolled them to study under Voetius of Utrecht and also beginning a search for employment that could support them, her calling external to motherhood remained unclear.[47] When asked by Moore whether women should be expected to serve the Body of Christ, André Rivet's affirmative response came with a qualification: "there are particular vocations to which this [female] sex may be entitled, according to a woman's position in marriage or widowhood."[48] By including widowhood in his statement, Rivet was speaking directly to Moore in his ensuing instruction that the widow's duty was first to her children. Moore's reply to Rivet was also affirmative – yes, she agreed, if they had them, women had a duty first to their children. But did women not also have a responsibility to the community at large?[49]

Sidestepping Rivet's suggestion that women should serve the Christian community through prayer and charity in quiet and unseen spaces traditionally designated to women, Moore proposed an interesting counter-argument: that personal devotion was not a qualitative service to the greater Body of Christ. Reaching back to the very impetus of service suggested by Luther and Calvin, Moore argued that personal devotion was fundamentally self-serving, and could therefore not be classified as a calling: "the ultimate goal of our spiritual life should not be first and foremostly our own personal profit, be it spiritual, but the good of the mysterious body given that our Lord will absolve or condemn depending on our behaviour in this respect…"[50] By employing the

[47] HP 2/5/1A-2B; HP 68/7/1A-2B; HP 2/5/5A-B.
[48] HP 21/3/3A-6B. Translation used: Moore and Hunter, *Letters of Dorothy Moore*, 25.
[49] HP 21/3/7A-9B. Translation used: Moore and Hunter, *Letters of Dorothy Moore*, 28.
[50] Moore is not referring here to the idea that works will equal salvation, but rather that the outward service to one's neighbour is the expression of one's service to God. Her argument echoes Calvin's problems with monasticism as fundamentally spiritually self-serving – HP 21/3/7A-9B. Translation used: Moore and Hunter, *Letters of Dorothy Moore*, 27-28.

doctrine of vocation for her own purposes, Moore was able to push aside Rivet's initial responses to her questions and pinpoint the root of his unwillingness to concede that women should be allowed to "serve" publicly. The theologian's discomfort lay in the concern that Moore was trying to find a space for herself within an established male sphere of public administration and spiritual leadership.[51]

When confronted by Rivet with the gentle and yet pointed accusation that she sought after a sphere of vocation that was not divinely ordained for her, Moore did something interesting. She *agreed.* If it can be argued that Moore had come this far by leaning on the accepted vocational framework as it applied to the traditional roles of men and women, it was here that Moore incorporated her second tactic: employing the traditional physical and spiritual distinction between the sexes to the advantage of her own argument.

2.5 Men and Women: Vocationally Distinct, But Both Called.

It was Rivet who first invoked the doctrine of vocation in explicit terms during his correspondence with Dorothy Moore: "There is a (general) common calling for all Christians, to which all Christian men and Christian women are called. There are gifts and vocations which are not common to all and these are the very sort that are in question."[52] Within the context of his letter, Rivet was speaking of spiritual gifts (such as apostleship, the prophetic word, and healing) to demonstrate to Moore that charity was the gift most praised by the Apostle Paul, and was thus the most appropriate for women.[53]

---

[51] Rivet voices this concern in his very first response to Moore, and even turns to an argument of talent and spiritual gifting to demonstrate that not even all men are divinely equipped for the same positions in the church – HP 21/3/3A-6B.
[52] HP 21/3/3A-6B.
[53] Rivet claimed that he had no desire to discuss extraordinary women's callings, such as that of Deborah or other prophetesses, arguing that their vocations came "immediately" from God. The ability to bestow the

It was for diligent domestic work, Rivet argued, that women were held in highest biblical esteem, and that the seventeenth-century woman should take her cue from this rather than attempt to fight for space in male-designated administration and leadership positions.[54] Contrary to Rivet's expectation (which can be seen in his preemptive citation and refutation of Galatians 3:28), Moore did not attempt to argue that women and men were spiritual equals.[55] Though several of Moore's sectarian contemporaries, such as the Quakers Priscilla Cotton and Mary Cole, grounded their arguments for an increased purview of female influence in the idea of spiritual equality, Moore instead agreed with Rivet that women and men belonged to separate spheres.[56] She did not, however, accept that this was a distinction between public and private vocations, as Rivet suggested. Instead, she argued that just as there existed a public sphere of influence that was appropriate for men but excluded women, there must be an appropriate public vocation for women that excluded men.

Although speaking primarily of spiritual gifts, Rivet used a general example of vocation to argue that individuality and talent were still subject to the public and private spheres so often dictated by sex: "For as not everyone is a magistrate and cannot be one, so is everyone an apostle[?] Are they all prophets? …No, of course not and starting again

---

sacraments, Rivet continued, was not even something that Jesus bestowed upon his own mother, the holiest of women – HP 21/3/3A-6B.

[54] Ibid.

[55] In his letter to the Galatian church, the Apostle Paul wrote that "There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female; for ye are all one in Christ Jesus." – Galatians 3:28, *KJV*.

[56] In reference to Galatians, Cole and Cotton argued that if Christ was in both man and woman, then Christ's voice could be heard through either sex. – Priscilla Cotton and Mary Cole, *To the Priests and People of England, we Discharge our Consicences, and Give them Warning* (London: 1655), 7-8; For a more in-depth discussion of Quaker women's use of spiritual equality and sexual difference to justify women's speaking and authority in the public church setting, see: Teresa Feroli, *Political Speaking Justified: Women Prophets and the English Revolution* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2006), 151-190.

all must work together for the edification of the body of Christ."[57] According to Rivet, the acts performed by women of the church were to be done "all by means of the gifts which they have received from God be they spiritual or worldly and according to vocations which are suitable for their sex and the order which God has established in his Church."[58] Rivet made no effort to deny that women received gifts and talents from God, and that in the same way that men could discern their vocation from such gifts, women could discern theirs. However, the pool of appropriate female vocations was confined to only a few acceptable options. No matter the talent, the practice of women could never presume to violate established vocational boundaries between the sexes. Rivet even opted to speak directly to Moore's own skill set by suggesting that "saintly meditations" communicated via pamphlet publication by "capable men and women" were fine, provided that they were published in accordance with the standard procedure and approval from men in church office.[59] He also referenced Moore's particular interest in teaching young women, perhaps to validate her desire to "shape the paths" of girls and encouraged her to stop pushing at the wider social boundaries conferred upon women by the doctrine of vocation.[60]

It is clear that Rivet knew of Dorothy Moore, as well as her marital status and particular skill set. His frequent references in their brief exchange to the responsibility of

[57] Original emphasis; HP 21/A/3A-6B; Translation used: Moore and Hunter, *The Letters of Dorothy Moore*, 23-24.
[58] HP 21/3/3A-6B; Translation used: Moore and Hunter, *The Letters of Dorothy Moore*, 24.
[59] Ibid.
[60] Rivet wrote that: "the Christian women who have received various gifts from God will find sufficient occasion to prove themselves worthy of them, according to the opportunities which God will provide for them, even in the direction of their own sex where they are more freely admitted, they will be particularly useful in forming and shaping the paths of girls in the service of God, all of which is to be performed in a chaste and honest fashion, according to their own charitable discretion." – HP 21/3/3A-6B; Translation used: Moore and Hunter, *The Letters of Dorothy Moore*, 25-26.

widows, as well as his approval of vocations that were of interest to her, show that he attempted to speak directly into her circumstances. In her letter to Lady Ranelagh in July of 1643, Moore expressed that it was her desire "of communicating the small Talent the Lord hath given me" that led her to initially be considered for a tutoring position for the young English princess Mary at The Hague.[61] Although this was the vocational route that others in her circle urged her to take on, Moore admitted in her letter to Ranelagh that she was already taking pains to "fit my Spiritt for an other employment," which would only be inhibited by receiving the tutoring job.[62] Moore used the opportunity to closely examine her own "Inclination & Qualification" to determine her calling to employment, which she believed to be the instruction of young women.[63] Moore justified her desire to teach on practical as well as spiritual considerations, but primarily because it seemed to check many vocational boxes. Not only would it provide for her sons, the work as a teacher would also keep her from idleness, and would ultimately serve to advance the kingdom of Christ by serving other women in forming their faith.[64]

Moore's seemingly insatiable drive to discover and use her talents in service of the community of believers was not an unprecedented desire or discussion by women in the seventeenth century. Rachel Speght, the daughter of Calvinist minister James Speght, wrote *A Mouzell for Melastomus* (or, "a muzzle for black mouth") in 1617 at the age of nineteen.[65] Speght's provocatively-titled pamphlet was published to answer an

---

[61] Dury was working as the chaplain for the young Princess Mary Stuart at the time, and advocated for Moore to be considered for the tutoring job. The Ladies Ranelagh, Dungarvan, and Clotworthy all petitioned on Moore's behalf as well – HP 2/10/3A-4B; HP 21/7/1A-2B.
[62] Being offered the job was something that Moore had resolved to see as an indication of where the Lord was calling her – HP 21/7/1A-2B.
[63] HP 21/7/2A.
[64] HP 21/7/2B.
[65] Rachel Speght and Barbara Kiefer Lewalski, *The Polemics and Poems of Rachel Speght* (Cary: Oxford University Press, 1996), xvi.

anonymous attack on women in a 1615 pamphlet: *Araignment of Leuud, Idle, Froward, and Vnconstant Women*.[66] The author, later identified as Joseph Swetnam, used both biblical accounts and classical mythology to argue that women were incapable of fending for themselves and were intent on wasting the gains of all of men's labour: "a man must watch and ward, fight and defend, till the ground, labour in the vineyard, and looke what he getteth in seuen years, a woman will spread it abroad with a forke in one yeare…" [67] In Swetnam's view, women were creatures whose very nature predisposed them to pride, envy, and idleness.[68]

In response to Swetnam's pamphlet, Rachel Speght attempted to "re-interpret biblical texts so as to make the dominant discourse – Protestant biblical exegesis – yield a more expansive and equitable concept of gender," for women to avoid idleness.[69] She famously applied the parable of the talents to women, and her very act of writing and publishing her work demonstrated that women were capable of both having and exercising gifts in callings beyond the private, domestic sphere. Speght argued against humanity's efforts to restrain the talents given by God himself: "no power externall or internall ought woman to keep idle [*sic.*], but to imploy it in some service of GOD, to the glorie of her Creator, and comfort of her owne soule."[70] In her later publication, *Mortalities Memorandum with a Dreame Prefixed*, Speght further clarified that God gave every talent with divine intention and greater purpose in mind: "The talent, God doth

---

[66] For more on Speght's role in the pamphlet war of her time, see: Speght and Lewalski, *Polemics and Poems*, xi-xviii.
[67] Joseph Swetnam, *The Araignment of Leuud, Idle, Froward, and Vnconstant Women* (London: 1615), 15.
[68] Swetnam wrote: "Although women are beautifull, shewing pitty, yet their hearts are blacke, swelling with mischiese [*sic.*], not must vnlike vnot old trees, whose outward leaues are faire and greene, and yet the body rotten." Swetnam, *The Araignment*, 31.
[69] Speght and Lewalski, *Polemics and Poems*, xxi.
[70] Ibid, 20.

give, must be imploy'd…All parts and faculties were made for use; The God of *Knowledge* nothing gave in vaine."[71] Speght used the parable of the talents to argue that women who were forced to be solely a "helper" of men and were expected to operate only under the "burthen of domesticall affaires and maintenance" were being employed by their husbands as servants rather than biblical spouses.[72]

Dorothy Moore used the discussion of talents to argue something different about women's traditional position as a "helper" of men. Rather than echoing Speght's assertion that subjecting women to mere "helping" was unbiblical, as Rivet seemed to expect, Moore made a different logical deduction. Rivet's insistence that women must use their talents in an "appropriate" vocation, suggested Moore, was not indicative that women should be solely relegated to their traditional private domestic roles, but that the church lacked a much-needed public sphere in which women could more freely operate. In order to show Rivet that they shared a Biblical understanding, Moore made no move to dispute the scriptural basis of traditional women's vocations within the domestic sphere. Instead, she attempted to show that if women were truly meant to function primarily as men's helpers, and her assertion that private piety was only good for "personal profit" was correct, this meant that there was an untapped potential to create a new public space in which women could serve the Body of Christ. Feminine "appropriateness" pointed to the logical conclusion that there was necessarily a sphere in which it was "inappropriate" for men to operate. If women were meant to be aids and men the "principal agents," Moore argued, "there must be something outside oneself which is not as fitting or essential for

[71] Ibid, 53.
[72] Speght argues that true marriage is directed by a "mutuall love," not the supremacy of the husband – Ibid, 20-24.

the principle agent to do…"[73] Moore made no attempt to dispute women's exclusion from the traditional male spheres of public administration, but she did assert that if women were equally obliged to serve, as Rivet had already agreed, then the obvious next step would be to establish an acceptable space in which they were free to do so:

> For if our sex is limited in the matter of spiritual service, it follows that our vocation is distinct from that of men; and that to understand the expanse of our vocational sphere we must realize that the aim is proportionate to the natural appropriateness of the sex…for I believe that the distinction goes from one to the other and that because of the distinction in appropriateness there must also be a vocation which is distinctly appropriate for women, to be used by them so the talents are not useless to those who have received them in order to glorify God as members of the mystical body.[74]

In a post-script to the same letter, Moore wrote that she believed Rivet must have misinterpreted her use of the word "public" to mean that she was after men's roles in ecclesiastical and political office, when this was not her intention. Rather, she clarified that she referred to "public" in a way that meant the service to all Christians, not only other women.[75] She denied vying for men's roles, rather demonstrating that even based in sexual difference, women logically ought to have a more clearly defined public role in the church.

This argument of sexual distinctiveness is one that was also famously used by Moore's sectarian contemporary, Margaret Fell. In her 1666 publication, *Womens Speaking Justified*, Fell re-interpreted humanity's "fall" in Genesis, painting Eve not only as the first sinner, but also as the essential means by which Christ was able to accomplish

---

[73] HP 21/3/10A-11B; Translation used: Moore and Hunter, *The Letters of Dorothy Moore*, 33
[74] Ibid; Translation used: Moore and Hunter, *The Letters of Dorothy Moore*, 34-35.
[75] Dorothy wrote that: "it seems you understand nothing by the public except that which is apparent to all ecclesiastical and political office: but I understand public to mean all that directly involves the state of the entire body, considered in itself to be an entirety, which ought to give you a clearer impression of my meaning." – HP 21/3/10A-11B; Translation used: Moore and Hunter, *The Letters of Dorothy Moore*, 35.

human redemption: "Let this Word of the Lord, which was from the beginning, stop all that oppose Women's Speaking in the Power of the Lord; for he hath put enmity between the Woman and the Serpent; and if the Seed of the Woman speak not, the Seed of the Serpent speaks."[76] Though written to defend women's right to prophesy in particular, Fell's text justified the sanctioned abilities of women "on the grounds of sexual difference rather than on the basis of spiritual equality," which ran contrary to many of the efforts of her female prophetic and Quaker contemporaries.[77] She insinuated, furthermore, that women's distinctness, even if it be deemed "weakness" by seventeenth-century society, could be used by God, as it was God who made women the "weaker" sex in the first place. When discussing the women who, in their "tenderness," "love," and "weeping" returned first to Christ's tomb and found it empty, Fell pointed out that it was through their emotional actions that God was able to deliver the initial message of Christ's resurrection: "Mark this, ye despisers of the weakness of Women, and look upon your selves to be so wise: but Christ Jesus doth not so, for he makes use of the weak…"[78] The disciples of Christ would not have received the news of the resurrection of Christ, according to Fell, if God had not made deliberate use of women's more emotional tendencies – ones that were bestowed upon them by God in the first place. This did not make women intrinsically "weak," but *distinct* in their power. Teresa Feroli argues that:

> For Fell, woman's inspired speech is not distinct from her gendered identity but rather emerges from her femininity to offer itself and female difference to the

[76] Margaret Askew Fell Fox, *Womens Speaking Justified, Proved and Allow of by the Scriptures…*(London: 1666), 4.
[77]For a full discussion of Margaret Fell in the context of her fellow female Quakers, see: Feroli, *Political Speaking* Justified, 173.
[78] Fox, *Womens Speaking Justified*, 7.

> broad community of believers…In justifying women's speech, Fell does not rely on, as did her predecessors, the gender-neutralizing power of the spirit.[79]

It is clear that Rivet expected Moore to make an argument of a neutralizing nature, as he preemptively discussed the equalizing power of Christ in his first response to Moore's initial letter.[80] Contrary to Rivet's expectations, Moore did not argue that women should be allowed into men's vocational spheres due to equality in Christ. Instead, she doubled down on the very distinctiveness that Rivet used to defend men's roles from interlopers, and proposed an entirely new application of the vocational doctrine.

It was on this new idea that Moore implored Rivet to assist her. She had a clear, logical reasoning behind her belief that women ought to have a more clearly defined public route of spiritual service that was separate from men. What she lacked was a clear idea of what this new vocational sphere should actually look like. Since Rivet was a learned man of God who had previously endorsed new possibilities for women in the world of learning, it was to the question of women's public vocation that Moore insisted that he contribute. Moore made it clear that she did not intend to drastically *undermine* the existing vocational or administrative rules set in place for the functioning of the Christian community, but to *expand* upon them. This would mean clarifying what women were to do with their talents and gifts in addition to the limited domestic roles to which they had already been relegated:

> I insist on demanding by which path the female sex can or should pursue this goal [of service], without going against the modesty required of their sex, and without passing outside the limits which have been laid down for women by the public administration of justice in a Republic and by the word of God in the Church…[81]

---

[79] Ibid, 175.
[80] HP 21/3/3A-6B.
[81] HP 21/3/7A-9B; Translation used: Moore and Hunter, *The Letters of Dorothy Moore*, 27.

The clarification of this idea was essential not only to Moore's own desire to be of greater service in the church, but also for determining potential future changes to women's education. In her second letter to Rivet, Moore laid out four questions for Rivet to answer: (1) in what vocation could women could be of greater use than men; (2) what unique attributes made women capable of working in this new vocation; (3) what areas of study would enable women to function well within said vocation; and (4) how women ought to conduct themselves while working in said vocation to best maintain their feminine modesty.[82]

In the end, Rivet refused to answer the final three of Moore's questions, because he admitted that he did not understand her initial claim that there was necessarily an area of public service to which women were better predisposed than men, since there was no biblical precedent that he could think of.[83] The lack of scriptural support, Rivet confessed, ended his ability to give authoritative advice on the development of Moore's ideology. The final letter in their correspondence was written by Moore – a last defense of her desire to locate a public calling for women so much that it had her intellectually paralyzed: "Here then, Sir, is what holds me locked in my spirit and prevents me resolving certain matters which cause me trouble and which your spiritual doctrine could deliver me from so that in your place I will have the opportunity of rendering acts of grace to God…"[84] Moore's vocationally driven internal torment would not end with Rivet's inability to offer her a solution to her questions. But the implicit connection

[82] HP 21/3/7A-9B; Translation used: Moore and Hunter, *The Letters of Dorothy Moore*, 29.
[83] HP 21/3/12A-13B; At the beginning of each of his letters to Moore, Rivet implored her to discuss her ideas with him in person to avoid misunderstandings. Because of the sudden end to their correspondence, it is impossible to know whether they might have continued to discuss Moore's ideas face-to-face, or whether they simply ceased to speak.
[84] HP 21/3/10A-11B; Translation used: Moore and Hunter, *The Letters of Dorothy Moore*, 35.

between vocation and education in her questions to the theologian made her desire for vocational clarity relevant to a wider discussion: the reformation of women's education in the seventeenth century.

2.6 Women's Education: The Mechanism and Realization of Vocation

Although the question of education seems rarely to be the focus of her early correspondence, it is a theme that bleeds through much of Moore's writing on vocation. This is undoubtedly at least partially due to what Moore believed was her own future calling to be a teacher of young women, as was discussed above. It was also an interest that was shared not only with her future husband, but also with her female correspondents. Education was a significant piece of the vocational puzzle with which Moore wrestled, as it was the mechanism by which vocation was to be realized. The development of a new pedagogy was essential, because it was through it that women's vocations would remain distinct from those of men.

Despite the growth of institutional education for men in the form of grammar schools and increased support of universities in the years of the English Renaissance, the majority of academic spaces remained largely unavailable to women. This was a phenomenon that Hilda Smith claims widened the gap between men and women's education: "The primary reason for this discrepancy was that humanist education was in large part pragmatic, concerned that intellectual training was to related to social role…The problem for women, of course, was that there was no logical end for their humanist training."[85] Humanist education boasted an explicit link to vocation, which was why the educations of men and women were so functionally distinct from one another.

[85] Hilda L. Smith, *Reason's Disciples: Seventeenth-Century English Feminists* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1982), 40.

Charles Webster writes that the connection between religious service and education in the seventeenth century, or the *pietas literata*, dictated that "all learning was judged by its relevance to the service of God. Such a duty, belonging to both secular and religious life, was owed to a beneficent Creator."[86] Because the traditional vocational expectation for women was to become mothers and wives, their education was primarily meant to provide them with "chaste thoughts and household skills." [87]

One of the most influential texts on women's education through the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries was Juan Luis Vives' *Instruction of a Christian Woman*, commissioned by Catherine of Aragon for the instruction of the young English princess Mary. Written in 1523, the text continued to be upheld by writers on education through to the seventeenth century. It was even the tract recommended by André Rivet to Anna Maria van Schurman in response to many of her queries on women's education.[88] The formation of chastity and modesty of character were the primary goals of Vives' vision for women's education, and this meant that Scripture and moral lessons took precedence over the more intellectual content of men's education:

> I put no limit either on male or female, save that it is reasonable that the man be equipped with the knowledge of many and varied subjects, which will be of profit to himself and the state, and that he be endowed with experience and learning, which will be diffused and transmitted to others. I wish the woman to be totally

[86] Charles Webster, *The Great Instauration: Science, Medicine, and Reform, 1626-1660* (London: Duckworth, 1975), 100.
[87] Ibid, 41.
[88] In a letter written to van Schurman in March of 1638, Rivet asked her to consider the entirety of the third chapter of Vives' book: "there you will see that it has always been praiseworthy, even in the estimation of the Holy Spirit, not only that matrons but most of all maidens, even of the royal court, occupied themselves in those workshops that require working with the hands." He goes on to say that if van Schurman accepts Vives' work as true, then there is no dispute between them: "provided that we all agree that they [the excellent learned women of the past] are rare birds on the earth – not because there could not possibly be more, but because it may not be useful or in the public interest." – van Schurman, *Whether a Christian Woman*, 51-52.

> given over to that part of philosophy that has assumed as its task the formation and improvement of morals.[89]

Although progressive in his assertion that women had the potential to be men's intellectual equals, Vives remained "staunchly traditional" in his "obsessive insistence of the virtue of chastity."[90] Not only this, but Vives was expressly against women as teachers: "for it is not fitting that a woman be in charge of schools or have dealings with or speak to men, and, while teaching others, detract from her modesty and decorum either in whole or in great measure."[91] The good woman was primarily a domestic creature who kept to herself and was silent when in the company of others.[92] Even men with tolerance for a more extensive women's education, such as Thomas More and Richard Hyrde, still commended and admired the work of Vives.[93] Overall, Hilda Smith summarizes, the sixteenth century saw a limited education for women as having some benefits, but "it had to be strictly limited to accord properly with women's sphere of social action," or her vocation.[94]

While much of the same thought continued into the seventeenth century, a widespread desire amongst academics to reform education led to increased consideration of changes to women's education, particularly amongst women themselves. Heightened intellectual revolutions in the sciences, philosophy, and politics posed a challenge to traditional preconceptions in the seventeenth century. The process of learning proposed by educational reformer Jan Amos Comenius in particular was still meant to lead directly

---

[89] Juan Luis Vives, *The Education of a Christian Woman: A Sixteenth-Century Manual,* ed. and trans.Charles Fantazzi, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000), 71-72.
[90] Vives, *The Education of a Christian Woman*, 2.
[91] Ibid, 72.
[92] Ibid.
[93] Ibid, 30-31.
[94] Smith, *Reason's Disciples*, 47.

to a vocational life, with "Harmony between the senses, reason, and the scriptures" as the foundation for his Christian philosophy ("*pansophia*"), imbuing students with a sense of religious obligation to serve the community.[95]

Moore's interest in education was one shared with the wider Hartlib Circle. Samuel Hartlib and John Dury were both personally invested in a reformed vision of children's education in England – work that preexisted Dury's marriage to Moore and continued after their nuptials. But it was Moore's discussion of *women's* education in particular that was an interest shared with several of her female contemporaries, including Bathsua Makin and Anna Maria van Schurman. Unlike Moore, however, in an effort to remain in accord with general views on women's vocations, the significant contributions of most other female intellectuals in her circle tended to circumvent the relevance of education to vocation rather than emphasize it.

Anna Maria van Schurman, who Joyce L. Irwin refers to as a "properly modest young woman of conservative seventeenth-century Dutch society," was a constant encouragement to other women of intellectual bent and potential.[96] Far more deferential and cautious toward the men with whom she corresponded, van Schurman's discussion of women's education with André Rivet took on quite a different shape than the one between Rivet and Moore. Similarly to Moore, van Schurman did not suggest drastic changes to the social or power structure in her proposal of a reformed vision for the kind of education available to women. However, unlike Moore, van Schurman saw education – particularly higher education – as untethered from women's vocations.

---

[95] Webster, *The Great Instauration*, 107-108.
[96] See Irwin's introduction to van Schurman's character – van Schurman, *Whether Christian Woman*, 1; For more on van Schurman's efforts to connect with and encourage other female intellectuals see: Pal, *A Republic of Women.*

The kind of life that van Schurman proposed for women interested in further studies was one of the mind, not of active application. She suggested that higher learning was a beneficial option of leisure for Christian women of higher-classes with few obligations: "that the circumstances of her time and fortune is such that it is possible sometimes to be free from any general or special calling, and certainly from the exercises of devotion or from the duties of the household."[97] van Schurman advocated for a kind of women's education that was completely disconnected from their domestic obligations, which was the only kind of "vocation" that van Schurman viewed as fit for women:

> If for the serving of one's vocation it is sufficient to know little, the curriculum of the liberal arts of a higher level of knowledge is not fitting for that person. But to serve their vocation women need to know little…a woman's vocation is confined within narrow boundaries, certainly within the limits of private or domestic life.[98]

Language, theology, and sciences were subjects that van Schurman believed women were capable of appreciating, understanding, and would serve as beneficial ways to fill their leisure time and to avoid idleness. Her main argument was that women were *capable* of studying the same subjects as did men, but since she proposed no change in the vocational status of women, study was of little practical use to them.

Although André Rivet commended van Schurman's intellect, he countered her belief that the intellectual potential of women was equal to that of men. Using the same assertion that he would deliver to Moore ten years later, Rivet argued that despite women's capability for intelligence, "it is certain that the author of nature so formed the sexes differently in order to signify that He had destined men to one set of things and women to another."[99] For Rivet, women's vocation would not be served by the kind of

[97] Van Schurman, *Whether a Christian Woman,* 26.
[98] Ibid, 36.
[99] Ibid, 49.

liberal arts education that van Schurman suggested, despite whatever capability women possessed. This emptied learning of its meaning. In the end, van Schurman agreed with her mentor and accepted his suggestion that Juan Luis Vives' pedagogy was the correct answer to her questions regarding the education of women. She even apologized to Rivet, concerned that he might believe that she was trying to make "immoderate claims" of women's superiority.[100] This was in complete contrast with Moore, whose claim of sexual distinction corroborated Rivet's view and who argued for an kind of education based *within* the differences of male and female vocations rather than including women in men's education due to intellectual capability. Moore was more interested in maintaining the connection between education and divine calling – preparing young women to practically serve their communities in their own unique feminine power – than in impinging on the liberal education of men's higher learning.

Forty years following van Schurman's discussion with Rivet, the prodigious woman of learning Bathsua Makin published her own essay on women's education. Though her tract was not strictly contemporary with Moore and van Schurman's, Makin's work in educating the Stuart children at The Hague coincided with that of John Dury, van Schurman, and likely Moore.[101] Like both Moore and van Schurman, Makin acknowledged the significance of women's domestic roles, but unlike the others, she spoke to the potential for a positive influence played by women's education on both marriage and the instruction of children.[102] Frances Teague writes that:

---

[100] Ibid, 12.
[101] It is also possible that John Dury's *Reformed School*, which chapter four will argue that Moore had influence on, influenced Makin's writing in turn – Frances N. Teague and Bathsua Makin, *Bathsua Makin: Woman of Learning* (Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press, 1998), 91.
[102] Teague and Makin, *Bathsua Makin*, 96.

> With this insistence, Makin breaks from other advocates of educating women; her position is that a learned woman does not have to live homosocially…as one of Anna Maria van Schurman's 'learned maids,' or in Mary Astell's 'monastery'," but instead of marriage and learning being irreconcilable, Makin believed that learning could serve to improve the domestic world.[103]

Like Rachel Speght, Makin believed that women had been given the gift of reason so that it might be exercised.[104] Like van Schurman, Makin argued that it was primarily rich gentlewomen of "good, natural parts" who ought to be educated, primarily to avoid the idleness and frivolity to which women were thought to be naturally predisposed.[105] However, unlike Moore, Makin did not make any effort to connect education with divine calling or the ability to perform the duties that pertained to vocations: "I do not intend to hinder good housewifery, neither have I called any from their necessary labor to their book. My design is upon such persons whose leisure is a burden."[106] Therefore, while Makin did see women's learning as potentially helpful (in particular, in the event that a woman's husband be absent and she was required to aid in his household responsibilities), it remained nearly as class-restricted and separate from public or practical vocation as van Schurman's vision.[107] While the contributions of these women are rightfully acknowledged as significant within the larger discussion of women's education, their desire to argue that women were *capable* of education did not seem to address the humanist link between education and vocation that Moore more clearly identified in her writings pertaining to women's calling.

---

[103] Ibid, 96.
[104] Ibid, 102.
[105] Makin argued that education was of potential use for occupying the time of all marital statuses: single, married, and widowed – Ibid, 128, 133.
[106] Ibid, 138.
[107] Ibid, 140.

Although Moore did produce a tract directly pertaining to the subject of the education of girls at the urging of Lady Ranelagh, the only piece of the text that survives is the scribal copy of the introductory cover letter. This document is preserved in a manuscript compilation of education writings from various members of the Hartlib Circle.[108] The tract was written several years after her marriage to John Dury, when she had given up her dream of personally teaching. The cover letter focuses predominantly on criticism of the traditional education of gentlewomen as it existed, and rather than providing specific suggestions for what a reformed woman's education would be, it points out what it should *not* be. These criticisms attest primarily that the focus on dancing, dressing, and hair promoted both idleness and vanity in young women: "neither from Religion or Reason hath it a ground…but (to speake modestly) we see them become such admirers of themselves, as the dotage upon their owne persons makes them useless to all others, both in regard of their purses and bodily assistance…"[109] In other words, Moore felt that the contemporary function of women's education did little to adequately prepare them for any sort of vocation at all, and thus failed to equip a whole group of willing Christians to serve the Body of Christ.

What *can* be discerned about Dorothy Moore's prospective pedagogy exists predominantly in the scattered pieces of her earlier correspondence on vocation. For example, just as she argued for women's vocational distinctiveness from men, it naturally followed that the education of women was one that would be unique to her sex. Unlike her female contemporaries, Moore made no effort to argue for women's intellectual

[108] See the final footnote in Felicity Lyn Maxwell's publication on Moore's writing: Felicity Lyn Maxwell, "Calling for Collaboration: Women and Public Service in Dorothy Moore's Transnational Protestant Correspondence," *Literature Compass* 14, no. 4 (2017), 14.
[109] Moore and Hunter, *The Letters of Dorothy Moore*, 87-88.

capability, or the potential for inclusion in the sort of liberal arts education to which men were accustomed. Moore's focus on the distinction of vocation between the sexes necessitated that girls' education be designed to prepare them for their unique vocations as grown women. This can be seen in Moore's insistence that a public role for women in the church be explicitly defined so that effective education could be created, and that this education must include spiritual as well as domestic vocations.[110] Unlike van Schurman and Makin, Moore did not specify any sort of class-exclusivity in prospective women's education. Her only references to class-driven education were disparaging, as she recounted her own childhood experiences with the kinds of "useless" training that young girls received as future gentlewomen. Since she believed education to be the mechanism by which young women would be prepared to serve the Body of Christ, fulfilling one of their most significant responsibilities as Christians, the swift determination of what should be taught was essential. This is why she "demanded" that Rivet, as a theologian open to the idea of female education, ought to weigh in and aid in her efforts to create more productive members of the church. With her own ideas about the potential for a more inclusive definition and application of the doctrine of vocation incomplete and her questions to Rivet unanswered, it would be easy to blame the theologian for the cessation of the development of Moore's prospective pedagogy. However, in 1645 Moore made a personal choice that had an equally significant impact on the continuation of her writing.

2.7 Conclusion

[110] In her second letter to Rivet, for example, Moore asked how much and what kind of study ought to be given to women so that they might exercise their prophetic gifts, and then goes on the clarify that the public use of the gift would still belong solely to men – HP 21/3/7A-9B.

Building a foundation on accepted Protestant theology and standing firm in the conventional belief in the physical and spiritual distinction between the sexes, Moore was able to propose a new vocational space for women in the church, made possible through a reform in women's education. Her in-depth understanding and clever use of the doctrine of calling allowed Moore to imagine new roles and learning experiences for women without disrupting existing authority and social structures in early modern English society. By encouraging women to embrace the full complexities of vocational doctrine, Moore created the potential impetus for greater women's control over the realization of their own callings, as well as their ability to serve more fully in their own Christian communities, without giving up the domestic spaces that they traditionally inhabited.

Although her dream of creating these new spaces was never fully realized, it is clear that Moore understood the significance and potential of her own ideas, and sought to ensure that they would be documented for those reformers of women's vocation who succeeded her. This can be seen in the conclusion of her extant cover letter to her tract on young women's education. Moore's expression of visceral frustration throughout the letter came to a head when the anger toward her own experience of education as a gentlewoman was made explicit: "My owne breeding and practise hath been too dangerously ill for me, to returne to those things either in my selfe, or to teach others…I must renounce them, and desire the Lord that he will manifest to others his will in this…"[111] It is clear from this ending to her essay that although Moore remained invested in the issue of women's education in theory, she viewed the responsibility for applying her theoretical changes in pedagogy as resting in the hands of others.

[111] Moore and Hunter, *The Letters of Dorothy Moore*, 88.

Dorothy Moore declared openly on many occasions in her early correspondence that she chose to remain unmarried to pursue her calling. Since she made no effort to condemn marriage, and even upheld the importance of domestic responsibilities for those women who had families, it is, in many ways, unsurprising that she did not go on to teach after she married John Dury in 1645. [112] Though she had openly declared herself well-equipped for this calling, within a few years, Moore had changed her tune on becoming a teacher in her own right. Although Moore believed that the reformation of women's education was the divine will of God, it is clear that by the time she wrote her essay on education, the calling that she had so vehemently been chasing was one that she no longer believed was hers to practice. At least not in the way that she had originally conceived.

[112] HP 21/7/1A-2B.

CHAPTER 3 – A COVENANT OF MARRIAGE: JOHN AND DOROTHY DURY'S SHARED VOCATION

3.1 Introduction

After four years of covenantal friendship in which Dorothy Moore prioritized pursuit of vocation over material interests, she agreed to marry the irenicist and reformer John Dury in the early months of 1645. While upon first glance her marriage appears to signal a departure from her earlier work on the potential for women's vocations, Dorothy Dury insisted that the match was a final step toward the ultimate fulfillment of her calling, one that joined her vocation with that of her husband through the covenant of marriage. Contrary to what has been argued by historians and literary scholars such as Ruth Connolly and Felicity Lyn Maxwell, the marriage of the Durys was neither a capitulation to cultural values nor an abandonment of Dorothy's previous convictions.[1] The union was extension and upholding of a pre-existing covenant between two people with a long-standing spiritual friendship The series of covenants taken throughout the lives of both Dorothy Moore and John Dury, up to and including their marriage, expose what they both believed to be their priority: serving God and the Christian community through their vocations. By grounding the written defense of her marriage in the idea of shared vocation, Dorothy sought to expose the reality of seventeenth-century priorities in marriage as socially rather than divinely constructed, while simultaneously modelling a companionate union as the ideal to which all Christian marriages ought to conform. In this way Dorothy Dury was able to circumvent the expectation that women's vocations be

[1] Ruth Connolly, "Viscountess Ranelagh and the Authorisation of Women's Knowledge in the Hartlib Circle," in *The Intellectual Culture of Puritan Women, 1558-1680*, eds. Johanna I. Harris and Elisabeth J. Scott-Baumann (Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave, 2011), 153; Felicity Lyn Maxwell, "Calling for Collaboration: Women and Public Service in Dorothy Moore's Transnational Protestant Correspondence," *Literature Compass* 14, no. 4 (2017), 12.

subordinated to marriage, arguing instead that any Christian marriage ought to be subordinated to vocation.

As central members of the renowned intelligence network pioneered by Samuel Hartlib, Dorothy Moore and John Dury were likely drawn together by a multitude of factors, including shared friends and associates, and an alignment in intellectual interests. But above all, the ultimate devotion to vocation shown by both Moore and Dury was the primary focus of both of their lives, apparent in the numerous covenants taken by Moore and Dury and book-ended by the seemingly contrary vows that they made to themselves to remain single in the early 1640s and their marriage vows to one another in 1645. It was the commitment to follow through on their divinely ordained callings that served as the root for each new covenant taken, and it is therefore by understanding this objective that the nature and significance of the relationship of John Dury and Dorothy Moore becomes clear.

3.2 The Peacemaker and the Teacher: Two Separate Callings

John Dury displayed a deep devotion to a public calling in ministry many years before he met Dorothy Moore. Both John's father and grandfather had been Presbyterian ministers embroiled in the ongoing ecclesiastical strife between the Scottish and English churches under the reigns of Elizabeth I, James I, and Charles I.[2] Robert Dury was banished from Scotland for the treasonous act of resisting the king's introduction of episcopalianism, and was accompanied by his ten-year-old son, John, to the Continent in 1606. John studied theology at Leiden and the Huguenot Academy at Sedan, having

[2] For more on John and Robert Dury, see: J. Minton Batten, *John Dury: Advocate of Christian Reunion* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1944), 12-13; Thomas H. H. Rae, *John Dury and the Royal Road to Piety,* vol. 37 (Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1998), 49-50.

"ample opportunity to observe the deepening lines of demarcation between types of Protestant thought and the increasing bitterness of theological strife."[3] He took up the call to the ministry as a pastor of a small congregation of English and Scottish Presbyterians in West Prussia in 1624. It was there, in Elbing, that Dury would witness the overflow of conflict from the Thirty Years' War. Before he had turned thirty, John Dury had a firsthand understanding the far-reaching consequences of theological splits within the Protestant churches of Europe. Driven by a firm belief that God desired to unite the Protestant community, Dury felt called to heal the wounds inflicted on the landscape of Europe through an international reconciliation of Protestant churches.[4] The perpetual political instability across Europe in the seventeenth century was closely tied to the inseparability of religion and governance in the majority of European states. This meant that in seeking to reconcile religious differences, John Dury often found himself embroiled in matters of international political significance.[5] With the friendship and help of the intelligencer Samuel Hartlib, who had himself fled the Thirty Years' War, John Dury embarked on his life-long mission for ecclesiastical peace, co-founding an international correspondence network with universal reform as its goal.

In June of 1640, John Dury wrote a letter to his first patron, Sir Thomas Roe, discussing the way that he planned to make personal decisions that would best benefit his

---

[3] Batten, *John Dury: Advocate*, 14.
[4] See: Scott Mandelbrote, "John Dury and the Practice of Irenicism," *Religious Change in Europe, 1650-1914: Essays for John McManners*, ed. Nigel Aston (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997), 43.
[5] One of John Dury's first major publications, a tract titled *Motives to induce the Protestant princes to mind the vvork* [*sic*] *of peace ecclesiasticall amongst themselves*, was written to argue that ecumenical reconciliation was the only thing that could prevent the downfall of the German states to the Catholic Austrians. This reconciliation could be achieved, Dury argued, by discerning the fundamental divisions between churches. It was by setting the extrafundamental principles of faith aside that a common faith amongst brothers might be realized – a belief that would become foundational to Dury's negotiations of church reunion for the rest of his career – John Dury, *Motives to induce the Protestant princes to mind the vvork of peace ecclesiasticall amongst themselves…*(Amsterdam: 1639), 3, 6, 18.

mission of Protestant reunion.[6] Above all, Dury vowed to put his own private desires aside to pursue his public calling, and outlined a list of rules designed to keep him from straying from this path.[7] The first four of these nine rules had to do with the relationship between Dury's duty to his calling and the possibility of a future marriage. Amongst rules concerning the necessary financial stability and setting in which he might one day settle, Dury's second rule served as the basis from which the rest of his thoughts on marriage were derived. This rule declared the primacy of John's calling over any human relationship: "I will never adventure the leaving of my Spirituall worke for to attend any marriage whatsoever Because the love of noe creature shall ever oversway the love which I owe to god in the duetys of my calling."[8] Any relationship, by this declaration, would necessarily have to be subordinated to John's vocation.

John Dury's desire to serve his vocation above all else was a sentiment shared by the recently widowed Dorothy Moore, who made several similar statements in defense of maintaining her single state three years later. Rather than merely vowing that a spouse would remain secondary to her calling, as Dury had, Moore declared that if she were to marry a second time, the relationship must itself function as a *means* to serve in that calling. She would remain in her single state, Moore claimed, "vntill the Lord present mee with such a Companion to whom being united by Conscience is convinced I may

---

[6] Dury met Roe, an English Ambassador who was sent to Elbing to help negotiate peace between Sweden and Poland, in the early years of his career in Elbing. Roe was very interested in Dury's ideas regarding the spiritual reunion of Protestant Churches, and became Dury's chief patron for the next ten years – Batten, *John Dury: Advocate,* 21-22.

[7] Dury wrote: "For I have once for all settled this resolucion That I will not (if it please god to enable mee & if by any meanes I can commend my Spirit in sudden occasions) doe any thing without a cleere rule goeing before mee then whatsoever shall befall vnto mee in my way of observing the Rule I will never bee troubled at it." – M. Greengrass, M. Leslie, and M. Hannon (2013) *The Hartlib Papers* [hereafter, HP] Published by The Digital Humanities Institute, University of Sheffield. [available at: http://www.dhi.ac.uk/hartlib], 6/4/56A-57B.

[8] HP 6/4/56B.

more then in an Ordinary way obtaine meanes and helpe of fulfilling this my Aime…"[9] Having already fulfilled the societal expectations to serve as wife and mother, she insisted that a second spouse must share her desire to serve in her vocation, and support her in this endeavor. Moore's use of the word "conscience" invokes an acknowledgement of moral or ethical motivation on behalf of the companion that she imagined; a man who shared in her ultimate aim to serve her community of faith. Dorothy Moore was uninterested in marrying for companionship alone. If she was going to leave behind the vocational freedom she had as a widow, she would be particularly selective about her marital prospects. Although she was intentional about including a desire to follow God's providential hand wherever it might lead, Moore firmly and repeatedly declared that her own personal desire was to remain in a single state: "allthough I could in my owne inclinations and desires beg and choose to doe my poore service in a single life, and soe through Gods Mercy I hope to doe, vntill the Lord Manifest his will to the Contrary."[10] Moore desired to follow her vocation above all else, and worried that marital responsibilities would take away from her calling, unless a particular sort of companion came into her life.

It is significant to note that neither Moore nor Dury vowed *never* to marry. Dury, in particular, clarified in his June 1640 letter to Roe that he had a full intention to one day find himself a wife when he was in a more stable place in his work.[11] The idealistic reformer spent many years in search of a Protestant leader to publicly champion the cause of church reunion, and travelled extensively in his early career in search of a person to fill

[9] HP 21/7/2A.
[10] HP 21/7/2A.
[11] HP 6/4/57A.

this role.[12] Although he had the nominal support of several significant church leaders, ambassadors, and even rulers, the political and religious unrest of the mid-seventeenth century meant that it was difficult to maintain support or alliances. Dury's finances were in a constant state of flux, and he did not have a fixed home base.[13] Despite this, or perhaps because of it, he remained quite selective about the circumstances under which he would choose to marry. Dury's letter to Roe in June of 1640 indicated that he wanted to be stable but also refused to marry for wealth: "I will not intend to marry for meanes For I must trust to bee maintained by Gods blessing in my calling & by it rather then by friends…when I know where I can settle & subsist with best advantage to my worke then I intend to sue for a match."[14] John trusted that the same God who had divinely ordained him for a mission of peacemaking would provide for that mission.

The intention of both Moore and Dury to remain single was not a problem by societal standards, especially given their strong devotion to vocation. As a widow, Moore had already fulfilled her primary calling as a wife and a mother. Although she still had a duty to support her sons, the death of her husband left her in a vocationally ambiguous space, which gave her leave to begin her own pursuit of what she felt was a divine call to service in the church and improving the instruction of young women. John Dury, a ministry man of intellectual inclination, faced no controversy in his decision to remain single. While there no longer existed a religious institutional environment for Protestants

[12] Batten writes that Dury would never find the figurehead that he sought, despite gaining the nominal support and goodwill of leaders such as Charles I, Gustavus Adolphus, John Oxenstierna, and Archbishop William Laud throughout his career – Batten, *John Dury: Advocate*, 24, 29-30, 36-38, 45-50.
[13] For a discussion of the unreliable funds John Dury possessed through various ministerial positions, see: Felicity Lyn Maxwell, "Pastoral Cares, Covenant, and Courtship in John Dury's Personal Correspondence, 1641-5," *The Clergy in Early Modern Scotland*, eds. Chris R. Langely, Catherine E. McMillan, Russell Newton (Boydell Press, 2021), 191-192.
[14] HP 6/4/56B-57A.

to live without obligation to familial ties or expectations, "a man so inclined might seek a form of collegiate life in the universities," an option that did not exist for the vast majority of women with similar inclinations.[15] Few members of Hartlib's circle, notes Charles Webster, "shared Dury's sense of divine purpose," and it was this drive to fulfill a mission, as well as his skill and strength of character that lent much credence to his irenic operation.[16]

The devotion that Dury displayed for his work is best exemplified in the written covenant that he signed with Samuel Hartlib and Johannes Amos Comenius in March of 1642. In it, the three men vowed to deny all private and personal interests to pursue the realization of a better and richer international profession of religion.[17] This goal was to be accomplished through Dury's mission of religious peace and unification, the joint effort in reforming the education of the youth, and a general pursuit of collecting and preserving all knowledge and wisdom.[18] Signing this covenant was a serious commitment, as were all covenants in early modern England, ranging from those taken between two people to those taken by entire nations. In his sermon on the nature of covenants preached at the official pledging of the Solemn League and Covenant between the Scottish Covenanters and English Parliament during the first English civil war in

[15] Frances Harris, *Transformations of Love: The Friendship of John Evelyn and Margaret Godolphin* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 3-4.
[16] Samuel Hartlib, Charles Webster, and John Dury, *Samuel Hartlib and the Advancement of Learning* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970), 39.
[17] "Quòd scopum divinae gloriae manifestandae, Proximorumque publicae aedificationis promovendae, unicè nobis prpositum habebimus: quem ad unicam revelatae nobis in verbo Evangelii Veritatis normam, sine omni humanarum nostarum vel alienarum quarumcunque particularium opinionum praeconceptione et praejudicio componemus. Ac proinde quòd nihil privatim nobis in studio publico quaeremus, aut captar studebimus (puta gloriam, aut emolumentum aliquod externum) praeter id quod ad finem jam propositum omninò necessarium esse comperiemus." – G. H. Turnbull, *Hartlib, Dury and Comenius: Gleanings from Hartlib's Papers* (Liverpool: University Press of Liverpool, 1947), 459.
[18] The full covenant can be found in: Turnbull, *Hartlib, Dury and Comenius*, 458-460.

1643, Joseph Caryl declared that it was necessary for all takers of covenants to search their own hearts beforehand, for "If should you should not feele and search your owne hearts, without doubt the Lord will, *And if you be found as deceivers, you will bring a curse upon your selves, and not a blessing*…"[19] Unlike an oath, in which God was the witness upon whom one swore, in a covenant God was viewed as an equal member of the agreement.[20] This did not mean that God no longer held those involved in the covenant responsible to maintain their vows, but instead that those who took the promise to maintain the covenant were working *alongside* God toward a shared goal. In the case of the covenant between Dury and his two companions, Charles Webster states that while there were many social manifestations of covenant theology, "In the hands of Hartlib and his colleagues, it reinforced their sense of sanctification in the mission to propagate a utopian social and religious programme. With this outlook, they operated more as an international spiritual brotherhood than a quasi-political pressure group."[21] The covenant that Dury took to uphold the mission of religious unification and reforming education bound him as much to Hartlib and Comenius as it did to their shared goal, one that God would work with and through them to achieve.

The taking of this fraternal covenant also meant that any other decisions made by Dury could not contradict the agreement. Any man who took a covenant, Joseph Caryl warned, had a duty to never take another that was inconsistent with it. For a man to swear to a covenant "while he hath either taken a Covenant with an other, or made a Covenant

---

[19] Original emphasis; Joseph Caryl, *The nature, solemnity, grounds, property, and benefits, of a sacred covenant. Together with the duties of those who enter into such a covenant* (London: 1643), 10.
[20] See: Jonathan Gray, *Oaths and the English Reformation* (Cambridge University Press, 2012), 9, 19-20; Edward Vallance, *Revolutionary England and National Covenant: State Oaths, Protestantism and the Political Nation, 1553-1682* (Boydell Press, 2005), 2-3.
[21] Hartlib, Dury, and Webster, *The Advancement of Learning*, 9.

in his owne breast against it, is desparate wickednesse."[22] This meant that to maintain his spiritual integrity, Dury could not make any future covenants that contradicted his ultimate devotion to his spiritual work in church reunion nor his commitment to the work of the other founding members of the Hartlib circle. Like Dorothy Moore, John Dury's commitment to his vocation went before all others, even the search for and devotion to, a future spouse.

3.3 A Friend Most Affectionate: Dury and Moore's Covenant of Spiritual Friendship

John Dury and Dorothy Moore became acquainted sometime in the first half of 1641, and were intimate friends by July of the same year. The earliest extant letters between them began around this time and demonstrated a distinct familiarity with one another's character, life circumstances, and vocational pursuits. Although the majority of their extant letters are not addressed to one another, they present a shared congruency of thought and motivation, showcasing how frequently they discussed their problems and ideas in-person. The details of their relationship are often more clearly presented in their correspondence with friends – namely Samuel Hartlib and Lady Ranelagh – rather than each other.[23] Although Dury and Moore originally became acquainted in London in the time that Dorothy Moore resided with the Boates, by July 1641, Dury's irenic efforts had led him into the British and exiled Bohemian courts at The Hague in Utrecht. Both Dury and Moore would go on to reside in the orbit of The Hague for the next four years, and their time would be marked by an effort to clarify the exact nature of their relationship.

---

[22] Caryl, *The nature, solemnity, grounds,* 9.

[23] Dorothy Moore saw Lady Ranelagh in particular as a spiritual advisor, one whom Michelle DiMeo has argued "was explicitly female and could speak with authority about a woman's responsibility to God." – Michelle DiMeo, *Lady Ranelagh: The Incomparable Life of Robert Boyle's Sister* (Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 2021), 46.

In a letter written to Lady Ranelagh in December of 1644, John Dury stated in explicit terms that sometime after becoming acquainted with Dorothy Moore in 1641, he proposed that they engage in a particular kind of bond: a "Covenant of spirituall freinshipp."[24] This covenant, much like the one that Dury had vowed to uphold with Hartlib and Comenius in 1642, was made with public benefit in mind, a relationship to be sustained through a mutual commitment to support and edification, whether at a distance or in person.[25] A covenantal friendship of the sort taken by Moore and Dury was not abnormal in the seventeenth century, and those taken between male and female friends were especially typical in Presbyterian circles between ministers and their female congregants.[26] Although Moore was not a congregant of Dury's, his beginnings as a Presbyterian pastor would have made him familiar with these spiritual friendships between men in ministry and godly women. The covenantal friendship was one of a "special, formalized" nature, writes Felicity Lyn Maxwell, "vowed before God and for his service, as Dury and Moore committed to engage in ministry toward each other and, together, towards a wider society."[27] It is unclear whether Dury swore his covenant with Hartlib and Comenius or with Moore first, since they were both taken between 1641 and the end of 1642.[28] But regardless which was taken first, Joseph Caryl's declaration

[24] HP 3/2/92A-95B.
[25] Ibid.
[26] John Coffrey writes that these relationships between Presbyterian pastors and godly women aroused some contempt in Episcopalian circles since "these were not merely one-way relationships in which the pastor was the dispenser and the woman the recipient of advice." Rather, pastors like Samuel Rutherford, the subject of Coffrey's book, "depended on these women as much as they depended on him." See: John Coffrey, *Politics, Religion and the British Revolutions: The Mind of Samuel Rutherford* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 98-99.
[27] Maxwell, "Pastoral Cares, Covenant, and Courtship," 201; These covenants of friendship were meant to mirror the covenants of the same sort that were made between David and Jonathan in the Old Testament. See: 1 Samuel 20:14-17, *King James Version*.
[28] Often the swearing of such covenants was accompanied by a document that outlined the aims of the agreement, such as the one produced by Hartlib, Dury, and Comenius. In the case of Moore and Dury, there

regarding the wickedness of taking covenants with opposing aims still applied.[29] This meant that the two covenants were required to be in agreement with one another's aims, which upheld the pursuit of divine vocation over and above all private interests and desires.

The earliest extant letter from Dury to Moore provides a window into how devoted their friendship had become, despite knowing one another for less than a year. It quickly become a friendship concerned primarily with the mutual desire to support one another in the fulfillment of their vocations. At the very core of his friendship with Moore, Dury wrote, was a desire to drive one another forward toward righteous living, the kind that would benefit them not only in their lives on earth, but in the Christian afterlife: "lette us aime at that which shall be permanent unto life eternall in our mututall acquaintance & conuersation; & if wee can make each other perfect in the best things, wee are sure that our ioye shall not bee after this world, wherein nothing is constant & entire."[30] The letter was saturated in Dury's admiration for Moore and his explicit desire to continue to converse with her and to aid her in her divine, vocational journey. It is clear that the two had already discussed their callings and desires to pursue them, since he offered to pray for the Lord to use Moore as "an instrument of his glorie in his Kingdome whereunto yow are called," and encouraged her to continue to pray for God to "reueale the happinesse of this estate [her calling] unto yow, & to fulfill it, yow shall be assured the helpe of yowr most faithfull & most entire freind [*sic.*] in Christ Iesus."[31] Moore's

is no extant example of such a document. It is possible that Moore and Dury only swore this covenant in person, or that it simply did not survive.

[29] See: Caryl, *The nature, solemnity, grounds*, 9.

[30] HP 2/5/1A-2B.

[31] Ibid.

dedication to understanding and fulfilling her calling was likely something that drew Dury to her in the first place. He believed that she was called to something significant, continuously extolling her many intellectual talents and pious virtues, and promising to aid her in the discovery and realization of her calling.

For John Dury, supporting Moore in her vocational pursuits meant not only aiding in her search for a role in public service, but also in her role as a mother, which was widely accepted by ministers and writers of marital manuals as the vocation that women were created to fulfill.[32] In the letter written by Dury in July 1641, he took on responsibility for the wellbeing of her children. Moore wished to enroll her two sons to be educated under the renowned Voetius of Utrecht, a mentor of her friend Anna Maria van Schurman, and John Dury had promised to look into securing a space for the boys in Voetius's home. His determination to aid her, Dury declared, was owed to his admiration of both her character and her love for her sons: "I know your upright & pious intentions towards your Children; & because I loue yow, in the truth of Godly affections; I haue made your intentions & care for them mine owne."[33] Dury not only praised Dorothy Moore's personal piety, but was clearly also impressed by her management of her maternal responsibilities, in particular her desire for her sons to be well educated, as education was something that held a significant place in his own mission. His assistance with her efforts was a show of his support in aiding her to fulfill her vocation as a mother.

The continuous affirmation of one another's vocations in the extant letters of Dorothy Moore and John Dury is also evident in their mutual support of the desire to remain single. In 1642, John Dury was appointed as the chaplain to the young Mary

[32] See for example: William Gouge, *Of Domesticall Duties* (London: 1622), A5r-A5V, 20.
[33] HP 2/5/1A.

Stuart, who resided at The Hague. The schooling of Dorothy's sons in Utrecht, connections with the intellectuals in the orbit of the exiled Bohemian royals in residence at The Hague, and a potential job opportunity in the courts brought Moore to Utrecht in the same year.[34] Praised for her piety, intellectual rigor, and virtue by several connections of note, including Archbishop James Ussher, Lady Ranelagh, Samuel Hartlib, Margaret Clotworthy, and others, Dorothy Moore came recommended as a prime candidate to serve in the young princess Mary's household, as "Dury's female counterpart."[35] Despite her own misgivings about the job due to her desire to pursue a career in teaching young women, it was ultimately the intimate nature of Dorothy Moore's friendship with John Dury that cost her the position.[36] Not long after her arrival in Utrecht, rumors spread through The Hague that Moore and Dury were not just friends, but had been secretly married. Not only did this gossip imply that Dury's desire for Moore's appointment to Mary's household was in his own self-interest, but the suggestion that he might be lying about his personal life "undercut his spiritual authority from the state and dashed her employment prospects."[37]

In an effort to save one another's reputations, both Dorothy Moore and John Dury wrote to external correspondents to deny the rumors regarding the nature of their relationship. In a French letter to Albert Joachimi, the Dutch ambassador in London,

---

[34]It was partly the fact that André Rivet was serving as the tutor for William of Orange at the same time that Dury served in the court of Mary Stuart and sought a position for Moore that allowed her to converse with Rivet regarding her ideas. See: Maxwell, "Pastoral Cares, Covenant, and Courtship," 189; For more on the Exile Court, see: Carol Pal, *The Republic of Women: Rethinking the Republic of Letters in the Seventeenth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), 33-35.
[35] Maxwell, "Pastoral Cares, Covenant, and Courtship," 190.
[36] Felicity Lyn Maxwell has argued convincingly that a letter written to Lady Ranelagh in July of 1643 strongly indicates that Moore never really wanted the job in Mary Stuart's household, and was only pursuing it because of the opinions and recommendations of the women of influence within her circle. See: Maxwell, "Calling for Collaboration," 3-4.
[37] Maxwell, "Pastoral Cares, Covenant, and Courtship," 190.

Moore disclosed that her own desire to remain single had nothing to do with her opinion of marriage, but with both her and Dury's desire to best serve in their vocations. Her status as a widow meant that she was not under anyone's supervision or subject to anyone's headship, Moore argued, which in turn meant that there was no reason for her to hide getting married: "For that would mean transforming something that which is good in itself into something improper and would seem to confess a transgression when none has been committed."[38] She declared that since her own conscience was clear, she did not care about other people's perceptions of her, but that she was distressed by how the rumors might affect John Dury. In particular, Moore's concern was that the potential damage to perceptions of his integrity would, in turn, affect his ability to continue his mission to reconcile the churches: "I find myself obliged to remove this burden from him to the best of my ability, in view of the fact that his sincerity will be affected/(questioned) as a result of this claim, as will the fulfilling of his vocation…"[39] Although Moore was defending herself as well as Dury, her denial of the rumors seems to be focused on a primary desire to clear her friend's name.

John Dury's concern regarding the rumors of marriage took on the same tone. In a letter addressed to Samuel Hartlib in June of 1642, Dury wrote that although he and Moore found their consciences clear, the gossip would interfere with Moore's ability to find an appropriate space in which to practice her vocation. Dury's articulation of

[38] Moore also disclosed to Joachimi that this was due to her dedication to vocation first: "if I felt that I would be better able to glorify God in a state of marriage rather than my present state…then I would have no qualms about telling him [Dury] and openly making known my choice." – HP 21/4A-B; Translation used: Dorothy Moore and Lynette Hunter, *The Letters of Dorothy Moore 1612-64: The Friendships, Marriage, and Intellectual Life of a Seventeenth-Century Woman* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004), 13.
[39] Moore and Hunter, *The Letters of Dorothy Moore*, 13.

Moore's resolution to remain unattached shows not only his understanding of her position, but where her primary goals lay:

> as for hir [Moore] I know that shee will not bee auerse from it [marriage] when it shall appeare that God can bee more glorified be hir & the public benefited by hir being in that estate rather then in hir single condition; & till that can appeare to me aswell as to hir & that God doth prouide a Competency for us to subsist by in a public profitable waye; I will neuer desire it of hir thus haue the truth of both our Resolutions which yow may keep to yowr self.[40]

His echo of Moore's words in her letter to the Dutch ambassador make it obvious that Dury and Moore had discussed the slanderous rumours and how they could adversely affect them face-to-face before writing to external correspondents. If nothing else, the gossip circulating in The Hague forced Moore and Dury to confront the status of their own relationship, and judging by their defensiveness, their feelings toward marriage and their desire to maintain a friendship remained unchanged by the opinions of others. They supported each other's decision to remain single, and claimed that it would require an intervention of God himself to convince them to get married – whether to one another or at all.

While it may have been simpler for Dorothy Moore and John Dury to limit their interactions to quell the gossip, this did not appear to have been an option for either of them. This is clear primarily in the letters of Dury, who was desperate to ensure that the court's slander against their integrity would not come between himself and Moore. In his June 1642 note to Hartlib denying their marriage, Dury revealed that Moore had written a letter much to the same effect to Lady Clotworthy (not extant), since her feelings, much like his own, remained unchanged in regards to both the idea of marriage and her

[40] HP 2/9/7A.

friendship with Dury.[41] Dury's main concern was how the gossip might affect his ability to relate to her in the same way, which was of utmost significance to him: "I would not haue it [the rumor] spread because it might worke effects in mens minds which are unprofitable to our aime in conuersing together."[42] In Moore, Dury had discovered an equal in a way that he had never considered possible. He admitted later in a letter to Lady Ranelagh in December 1644, that before meeting Dorothy Moore, the "silly weakenes & want of Capacity which doeth appeare in most of the feamale kind" had kept him from befriending women, or even from conversing with them at length.[43] Although he did not blame women entirely for this (citing his own "disproporcion of spirit"), he nevertheless kept his distance until being acquainted with Moore, whom he believed God had gifted with the ability not only to be of "spirituall service," but also to be even more "heelplefull [*sic.*] in some things toward the advancement of the kingdome of his sonn then even men themselues."[44] It is clear that Dury saw Moore as wholly capable of functioning within the spiritual work in which he was heavily engaged. He often wrote to her to discuss not only his ministry work as chaplain and irenicist, but the international relations and political shifts in which he was often directly embroiled.[45]

Not only did Dury believe that Dorothy Moore was unique among women, but she had apparently proved to Dury over the course of their friendship that women were

[41] Ibid.
[42] Ibid.
[43] HP 3/2/92A-B
[44] Ibid.
[45] See for example: HP 3/2/19A-20B, in which Dury indicates the attachment of an essay that he wrote defending his use of *The Book of Common Prayer* in The Hague (see: HP 3/2/6A-7B, 'Concerning the Daily Prayers in the Princess Royalls Family'), as well as his thoughts on the arguments of both Independents and Presbyterians concerning state adoption of Presbyterian ordering of church government. He not only voices his own opinions on the subject, but encourages Moore to familiarize herself with the debate so that she might weigh in on the matter.

capable of better service toward God's kingdom than men in some areas, an argument that Moore herself had forwarded in her correspondence with André Rivet in 1643.[46] When Dorothy Moore moved to The Hague, John Dury's intention, which he communicated to Samuel Hartlib in a letter written in July 1642, was for her to work *with* him to further their joint mission both in print and correspondence throughout the Hartlib network: "it might much aduance our designe to liue together & doe good to the public & as I wrote before, if wee could bee maintained in competencie here to agitat by correspondencie & to print…"[47] As Maxwell has argued, "Dury obviously recognised that Moore had the intellectual, spiritual, and literary capabilities as well as the willingness to serve with him in this way."[48] The feeling was apparently mutual, as the extant holograph copies of Moore's letters to Rivet show revisions and edits in Dury's hand.[49] Dury's implicit support of Moore's effort to secure a more explicitly defined public space for women showed not only his support of her ideas, but his belief that she was exactly the kind of woman who deserved to inhabit such a space. Ironically, it would be the collaboration of Dury and Moore to further their individual vocations that would allow a separation anxiety to take root in John Dury's heart. Just as his covenant with Hartlib and Comenius bound them just as much to one another as their mission, Dury and Moore had committed themselves to one another as much as to their service to the public through their covenant of spiritual friendship.

3.4 The Dilemma: How to Uphold the Covenant of Vocation

[46] HP 21/3/10A-11B.
[47] HP 2/9/9A.
[48] Maxwell, "A Call for Collaboration," 10.
[49] This is argued convincingly by Maxwell, along with the inherent implication that although "Dury does not engage on paper with her ideas, but they must have discussed them. His willingness to look over her letters demonstrates his support" – Ibid.

The duty to remain faithful to a covenant, including one of friendship, was taken very seriously in seventeenth-century England, regardless of external spiritual, relational, or geographical factors. When the young Margaret Blagge made the decision to leave the royal court of Charles II and commit herself to private devotional study, her covenanted friend John Evelyn expressed strong anxiety that her withdrawal into a private, ascetic environment would make her "less accessible to him than before."[50] The importance of their covenant to one another could not be broken, not for service to God nor the making of other covenants. Even in the event of Blagge's marriage in 1676, John Evelyn claimed that due to their covenant of friendship, she was "as much bound to him as she was to her husband."[51] In other words, Margaret's new marital covenant with her husband did not supersede or cancel her previous agreement to commit to a spiritual friendship. Their story demonstrates another rule of covenantal friendships: that not only must all covenants taken by one person be in accordance with the other, but abandonment of a past covenant to take a new one was no simple matter.

A separation anxiety similar to that displayed by John Evelyn can be seen in the letters of John Dury. Members of a covenantal friendship often agreed to remain in constant contact, regardless of external responsibilities or desires, even religious ones. This level of constant communication was a condition of both John Dury's covenanted mission with Hartlib and Comenius and his covenant of friendship with Dorothy Moore.[52] The duty to remain committed to one another, Dury relayed to Lady Ranelagh

[50] Harris, *Transformations of Love*, 168.
[51] Ibid, 249.
[52] Dury wrote Lady Ranelagh in 1644 that his agreement with Moore "mainteyned for the aymes of the publick & mutuall Edification, as well at a distance as when wee should be neare at hand." – HP 3/2/92A-95B.

in 1644, had been clarified and reaffirmed several times throughout his friendship with Moore, likely made in adjustment of changing circumstances in their career opportunities.[53] Despite this, the challenges of maintaining the level of conversation and collaboration began to prove overwhelming through 1643 and 1644, and John Dury felt that the best solution for their relationship moving forward was for them to get married.

For Dorothy Moore, the shift in her relationship with Dury became part of an internal battle to discern the difference between her own desires for her life, and the life that God was calling her to live. In her earlier correspondence with Ranelagh, Dorothy Moore saw her career aspirations and God's design for her life as one in the same, and even argued that one could deduce God's calling for one's life by taking stock of particular relationships, talents, or desires one might already possess.[54] However, the constant reminder of time and conversation that she owed to Dury by nature of the vow they had taken seemed to conflict with the amount of time that Moore wanted to devote to her interests in girls' education. John Dury resolved to ask Moore to marry him sometime between 1643 and 1644, and based on Moore's confession to Ranelagh in January of 1645, he had been trying to communicate this for quite some time. Moore, who was still dedicated to pursuing her desire to teach, pretended to ignore his intentions as long as possible. When Moore fell ill at The Hague in 1645 and Dury devoted himself to her care, she was unable to escape the marriage conversation any longer:

> beyond my intentions and Contrary to my resolutions the Lord hath ordered my stay heere till now; and by that meanes, hath given Mr Dury full opporunitie to discover of our Covenant of friendship which att last is come to this, that he

[53] For example, in the closing to a letter written to Moore in April 1644, Dury wrote that: "though I am absent in body, yet my Spirit is with you in many respects, because I am as you know deuoted vnto the public & in it wholy vnto you, to liue & dye…" – HP 3/2/20B.
[54] HP 21/7/1A-2B.

> speaks soe plane, as I can noe longer pretend ignorance nore stupiditie, neither can I conscionably refuse to heare [him]…[55]

The conversation, which Moore believed had been orchestrated by an act of Lord, forced her to make a choice between upholding her commitment to John Dury or continuing her effort to pursue her vocation as a single woman.

Dorothy Moore's confidence in her ability to work in her calling as a single woman had been shaken for quite some time before John Dury made his feelings plain. About six months after her last extant letter to André Rivet, Moore wrote several letters to Lady Ranelagh on the subject of discerning God's call.[56] The internal struggle apparent in the second letter stands in stark contrast with the self-assured voice of Moore from her correspondence with Rivet – the voice of a woman who knew exactly who she was and what she was capable of, seeking an outlet for her talents. It is clear that Moore was experiencing frustration on several levels. First, she seemed unable to find the outlet she was looking for, leaving her talents without use. In a letter that does not survive, Ranelagh seems to have communicated that she saw a warrior's strength in her aunt. Moore responded with doubt, arguing that she was not the "Combattant you speake of."[57] Rather than a hardened warrior clad in the armour of God, Moore wrote that "my armour sits soe loose & my weapons (though Gods guifts) ill managed, as truly the best I can say of my selfe is, I see my selfe foiled…"[58] Moore's second frustration came when all doors of opportunity seemed to close upon her. In the same letter to Ranelagh, Dorothy explained that the lack of employment options forced her to reevaluate whether her desire

[55] HP 21/7/5A-6B.
[56] HP 8/52/1A-2B; See also: HP 21/7/3A-4B.
[57] HP 8/52/1A-2B.
[58] Ibid.

to teach was actually God's plan for her: "I see the Lord, letts us lese or more fall from resolutions…that by meanes hee might discover to vs, our naturall corruption, & that we can be trew to noe not to our owne resolutions & prinsiples longer then his supporting hand upholds us…"[59] In light of these confessions, John Dury's proposal of marriage grew increasingly difficult for her to dismiss. Moore felt that she had to leave room for the possibility that her ongoing struggle to realize her dreams might have been God showing her a different path forward than the one that she had envisioned.

John Dury's desire to move from friendship to marriage was as much rooted in anxiety about maintaining his covenant with Moore as in his true admiration of her character. Dury professed that constant communication with Moore had not just aided him in fulfilling his vocation, but had actually become *essential* to it. In a letter to Lady Ranelagh in December of 1644, John appealed to her as Dorothy's niece in-law and closest friend to intervene and help him to convince Dorothy to accept his proposal. It was their shared desire to pursue service to the Christian community through divine calling that had drawn Dury to Moore in the first place, he explained.[60] Since their initial acquaintance he had become so reliant on her conversation, that any physical distance between them affected his work: "the want of freedome to communicate vpon all occasions our thoughts one to another, which is occasioned by the distance of our aboude; this doth put both my spiritt within me to a perpeutall straitnes, & the prosecucion of my worke in publicke without me to a lingering slowness."[61] This was why Moore's inability

[59] Ibid.
[60] Dury wrote that: "in continuance of this endeavour [of service], some intimacy being growen betwixt vs, & a settlement of that resolucion (which I had long before vowed mainteyned & practiced to live noe more to myself, but vnto the Communion of Saints) being then alsoe betgotten in her, I found that she was Capable not only of a morall but of a spirituall freindshipp…" – HP 3/2/92A-95B.
[61] HP 3/2/93A.

to secure a court position and her desire to move further away to pursue her goal of teaching caused so much anxiety in him. While their covenant indicated that staying in touch through letters would still fulfill their agreement, Dury argued that his very ability to pursue his vocation was at stake if Moore were to put any more physical distance between them. Since the pursuit of vocation over and above all private interest and desires was the core of all covenants taken by Dury, Moore's refusal to remain close would violate the terms of their agreement, and could even endanger his ability to fulfill the covenant that he had made with Hartlib and Comenius. Regardless of his affections for Moore, John argued that a covenant of marriage would be in the better interest of their vocations rather than a realization of their private desires to remain single. The difficulty of maintaining their friendship had gotten to the point where Dury only saw three possible paths forward: to end his friendship with Moore (and thus break a covenant he saw as having been made in the eyes of God), to neglect his own irenic mission to maintain their friendship in its current state, or to marry her.[62]

Dorothy Moore clearly understood the rationale behind John Dury's proposition of marriage. Her already unstable belief in how exactly God was calling her to serve his purposes was thrown into further question when she understood Dury's concerns about the maintenance of their covenant. The conditions laid out by both Moore and Dury regarding the possibility of marriage earlier in their lives appeared to be fulfilled in each other, and yet Moore still struggled to let go of her own vision for her future calling. She disclosed as much to Ranelagh when she wrote that "unlesse I can find more to answere to or object against it," she would need to grant Dury's proposition of marriage:

[62] HP 3/2/93B.

> and yet I am come noe further than to hold myself att that point where I have long desired and resolved to stand, namely to follow in all things that is proposed to mee that which is most spirituall (which indeed is a Clause off my owne Vow) & to judge the most spirituall…[63]

It was her duty to consider Dury's proposal fairly before God, Moore conceded, "and consult oft with him of this matter, Lest I bee found a meer Convanend [*sic*.] Breaker…"[64] It is clear that she did possess a deep affection for John and a profound gratefulness for his friendship and support. Citing an in-person conversation with Ranelagh, Moore revealed that she "iudged myself obliged to grant what soever Mr Durye could demande of me in regard of that Noble affection and extraordinary expression of theat Love which hee had manifested to mee, when God made none other an Instrument of comfort to mee."[65] Moore respected Dury and did not want to dismiss his proposal out of hand, especially since it was accompanied by a wholly reasonable argument for why marriage could be the divine plan for them.

The social reality was that marriage would affect Dorothy Moore's ability to serve in the kind of calling that she had envisioned more than it would affect John Dury. Marrying John would limit Dorothy's ability to freely explore the very possibilities of public service that he had helped her argue for. Despite Dorothy being of higher social rank, seventeenth-century gender hierarchy dictated that marriage would grant John the role of household headship.[66] Their relationship, which had up until that point been comprised of two intellectual equals, would automatically shift to one in which John

---

[63] HP 21/7/5A-6B.
[64] Ibid.
[65] Ibid.
[66] Family was understood as the basis of all social and political order and served as a metaphor for the state, and the gender order was clearly defined: "women and men belong to families governed by a benevolent *pater familias* who guarded their morals and directed their behaviour." – Susan Dwyer Amussen, *An Ordered Society: Gender and Class in Early Modern England* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1993), 133.

Dury would become the head. Between the ambivalence towards remarriage in large cities such as London and the evidence from smaller English locales that remarriage was discouraged, Moore likely did not face widespread unanimous judgement or social pressure whether she decided to remarry or remain single.[67] It was the potential loss of a portion of her liberty that Moore dreaded. Rather than being able to explore the possibilities of a life of teaching, as she desired, Moore would be once again relegated to the traditional vocation of women in the seventeenth century: a wife and mother, confined to the domestic sphere.

This was the apparent dilemma facing John Dury and Dorothy Moore: if they chose to marry, the gendered reality of marital expectations would limit Dorothy Moore's vision for the realization of her vocation. On the other hand, ending the relationship would mean breaking their covenant of friendship, whose very purpose was to further the individual vocations of both parties. John and Dorothy's solution to this conflict of interests became apparent in their post-nuptial correspondence. Although Dorothy accepted John Dury's proposal and became his wife in the early months of 1645, the kind of marriage that she defended was not one that restrained her in the ways that she feared. Dorothy Dury refused to submit to cultural expectations, and used her marriage as a tool with which to critique the very reality of marital priorities in seventeenth-century England.

3.5 A Marriage of the Heart and Mind: the Durys Defend Their Decision

[67] For a more in-depth discussion of the public perception of widows and remarriage in Early Modern England, see: Jennifer Panek, *Widows and Suitors in Early Modern English Comedy*, first ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 2004); Barbara J. Todd, "The remarrying widow: a stereotype reconsidered," *Women in English Society 1500-1800*, ed. Mary Prior (Florence: Routledge, 1985).

Dorothy Dury's conviction of purpose only grew after she made her decision to marry John Dury. Despite the time she spent questioning how her vocation might finally come to be realized, Dorothy never abandoned her belief in the significance of her calling to serve the body of Christian believers. In fact, it was John's faith that vocation ought to serve as the very foundation for their union, just as it had for their friendship, that won Dorothy over.[68] Members of the Hartlib Circle were quick to weigh in on whether or not they felt that the Dury's decision to marry was the right one. Soon after the union Dorothy Dury felt the need to defend it, knowing that "all would not be satisfied with it," since "Something of that nature (I meane understanding) I find in the apprehensions of people concerning my late Mariage."[69] Despite what Ruth Connolly has suggested – namely that Dorothy felt "compelled" to marry John Dury after the scandal their relationship sparked at The Hague, and that her consequent defense of her marriage was merely a "rushed" attempt to justify her decision – Dorothy's apprehensions regarding the realization of her own vocation are evident in the years before she marries, and her defense indicates a thoughtful grafting of a new perspective onto her existing work, rather than a sudden shift away from her previous thought.[70] In a letter to Lady Ranelagh in May of 1645, Dorothy stated in no uncertain terms that her conviction regarding the significance of her vocation remained unchanged and defended the marital covenant as the most advantageous way by which to accomplish it.

---

[68] Dorothy stated herself that "marriage was for that end (so oft already mentioned) [serving God] proposed to me, & more then ordinary meanes & opportunityes of seruing Christ was made apparent to me…" and listed this as one of her reasons for deciding to marry John Dury – HP 3/2/119A.
[69] HP 3/2/118A-121B.
[70] See: Connolly, "Viscountess Ranelagh and the Authorisation," 153.

Dorothy Dury encapsulated what she believed to be God's intention for the "solemne & publick Couenant" in her very definition of marriage:

> I say we may gather from Gods intentions what our Aime should be in Marriage, namely Gods glory (for vpon that our eyes must be perpetually fixt, as vpon the maine grownd of all actions) & secondly as the meanes to produce that effect; to be a help one to another for the auancement of his kingdome…[71]

Working for the glory of God and the advancement of the heavenly kingdom had also been the basis of Dorothy Dury's previous writings on vocation.[72] Her view on how marriage affected women's vocation had been laid out concisely: that married women, as seventeenth-century English theology supported, were called to glorify God through serving their husbands and households first.[73] Having already fulfilled this task, Dorothy saw herself as part of the ambiguous space of single and widowed women – one in which they had the ability to be called to public service in ways the church had yet to define or accommodate.[74] The basis of her assessment of difference between married and single women remained unchanged after her decision to marry John Dury. Dorothy still believed that single women were capable of operating within their callings to serve the community. Her qualification that the "ordinary" calling for women was marriage implied that God could also have "extraordinary" calls for women external to it, a point which she had previously established in her correspondence with André Rivet. It would be a mistake to ignore that it was never Dorothy's intention to set the majority of women

---

[71] Ibid.
[72] HP 21/7/1A-1B.
[73] Moore wrote that: "For such as are Maryed they have a taske to exercise toward husband and children sometimes & Family, besides a good example in their comportment to all & particular Edification by a good conversation of those with whom their owne relations and sexe they finde most opportunity to communicat or receaue from." – HP 21/7/2A.
[74] As was discussed in chapter two, this was the primary subject of Dorothy's correspondence with André Rivet.

free from marriage. Her goal in her early correspondence with Ranelagh and Rivet was to discern how women already in a single space, or who had unique callings, ought to serve in them.[75] What was distinct in the defense of her own marriage was that Dorothy no longer placed herself within this category. Instead, she emphasized the way in which the covenantal bond between husband and wife affected, and was affected by, vocation. If husband and wife were to become one, as the Bible dictated, and the spousal duty for John and Dorothy Dury was to help one another, as she clearly affirmed, would that not extend to helping each other to serve in a single shared vocation?[76] If so, there was not a problem to be found in having to give up her calling, as Dorothy had originally feared, since marriage offered her something that was both the same and new: a calling that she shared with her new husband, one that dictated the nature of their marriage and was pursued avidly by two minds and hearts working as one.

Having laid down a general aim for all marriages through covenant, Dorothy Dury sought to explain her own personal reasons for deciding to leave behind her vocational aspirations suited to a single life. While she did not recant her previous arguments regarding the capabilities of single women, Dorothy did concede that ordinarily, it was more difficult for a woman to serve effectively on her own than when she was married to a godly man. Using language similar to that of her earlier writings on vocation – that of divine ordination, service to the community, and the ultimate goal of advancing a heavenly kingdom – Dorothy Dury affirmed that God's very intention for the

[75] Moore's most explicit communication of this intention is in her correspondence with Rivet – HP 21/7/1A-2B; 21/3/1A-2B; 21/3/7A-9B; 21/3/10A-11B.
[76] HP 3/2/118B; Two spouses becoming one was a biblical expectation of marriage: "And they twain shall be one flesh: so then they are no more twain, but one flesh. What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder." – Mark 10:8-9, *KJV*.

institution of marriage was "by ordayning a speciall way for them to be a help one to another, for the Aduancing of his kindome in theyr owne spirits, that they may aduance it in others."[77] Marriage was not an institution that God created because women were helpless on their own or lacked a public calling, but a covenant that ensured that both spouses were stronger in a single mission due to their mutual support of one another. It had been her vanity, Dorothy claimed, that made her believe that her gifts made her one of the extraordinary women who could accomplish her vocation without the support of a spouse, but when she truly opened her heart to God's full plan for her, she no longer believed this to be the case.[78] The reason why this confusion had taken hold is implicit in the remainder of her marital defense: that the impediment to her ability to serve the Christian community was not marriage, as she had previously believed, but the *kind* of marriage in which she had imagined herself to be confined.

While the nature of marriage that Dorothy described in her letter to Lady Ranelagh in 1645 would not have sounded all that revolutionary to seventeenth-century readers, Dorothy argued that the criticisms she received from her peers were an indication of the real concerns of contemporary English culture. Her own description of marriage was actually in alignment with many of the most widely read marital and vocational sermons and manuals. The idea of the "companionate marriage" was a cornerstone of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Puritan conduct literature and theology – one that historians such as Louis Wright have argued displayed a new emerging pattern and ideal of family life whose foundation was mutual respect, love, and shared responsibility.[79]

---

[77] HP 3/2/119A.
[78] Ibid.
[79] Wright has argued that "Though the husband remained the commander, with powers of discipline if necessary, the increased emphasis upon woman's spiritual and material rights paved the way that led toward

However, as social historian Kathleen Davies has countered, this ideal was likely confined in large part to literary sources and may not have reflected the social reality of early modern English households.[80] Although they continued to support male headship and dominance within the domestic sphere, popular sermons and manuals printed from the end of the sixteenth through the seventeenth century, such as those by Edmund Tilney, Robert Snawsel, and William Gouge, endorsed companionate marriage as the ideal for all Christian spouses to emulate.[81] However, as Davies has pointed out, "The 'sacred condition of equality' was interpreted by the mid-seventeenth-century Puritans…as meaning similarity of social status and age in the partner, not as equality of status after marriage."[82] Davies' assessment of what was upheld as the most pertinent interpretation of companionate marriages in the seventeenth-century is echoed by Dorothy Dury's own defense of her marriage against similar critiques.

Dorothy's need to defend her marriage did not come from the ideal of a heavenly-minded marriage, but from the reality of how the cultural expectations of marriage focused more on the "worldly" concerns of wealth and class. After outlining her own reasons for deciding to marry John Dury, Dorothy answered the "exceptions" and criticisms that had been voiced to her by her peers, ones that she saw as "not better then Carnall."[83] She boiled them down into two main problems: that she had married below

---

theoretical equality…" – Louis B. Wright, *Middle Class Culture in Elizabethan England* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1935), 227.

[80] Kathleen M. Davies, "The Sacred Condition of Equality: How Original Were Puritan Doctrines of Marriage?" *Social History* 2, no.5 (1977): 563-80.

[81] See Edmund Tilney, *A Brief and Pleasant Discourse of Duties in Marriage, Called the Flowe of Friendshippe* (London: 1571); Gouge, *Of Domesticall Duties*; Robert Snawsel, *A Looking Glasse for Maried Folkes* (London: 1610).

[82] Davies, "The Sacred Condition of Equality," 568; For a primary example of this, see: Daniel Rogers, *Matrimoniall honovr, or, the mutuall crowne and comfort of godly, loyall, and chaste marriage* (London: 1642), 60-62.

[83] HP 3/2/119B.

her "degree," and that she chose to marry a man with neither "a great nor Certaine fortune."[84] While she agreed with the second critique, that John Dury was not a man of means by any stretch of the imagination, she took great issue with the first. Dorothy's refutation of the inequality between her rank and that of John Dury, rather than being based upon any seventeenth-century conception of hierarchy or blood, was based wholly in the idea of honor and employment in the eyes of God. She justified her marriage, in other words, by uplifting the honour her new husband gained through his vocation in ministry:

> As for the distinction of equality or inequality which God makes betweene man & man, I conceaue it is only made in his intention, by the Imployment in his owne seruice which he calls men vnto, that men being invested in his esteeme, with the hyest degree of honor, who is most trusted by him…if this be granted a truth as I think it must be, it will easily appeare that a man called quallifyed & sent by God, as his Sons Ambassador, to dispence the misteryes of mans saluation that he I say receaues the greatest trust from God, & Consequently the imployment which gives him the hyest degree of honor.[85]

Although John Dury was, as Dorothy herself conceded, "no Gentlman [*sic*.]," she pointed out that Christ himself had turned down the ruling of an earthly kingdom in favour of the ministry role that God ordained for him.[86] Being in the ministry was thus the "degree" closest to God. The rank of nobility, Dorothy argued, "at the best had its rise from humane policy, & its support from the foolish fancy of men."[87] Class was an institution wholly conceived of and enforced by human society, while John Dury's calling, one that Dorothy herself now shared, was divinely ordained.

---

[84] Ibid.
[85] HP 3/2/119B-120A.
[86] See for example: Matthew 4:8-10, *KJV.*
[87] HP 3/2/120A.

In response to the critique that John Dury was not a man of means, Dorothy Dury once again accused her peers of being all too concerned with cultural expectations. Wealth, Dorothy argued, was never one of God's primary concerns in the institution of marriage, since all those who were devoted to working within their calling were storing up "eternall possessions" in heaven: "this lesson God calls Loudly our Nation to learne at this very instant…which if we did not vnderstand, we should despise the reasonings of flesh & bloud; & keep ourselues in a joyfull constant dependency vpon God."[88] Dorothy Dury's contemporaries, she claimed, had a tendency to observe the "foolish superfluous Custome[s]" of culture, rather than defining themselves by God's standards and working in his purposes.[89] The emerging hierarchy of the seventeenth-century, as Susan Dwyer Amussen has indicated, dictated that "social position was based on a theoretically fixed status hierarchy, but status in turn largely depended on wealth."[90] Rooting her defense of her husband in divinely-ordained vocation, Dorothy raised her new husband up to the top rung of both despite his lack of nobility or wealth. Dorothy insisted that these were merely "carnall" concerns dictated by men when compared to the divine will and purpose of an omnipotent God.

While she claimed to have submitted to God, Dorothy also made it clear that her decision to marry was *not* a submission to culture. Marriage by society's standards was not the answer to her vocational dilemma, which was the reason that she originally resisted it. But the definition of marriage outlined by herself and her new husband upheld both their covenanted relationship and vocation, now unified into a single, divinely-

[88] HP 3/2/120B; It is interesting to note that dependency on God was the very reason that Dury had used to justify not wanting to marry a woman of wealth in his 1639 letter to Sir Thomas Roe – HP 6/4/56B-57A.
[89] HP 3/2/121A.
[90] Amussen, *An Ordered Society,* 151.

ordained mission by means of a new marital covenant. While thanking Lady Ranelagh for her congratulations on their marriage, John Dury echoed his new wife's convictions about the purpose of their union, "as wee seeke not the Honour of appearance of this world, but are sincerely bent to seeke the Honour which is from God alone."[91] It was the Durys' shared passion for the primacy of vocation and their covenant of friendship that had finally changed Dorothy's mind on marriage. She remained convicted of her calling – that much had not changed. What had changed was that the kind of marriage that John offered to Dorothy presented far more opportunities to serve than did her single life.

Existing gendered expectations of vocation and marriage continued to show themselves in the Hartlib Circle's wider response to the marriage of the Durys, largely aimed at Dorothy rather than John. John Dury had recognized that his wife would be more subject to worldly criticisms than himself early on after their marriage: "worldly minded Friends…will bee intended with the first occasion by hir [Dorothy] who will be more subject to bee blame by those that Consider things after the flesh, then I will be, either by them or others."[92] Scottish minister Robert Baillie's concern that marriage would only prove to be a distraction to John Dury's mission and his covenant with the Hartlib circle demonstrated that the existence of vocationally driven marriages of the kind proposed by the Durys were few and far between. In response, John reassured Hartlib in April of 1645 that "I have assured him [Robert Baillie], that the very ground of our Conionction is an inclination to serue the public & that shee will rather further it with all hir might without respect to hir owne priuat content."[93] John pushed back against the idea

[91] HP 3/2/145A.
[92] HP 3/2/145A.
[93] HP 3/2/109B.

that Dorothy would prove a distraction, and instead raised her up as an asset to his mission and the keeping of his fraternal covenant.

Although there obviously existed enough criticism within the network to warrant written defenses from the Durys, the marriage also received support from several key members of the Hartlib circle. Aside from Lady Ranelagh, who had been instrumental in orchestrating the marriage at the request of John Dury, Samuel Hartlib himself clearly supported of the union. In 1645, Hartlib printed Dorothy Dury's defense of her marriage alongside four other letters written by herself and her husband, headlined by John's letter to Lady Ranelagh of December 1644.[94] The printed pamphlet, Felicity Lyn Maxwell has argued, was Hartlib's way not only of showing his support of their marriage, but of "announcing that not only these letters but Dury and Moore's whole marriage should be on public display as a good example to others."[95] While Dorothy Dury would later rebuke Hartlib for publishing her defense of marriage without her express permission, her qualms had more to do with the "rude, indigested [*sic.*]" nature of the writing, not the ideas themselves.[96] In fact, she conceded that her argument had the potential to be "convincingly and powerfully" handled, if her unedited writing did not discredit her point.[97] While her name was not explicitly listed, it appears to have been common knowledge that John was the principal author of the pamphlet. Dorothy Dury was well known to the Hartlib Circle's members, as was the nature of her spiritual friendship with John. Their recent marriage and probable circulation of previous letters (both addressed

[94] Hartlib's pamphlet included the following letters: HP 3/2/92A-94B; HP3/2/95A; HP 3/2/145A-B; HP 3/2/111A-B; HP 3/2/118A-121B.
[95] Maxwell, "Calling for Collaboration," 12.
[96] Dorothy Dury laments in her letter to Hartlib that she was not given occasion to read over her own writing before it was printed – HP 3/2/143A-144B.
[97] Ibid.

to Lady Ranelagh) would have left no question that a portion of the printed letters in Hartlib's pamphlet were written by Dorothy Dury. The priorities that existed within Dury and Moore's covenant of spiritual friendship carried forward into their marriage, a concept reaffirmed not only by Hartlib, but still others within his correspondence network. Sir Cheney Culpeper, a supporter of the progress and reform championed by the Hartlib Circle, expressed a high opinion of Dorothy Dury and how her marriage to John might benefit the mission in May of 1645:

> I am moste heartily glad to vnderstande of Mr Duryes happy marriage, &showlde be ambitious (yf in Englande) to be knowen [*sic*.] to that whom his judgement hath fownde moste susceptible of the beste motions, moste appreheniue of the cheefeste aymes, &moste generousely actiue &resolute to set forwarde the fitteste meanes & wayes leadinge to--- those aymes of publique ædification which were the principall thowgh not onely growndes of the couenante of theire spirituall friendship. [98]

The Durys building their marriage upon their covenant of spiritual friendship allowed peers such as Culpeper, who was clearly familiar with their efforts, to have high hopes for what Dorothy was capable of contributing to their shared mission.

In one sense, the union of Dorothy and John Dury was exactly what contemporary manuals on married and household life championed: a companionable marriage grounded in mutual spiritual support and a shared vocation. But in another, the marriage of Durys revealed that the conditions of the ideal marriage were not the ones that seventeenth-century English society valued as the most significant. Dorothy Dury took a stand in her marital defense on the correct intentions Christians ought to have in marriage: a shared calling to serve God and a covenantal promise to assist one another in doing so. Casting the concerns of the world aside, John and Dorothy Dury took their first steps into

[98] Original emphasis; HP 13/86B.

marriage in the same way that they had sustained such an intimate friendship: by prioritizing their divine calling above all else.

3.6 Conclusion: A New Path to Vocation

From personal commitments to remain single to a covenant of spiritual friendship, and finally, the bonds of matrimony, the covenants taken by John and Dorothy Dury demonstrate their dedication to subordinate all relationships and personal desires to their vocations. In the act of including God in their agreements by taking formal covenants, the Durys committed to walk toward a single goal, not only with God but also with one another. Rather than being a departure from her early work on the potential for women's vocations, Dorothy Dury's decision to marry John shows a continuity of thought and conviction. Refusing to compromise on her integrity, commitments, or calling, Dorothy Dury changed her perspective to continue to work toward public service to her Christian community by use of the talents that she believed God had given her. By redefining the covenant of marriage and subordinating cultural standards to what she believed to be God's purposes, Dorothy and John became of one mind in their shared mission. In the remaining years of her life, Dorothy became even more of essential to her husband's efforts in educational reform and ecclesiastical reconciliation.

CHAPTER 4 – A NEW VOCATION: DOROTHY DURY'S PURSUIT OF CALLING AS A MARRIED WOMAN

4.1 Introduction

Dorothy Dury's marriage did not signal an end of her efforts to use her talents in service of her vocation. After taking on John's mission of irenic peace amongst Protestant churches as her own, Dorothy used all the talents and connections at her disposal as an educated woman of high status to aid in her husband's efforts. While her reputation as a wise and devout woman remained largely untarnished, Dorothy did encounter pushback from others within the Hartlib Circle when she and John attempted to share in each other's gender-designated roles. While their defenses of the decision to marry in 1645 had stated their intention to prioritize vocation over social convention and cultural expectation, the years following their union showcased their very real effort to put this belief into practice. The couple's close partnership was also obvious in Dorothy's influence upon John's ideas and writing, and in Dorothy's distress at being excluded from important decisions when she was separated from her husband by his travel abroad. Through financial, political, and health-related troubles, Dorothy never lost belief in the significance of their shared calling, and hoped that even when she was unable to contribute to its realization, her efforts would be blessed and rewarded by God.

Although Dorothy Dury's married life is obscured by the limited number of her extant letters, the outline of her activity takes shape in the correspondence and publications of her husband and peers. The ability to discern the broad strokes of her life between the lines of others' correspondence affirms Evan Bourke's findings regarding

Dorothy Dury's central role within the Hartlib Circle and beyond.[1] Even those contemporaries critical of her less conventional efforts to support the vocation she shared with her husband expressed respect for her wise and pious character, as well as the faithfulness with which Dorothy conducted her traditional duties as John's spouse. In spite of contradictory social expectations, physical distance from her husband, and failing physical health, Dorothy Dury worked to uphold and contribute to John Dury's ongoing writings, travel, and funding. Hartlibian peers were often supportive of the Durys' goals, and Dorothy was commended for her performance and commitment as a wife and mother. However, when the Durys pushed against the constraints of gender expectations, Dorothy in particular was criticized for her belief that she was called to contribute *more* to John's mission than the traditional duties of a wife.

From their marriage in 1645 until Dorothy's death in 1664, John and Dorothy Dury's intention was to be equally yoked to a single vocation: reconciling the protestant churches and improving English society through reform in education. John's work forced him to confront the difficulty of convincing and negotiating peace between what he argued were adults with a lack of clear knowledge and education in their own faith. The belief shared by Hartlib, Dury, and Comenius was that this division and ignorance stemmed from the existing education system's failure to instruct more than a few children in consistent religious teachings. John hoped in both his irenic and pedagogical writings to clarify the difference between fundamental and "extrafundamental" principles of the Christian faith, arguing that this would decrease both national and international conflict.[2]

---

[1] Evan Bourke, "Female Involvement, Membership, and Centrality: A Social Network Analysis of the Hartlib Circle," *Literature Compass*, vol. 17, issue 4 (2017).
[2] John Dury, *Motives to induce the Protestant princes to mind the vvorke of peace ecclesiasticall amongst themselves* (Amsterdam: 1639), 18.

Therefore, while John Dury continued to travel and sue for peace between the churches, he and Samuel Hartlib also worked toward a reform in schools for children, seeking to reform English society from the ground up.[3] In both areas, Dorothy Dury's influence and support can be discerned through her attempts to contribute financially to John's work, and the clear presence of her previous ideas about women's education in her husband's writing. Despite her efforts, the Durys' ability to maintain a truly companionate marriage with a single goal was often thwarted by a multitude of external factors, from financial strain to shifting political climate.

4.2 The Newlyweds: Dorothy's Early Aspirations for Shared Vocation (1645-1648)

The largest collection of Dorothy Dury's extant letters from her married life were written in the years immediately following her marriage. During this time Dorothy began to take stock of her new husband's financial situation, and to contemplate how they might fund their pursuit of learning and ecclesiastical peace. Although generally optimistic about the future that she now shared with her new husband, Dorothy was also realistic about what they had, and the changes that would need to be made to move forward with the mission. The most significant drain on what little money John was earning was his sister, Jean Dury. Jean was a financial problem for John in the years before his marriage, but her continued disrespect and irresponsible spending following his union with Dorothy affected not only John, but also the life and work that he and Dorothy sought to pursue. As her closest male relative, John Dury was expected to support his sister until a marriage

[3] In his introduction to *The Reformed School,* Samuel Hartlib argued that "to meddle directly with the multitudes of Aged people…who are now settled and habituated in the way of their own choosing, and to think to draw them from it, is to attempt, *without discretion*, an impossibilitie," and that therefore trye change could only be achieved through a change in the instruction of English children. See: John Dury, *The Reformed School* (London: 1649), A4r.

could be secured. As early as 1639, John suggested that his sister find employment to support herself, and to remove the financial pressure from him. He even leveraged Deuteronomy 33, in which the tribe of Levi denied family to pursue God first, to argue that his calling and ministry ought to precede his obligations to family:

> As for my distressed Sister I know not at this distance what to advise her better then to betake her to some trade to liue by. According to mine abilites I shall neuer bee wanting to her, although in this Calling wherein now I am busie I ought to say with Leuj whome Moses blesseth deut. 33. That I know not my Father not my Mother nor any of my kindred because I ought to know no body any more according to the flesh.[4]

Even before announcing their marriage to the public, Dorothy Dury expressed her concerns about Jean Dury to Samuel Hartlib, who was one of few friends aware of the impending nuptials in the early months of 1645. Dorothy complained that the expense of caring for his sister meant that John had not even had enough money to furnish the house provided for him by the state in his job as a chaplain in Princess Mary's court: "in it hee hath not one bed nor stool nor any earthly goods of his owne soe as what he will doe I know not."[5] Having helped to secure John an offer to leave The Hague in favour of a ministry position with the Company of Merchant Adventurers in Rotterdam, Dorothy set about inquiring whether his future employer might consider increasing John's pay, since he was soon to be a married man and would need to support a family.[6] Two months later, Dorothy voiced frustration at her husband's inability to escape the burden of his sister in a letter to Hartlib. Dorothy painted Jean as a roadblock, sent by Satan himself to impede her husband's work. Not only this, but Dorothy indicated that Jean's poor public conduct

---

[4] M. Greengrass, M. Leslie, and M. Hannon (2013) *The Hartlib Papers* [Hereafter, HP]. Published by The Digital Humanities Institute, University of Sheffield. [available at: http://www.dhi.ac.uk/hartlib], 9/1/73B; See also: Deuteronomy 33:9, *King James Version*.
[5] HP 21/5/19A-20B.
[6] Ibid.

and her propensity to speak slanderously of Dorothy had begun to reflect on John's reputation. Having already fought to maintain perceptions of John's integrity in the face of the rumors circulating in The Hague, Dorothy's anger with Jean's actions was clear:

> his sistir is such an inward and outward burthen as it is very evident, the Divill looseth not his opertunity to make her serviceable to his malicious designes: for mr Durey not being gott into the hartes of most of his people…all her maliece to mee reflects vpon him, even to the hinderance of the effectuall working of the gospell and gives such a preiudice to me personne amoung them…[7]

In order to rid himself of the financial burden and combat the effects of Jean's gossip, John sought to marry his sister to Henry Appelius, with whom Jean was to move to Germany. Dorothy's skepticism that this solution would free John from the burden of caring for his sister can be seen in the post-script of her letter to Hartlib, in which she dreads Jean's talk of a "great wedding and 40 people at it," and the distinct possibility that she would still return to her brother's home to "torment vs speedily againe."[8]

Because of John's low income and his responsibility to his sister, Dorothy expressed concern that she had barely been able to receive guests since moving in with her new husband due to the lack of furnishings or household servants, and that what little furnishings they were able to purchase had already put them in debt.[9] Eager to begin their shared work, Dorothy appeared hopeful at the prospect of hosting those sympathetic to their mission. Hospitality and management of the home fell under her responsibilities as mistress of the household, and she clearly took this role seriously. In her letters, Dorothy balanced her mild disappointment at the reality of their financial situation with optimistic language supporting a faith in the bright future of their mission. God would provide what

[7] HP 3/2/103B-104A.
[8] HP 3/2/104B.
[9] The barren nature of their home was Dorothy's self-professed reason for being unable to host Hartlib's children, as she indicated in her letter to him in March of 1645 – HP 3/2/104A.

they required, she insisted, and anything that was not provided for must be unnecessary. Dorothy's writing regarding her own role continued to focus on the use of her talents in support of the vocation she now shared with John. In a letter to Hartlib in March 1645, Dorothy defended her complaints about Jean Dury by writing that: "all which I tell you, not out of …a covetious [*sic.*] minde of having more, (for I beg that God would intrust me with the imployment of spirituall tallents, and let the riches of my stocke be in thos, and not in despencing earthly matters…"[10] The firm belief that her own talents were still to be used to help to provide for her vocation, as they had been in her single state, would serve to earn her both the respect and disdain of her peers over the course of her married life.

In spite of their inability to receive many guests, a letter from Dorothy to Lady Ranelagh a few months later relayed Mrs. Dury's attempts to find contentment in living with few possessions. Illustrating her own life with John as a journey, Dorothy wrote that anything that might weigh them down in their pursuit of public service was unnecessary:

> For there is much sinne in our customary conveniences (as wee call them) and a huge burthen over-charging vs in a straight passage… The reason of thus [*sic.*] bit of discourse is to let you know Madam j have no ambition to haue my house furnished nore to haue more in it then of necessity must bee, that I may bee ready to goe where called at all times, and may bee free from present worldly Loue or delight in such poore things.[11]

By writing of her lack of possessions in this way, Dorothy likely hoped to convey that she maintained her faith that their mission was set out by God and would therefore be funded through his provision. In doing so, she also exposed her own expectations for spontaneous travel in her future. Although the couple settled for a brief time in Rotterdam

[10] HP 3/2/104B.
[11] HP 3/2/138A.

following their marriage, given John's frequent travels to negotiate with Protestant leaders across Europe in the previous years, Dorothy's assumption of a less than static future seemed a fair one. However, what Dorothy's language conveyed in her letter to Ranelagh is that she too, expected to be summoned to travel on short notice alongside her husband. Her belief that her talents had been given for the purpose of supporting the mission appeared to lead to Dorothy's assumption that she would be accompanying John on his peace missions, assisting him directly in any way that her abilities allowed for.

Not much of Dorothy's own writing is extant in the years following 1646. The Durys moved back to London in July of 1645, originally intending to stay only for a short time.[12] The move turned out to be longer than expected, indicated by John's official resignation from his position in Rotterdam in favour of an appointment as one of several officials at the Cathedral Church of Winchester in March of 1646.[13] Despite having stable work, the stipend promised for this position was only partially and unreliably paid. Dury complained to Hartlib in October of the same year, writing: "our meanes here comes in so slowly, that wee are from hand to mouth; yesterday wee receiued ten pound; when wee hadde scarce a penny to go to market withall [*sic.*] it came seasonably: but the receiuing of it by dribblets is a tedious and hurtfull thing…"[14] John claimed that his salary was barely enough for he and Dorothy to eat or make any dent in their debts.[15] Having very little money to live on, not to mention travel or to help others, Dorothy indicated in the

[12] In a letter to Hartlib in July of 1645, John inquired whether Lady Ranelagh had been able to locate lodgings for the Durys close to the Westminster Assembly of Divines, where Dury (as a member) would be spending much of his time – HP 3/2/137B.
[13] HP 3/3/2A-3B; See also: G. H. Turnbull, *Hartlib, Dury, and Comenius: Gleanings from Hartlib's Papers* (Liverpool: University Press of Liverpool, 1947), 250.
[14] HP 3/3/45B.
[15] In October of 1646, Dury wrote that "if I had gotten any Competent summe from our pay masters, who owe me a quarter and a hald I would haue made ouer to Appelius something to paye Serrurier that which I owe him, but now I must differre it & therefore doe not yet write to him." – HP 3/3/45B.

letters that are extant from this time that she turned to petitioning on behalf of others as a way to be useful. In 1646, Dorothy wrote several letters to Hartlib on behalf of a "Mrs. Skinner," a widow with little money to live.[16] Given Dorothy's experience as a widow trying to earn a living to support her sons, the compassion wrought by her personal experiences seems to have prompted her to use her connections not only to aid this woman, but also possibly others. There is a distinct possibility that Dorothy may have been writing on behalf of others during this time, but the lack of extant letters make it impossible to know for sure.

In 1647, John responded to a summons to London to help with educating the royal children at St. James's Palace, believing the position would afford him more time to think about his peacemaking work than the one he held at Winchester.[17] This job brought the Durys back to London for the next two years, during which time political conflict between the King and Parliament came to a head, culminating in the execution of Charles I in January of 1649. Although little is extant from Dorothy during this time, John would later shed light on their joint activities concerning the trial of the King. In his 1660 pamphlet titled *A Declaration of John Durie*, John claimed that Dorothy (along with Lady Ranelagh) used her connections to deliver a series of arguments written by John to the King to use in his defense during the trial.[18] Whether or not these papers made it to

---

[16] Dorothy asked for Hartlib's help to a obtain a "debenter" for Mrs. Skinner, since the widow was unable to obtain a copy and did not even have an accurate estimation of her own debts, and to add her to a list for Parliamentary relief. – HP 3/3/70A-71B; 3/3/72A-73B.

[17] HP 4/1/1A-4B.

[18] According to John, both Dorothy and Lady Ranelagh delivered John's writing to the Lady Monmouth and Doctor Juxon in hopes that it would get to the king for his defense – John Dury, *A Declaration of John Durie* (London: 1660), 1; It is likely that Dury is referring to William Juxon, who was lord treasurer of England from 1636 to 1641, Bishop of London from 1633 to 1646, and Archbishop of Canterbury in 1660. Juxon was present at the king's trial and with him on the scaffold, which would have made him a prime candidate to deliver Dury's words directly to Charles I. For more on Juxon, see: Brian Quintrell, "Juxon, William (bap. 1582, d. 1663), Archbishop of Canterbury," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (23

the King is unclear. In the same text, John also claimed that he wrote an additional plea to stop Charles's execution. Once again, John relied on Dorothy to deliver these written arguments to acquaintances of hers who might be able to get the text to Lord President John Bradshaw and the Judges of the high court.[19] John claimed in 1660 that there were no extant copies of either of these deliveries made by Dorothy to help the King in 1649, but did assert that Dorothy succeeded in her delivery of the second set of papers, since the Lord President asked John about it directly.[20] John's inclusion of Dorothy in his later description of this attempted political intervention ties her to his activities and paints her as an indispensable helper: a woman with reliable connections in high places who was essential to his efforts. John may have done the writing, but it was only due to Dorothy that Bradshaw read John's plea to spare the life of Charles I.

Although the lack of Dorothy's own writing makes it impossible to assess a primary record of her activity in the years following the death of the King, the writings of her husband and other members of the Hartlib Circle tie her closely to John's work during 1649 and 1650. Using her talents in writing and a newly acquired interest in chemistry, Dorothy's attempts to financially support her family through distilling and her lost writings on the reform of women's education signify that Dorothy remained focused primarily on the success of her shared vocation with John Dury.

4.3 The Distilling Misadventure: An Attempt to Subvert Gender Roles (1649-1650)

September, 2004); The "Lady Monmouth" may be the wife of Henry Carey, second earl of Monmouth, a staunch royalist during the Civil War years.

[19] Dury wrote that: "These Arguments the Lady *Ranalaugh* aforesaid and my wife gave to Mistrisse *Sutton*, heretofore a School-Mistress at *Kensington,* to be delivered by her to the President and Judges." – Dury, *A Declaration*, 11-12.

[20] Ibid.

Through the latter part of the 1640s, Hartlib began to track medicinal trials and discoveries being made by members of his vast network in his *Ephemerides*. As several scholars have noted, there was a significant increase in the Hartlib Circle's production and correspondence regarding chemistry and natural philosophies through the 1640s and 1650s. [21] In 1648, Dorothy's name appeared in two of Hartlib's entries as a test subject for several different remedies, including one for Dorothy's "blood distempers" that two different doctors were unable to treat, as well as redness of the eyes.[22] Following the birth of her first child with John in 1649 (a son that appears to have died sometime before 1656), Dorothy tried several remedies for her post-partum discomforts.[23] Hartlib also recorded that "Lady Kents [*sic.*] Powder" was given to Mrs. Dury, a medicine that had applications to child-bearing and convulsions and cured Dorothy of "squinzie of throat."[24] The birth of John and Dorothy's first son in the early months of 1649 and John's continuing inability to secure a stable income seems to have put further strain on Dorothy's ability to manage their finances. It was this financial insecurity, as well as her increasing participation and interest in the distilling research within the network that likely contributed to Dorothy Dury's idea to open a shop to sell chemicals in 1649.

Extant letters written by Samuel Hartlib and John Dury regarding Dorothy's activities in chemistry do not suggest any reason for her interests beyond a desire to educate herself and practice new skills, but the responses and criticisms that survive in letters from Benjamin Worsley and William Hamilton suggest that Dorothy may have

---

[21] Lynette Hunter has suggested that this may have been a deliberate effort to "avoid discussion of the political and religious conflict of the time." – Lynette Hunter, "Sisters of the Royal Society: The Circle of Katherine Jone, Lady Ranelagh," *Women, Science, and Medicine 1500-1700: Mothers and Sisters of the Royal Society*, eds. Lynette Hunter and Sarah Hutton (Sutton Publishing Ltd, 1997), 180.
[22] HP 31/22/1A; 31/22/37B-38A.
[23] Hartlib indicated that Dorothy suffered from chapped nipples – HP 28/1/9B.
[24] "Squinzie" may mean "quinsy," a common name for a peritonsillar abscess – HP 28/1/32B.

been interested in gaining financially from her efforts. As Evan Bourke has already suggested, this exchange of letters demonstrates the difficulty that women in the Hartlib Circle had in navigating conventional gender expectations in the interconnected areas of social class, economic status, and religious conviction.[25] What this chapter hopes to add into the discussion of this episode of Dorothy's life is an acknowledgment that it was not only Dorothy overstepping the conventional class and gender lines, but that John was also doing so. John's decision to place their shared vocation ahead of his own duties as husband and provider necessitated Dorothy's attempt to contravene traditional expectations of a wife. In other words, the way that Dorothy and John attempted to equally share the responsibilities in their vocationally centered relationship clashed against conventional expectations of marriage.

In what was likely early June of 1649, Benjamin Worsley distributed a memo on chemical distilling through the network.[26] Both Samuel Hartlib and John Dury wrote to Worsley on behalf of Dorothy, requesting further clarification on certain aspects of the distillation process.[27] Worsley's responses to the letter written by John on behalf of his wife took the common stance of sixteenth and seventeenth-century English society: that the practice of chemistry and distilling was an acceptable past-time for aristocratic women. The close relationship between experimental chemistry and the traditionally female realms of cookery and household healthcare meant that it was considered an extension of women's domestic skills, and therefore an acceptable leisure activity for

[25] Evan Bourke, "'I would not have taken her for his sister': Financial Hardship and Women's Reputations in the Hartlib Circle (1641-1661)." *The Seventeenth Century Journal* Vol.37, No. 1 (2022), 47.
[26] HP 26/33/9A-10B
[27] For John's letter, see: HP 26/33/4A-5B: That Hartlib wrote a letter to Worsley is obvious by Worsley's response, but the letter that Hartlib wrote is not extant – HP 26/33/1A-3B.

women of the nobility.[28] Healthcare began in the home, as Michelle DiMeo has illustrated in her discussion of Lady Ranelagh's own interests on the subject: "Women were responsible not only for making and administering their own medicines, performing minor surgical operations, and assisting in childbirth, but also for preventing disease through a healthy home."[29] Given the ill health that Dorothy experienced surrounding her pregnancy, her participation in medicinal trials within the Hartlib Circle and her interest in distilling her own remedies was understandable. Benjamin Worsley's response to John Dury's request for clarification on his memo on distillation showed no contempt for either John or Dorothy's interest, and offers straightforward answers to their questions.[30] Dorothy's overstepping of the conventional boundary did not come from her interests or even her practice of chemical distillation, but from her intention to open a shop to sell distillations to the public.

It was Benjamin Worsley's response to Samuel Hartlib's letter, written on behalf of Mrs. Dury a month or so before John's, that showed Worsley's concern regarding Dorothy's activities. Although Evan Bourke has drawn attention to the fact that Worsley quickly "effaces Moore from the conversation," and solely addresses John, it is also significant to note that Worsley's initial confusion was not actually directed toward Mrs. Dury's interest in distilling, but how distilling could possibly benefit John Dury's vocation. [31] After outlining several methods of distillation, Worsley expressed this

[28] For more discussion on this, see: Hunter, "Sisters of the Royal Society," 188; and Michelle DiMeo, *Lady Ranelagh: The Incomparable Life of Robert Boyle's Sister* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 2021), 69-76.
[29] DiMeo, *Lady Ranelagh*, 72.
[30] The introduction of John Dury's letter indicates that John was speaking on behalf of himself and someone else by his use of "us" and "we." This was undoubtedly his wife, given the context in which the letter was written. Dury relays that they had both enjoyed Worsley's work – HP 26/33/4A; HP 26/33/7A-8B.
[31] Bourke, "I would not have taken her for his sister," 50.

bewilderment: "I could not see how they could become Mr: Duryes calling, for it being a mechanicke trade, it would be very difficult to do any thing in such quantity, as it would get a considerable livelyhood [*sic.*]…unlesse it were followed with hard and constant labour."[32] Bourke has argued that in singularly addressing John, Worsley was excluding Dorothy from the conversation on the basis of gender.[33] While his analysis is convincing, it fails to take into account Worsley's direct reference to John's calling, and how distilling could possibly contribute to its pursuit. Given Dorothy's emphatic public declaration that John's vocation was one shared equally between them upon their decision to marry, it is entirely possible that by mentioning John's calling, Worsley was including Dorothy by extension. If this is true, Worsley's confusion regarding the selling of remedies and perfumes is understandable, since chemical distillation had little to do with irenic or educational reform, and would take, as he pointed out, full-time dedication of one or both parties to turn it into a viable business.

Although he cautioned her to keep within the acceptable charitable reasons for giving away chemical remedies, Worsley articulated that his concerns had nothing to do with Dorothy's abilities. Dorothy's intellectual talents remained well acknowledged in the circle, as were those of other significant women such as Lady Ranelagh, who showed great interest in chemistry as well. Rather than discouraging her from continuing in her efforts to practice distilling, Worsley imparted advice to Dorothy regarding both *how* she ought to be distibuting her remedies, and to *whom*. After making a pointed reference to a "Mr Phyllips," who created cordial waters and scented spirits "privattly, and rather out of a Care of or desire to obleige [*sic.*] others, then out of a designe to get a gaine of

[32] HP 26/33/1B.
[33] Bourke, "I would not have taken her for his sister," 50-51.

others…," Worsley suggested that Dorothy distribute her creations only "through her Acquaintance with persons of honour."[34] In this, Worsley sought to firmly confine Dorothy to a place appropriate for her gender and class, recommending that she created spirits only for the purposes of charity, as would befit a woman of genteel birth. Even after offering her this advice and in spite of his obvious concerns, Worsley did not deny Dorothy answers to her questions: "I did pitch upon this imployment, as most fit for her; and shall give the best skill I know/ hyding nothing from her…"[35] It is obvious that although Worsley thought it his duty to recommend a certain use for the recipes that he gave to Mrs. Dury, he trusted her to make a wise decision based on his advice and her own conscience, rather than berating her in a more obvious way.[36]

Despite his attempt to warn Dorothy away from opening a shop to sell her distillations for profit, Worsley expressed both an understanding of Dorothy's thought process and empathy regarding the financial state of the Durys: "I am heartily sorry for their straights, I shall be cheerefull if the imparting of any thing I know may serve them."[37] The very recipes that Worsley offered to Dorothy, he wrote, were the ones that tempted him to retire to the countryside and take up distilling for profit as well: "I have many times thought, of retyring into the Country, and by lodging in some house, where there was a good garden, and…by distilling these spiritts, & the perfume or oyle of Roses (which is a staple commodity) to get my selfe, a handsome living and do know that it

[34] Ibid.
[35] HP 26/33/2A.
[36] Benjamin Worsley's respect for Dorothy's character and abilities is clear in his letter to Hartlib. He holds her in such high esteem, in fact, that he even writes, "that I have several times resolved in my heart, that if ever providence, would so much favour me that I continued in Batchelors estate, to live with them [the Durys], and be advised by them as their sonne." – HP 26/33/1B.
[37] Ibid.

may very well be done."[38] But despite his understanding of their situation, Worsley did not approve of Dorothy opening a shop.

The poverty of the Durys despite their honourable reputation was well known and mentioned not just by their peers, but within their own circulated writings. Though John had known from the beginning of his career that he would need to rely on God's provision to accomplish the kind of mission he felt called to, these concerns became even more pronounced after his marriage, knowing that his decisions and ability to retain funds would affect not only himself, but also his family. Despite this, John Dury continued to emphasize that his calling as a peacemaker came before any other duty in his life. He used this argument most famously in several of his published defenses of his changing political associations, repeatedly claiming that he was committed to work *with* the government toward church unity, no matter what regime happened to be in power. In 1650, John published a pamphlet titled *The unchanged, constant, and single-hearted peacemaker* in response to rising public criticism of his previous alliance with Archbishop William Laud. As the title suggests, Dury argued that he had but a single goal in his heart that remained unchanged, no matter the balance of political power: negotiating peace between the Protestant churches. Claiming that he would continue to propagate his mission by any means and through any ruler, Dury argued that he had never been working for his own gain, since his decisions to turn down multiple positions had left his family financially compromised: "you suppose I have a present living, but I have none; and though besides other offers I might have had a place of 300 *l.* a year in *Hampshire*, yet I refused it; that I might serve the publick more freely, being free from a

[38] HP 26/33/2B.

particular imployment."[39] Dury went on to say that he was resolved in his decision to turn down private offers of employment, "that I may set my self apart to publick designes of Peace, to publish the Councles [*sic*.] and to sollicit the meanes thereof."[40] The fact that this decision was, at least in part, the reason for the financial struggles of the Durys is corroborated by William Hamilton, who wrote to Hartlib in 1649 that he was displeased "that Mr Dury (as yow wryte) is resolved not to accept of any call for the ministrie, but to sett himself apart for more publick imployments…"[41] According to Hamilton, John had not only turned down the offer of curacy in Hampshire, but also a position offered by the Palsgrave, as well as ones in Prussia, Winchester, and London, all for the sake of pursuing his calling to public service in ecclesiastical peacemaking.[42]

It was in December of 1649 that Willam Hamilton wrote to Samuel Hartlib to express his concerns regarding the distilling ambitions of Mrs. Dury. Hamilton, a previous Regent at the college in Glasgow where he taught philosophy, became so committed to the goals of the Hartlib Circle that sometime around 1647 he signed the same covenant document created by Hartlib, Dury, and Comenius in 1642.[43] Since the covenant bound all signatories to a mutual accountability regarding commitment to their vocations, Hamilton's opinion of John and Dorothy's actions held particular weight, especially if they claimed to be doing something to facilitate God's calling. While Hamilton's letter has been previously analyzed for its scathing criticism of Dorothy, what has not been accounted for in the same letter is that his opinion of her is prefaced by a

[39] John Dury, *The unchanged, constant, and single-hearted peacemaker drawn forth into the world* (London: 1650), 12.
[40] Dury, *The unchanged, constant, and single-hearted peacemaker*, 14.
[41] HP 9/11/18A.
[42] HP 9/11/18B.
[43] For further discussion of William Hamilton and his involvement in the Hartlib Circle, see: Turnbull, *Hartlib, Dury, and Comenius*, 263.

critique of her husband. More specifically, Hamilton implied that the method by which John attempted to pursue his vocation was the very reason why Dorothy considered opening her shop in the first place. Despite their good intentions, Hamilton argued that the Durys' insistence on the primacy of vocation above all else had led to an unacceptable distortion of gender roles.

Dorothy herself never complained that John refused to accept ministry positions. While both John and Dorothy voiced concern about finances throughout their marriage, they tended to place the blame for their poverty on the fact that they were *owed* money, rather than on their own actions or decisions. After the execution of Charles I, John pointed out that he had never been compensated for his time spent working for the King's children preceding the trial.[44] Dorothy, too, was owed money from the Irish estates she had inherited through her first marriage. Despite owning land in Ireland from which she should have been collecting rent, the chaos wreaked by the Irish Rebellion and the later Cromwellian reforms meant that the 400 pounds per annum that she should have been receiving had not been paid since 1641.[45] When the Durys sought funding, they almost always petitioned on the grounds of the importance of John's irenic work, and not in spite of it.

Considering that one of John's primary complaints during his time at The Hague was that his work as a chaplain dominated his time and left little room for his primary calling, it seems a likely assumption that he turned down offers for other ministry positions in fear of that work displacing vocation as his priority.[46] As the previous chapter

[44] Dury, *The unchanged, constant, and single-hearted peacemaker*, 14.
[45] Ibid.
[46] For a full discussion of Dury's conflicting vocational interests while working in the household of Princess Mary, see: Felicity Lyn Maxwell, "Pastoral Cares, Covenant, and Courtship in John Dury's

has demonstrated, the primary goal of all covenants taken by John and Dorothy throughout their relationship was to provide mutual support and motivation in the pursuit of their vocations. When John's vocation became Dorothy's upon marriage, she resolved to do all in her power to support her husband's work, as doing so became a fulfillment of her own calling. Since public service in their shared calling took priority over all else, bending conventional marital expectations (such as Dorothy becoming a primary wage earner in a job normally unbefitting of her gender and status) likely seemed a necessary sacrifice. John clearly had no problem with Dorothy's aspirations to open a shop, as he had reached out directly to Worsley on her behalf even after Worsley had voiced his concerns to Hartlib about a woman of Dorothy's status selling distillations.[47] If Dorothy was able to bring in a little extra money, it would have helped to facilitate John's public service, and thus may have been sanctified by its service to vocation.

It was to this unconventional sharing of gender-designated roles that William Hamilton objected. By prefacing his criticism of Dorothy with a disappointment in John's failure to provide for his family, Hamilton (perhaps unintentionally) reinforced the view that the Durys operated with a single heart and mind toward a shared goal, and were both equally responsible for Mrs. Dury's ambitions. Dorothy could not be held solely responsible for what Hamilton considered an immoral desire to financially profit from selling distillations when her husband prioritized his public duty over his family. Despite Hamilton's respect for Dorothy's character and reputation, he viewed her desire to sell chemicals as an unacceptable distortion of her duties as a wife and homemaker:

Personal Correspondence, 1641-5," *The Clergy in Early Modern Scotland*, eds. Chris R. Langely, Catherine E. McMillan, and Russell Newton (Boydell Press, 2021), 194-199.

[47] HP 26/33/4A-5B.

> I had thowght that Mistresse Durey…as shee might but have the occasione by a straine of wit to misinterpret the intentione to the sordidnesse of an hostesse put upon hir, cowld farre lesse have stepped from that sparkling spiritfyllnesse, to have taken up a publicke shop for selling of spirits & oills, whether hir owne, or others.[48]

Hamilton's language that it was by a "straine" of Dorothy's "wit" that she attempted to justify her "sordid" distortion of the hostess's duties indicates that Hamilton understood how Dorothy might have arrived at the conclusion that selling chemicals for profit would be acceptable given her particular circumstances and beliefs. It is even possible that Dorothy herself may have attempted to justify why or how selling the very chemicals she made was an acceptable extension of her domestic responsibilities.[49] Not only this, but Hamilton saw her "sordid" desire not only as a small subversion, but as a large one, indicated in his language that she could "farre lesse have stepped" from her duties as a hostess than her intention to profit from her distilling. Hamilton's scathing rebuke of this thinking was followed by an appeal to what he clearly believed were Dorothy's best intentions. Demonstrating that he did not believe that she was an evil woman, but a godly one who had grossly overstepped the lines of gender distinction that convention had dictated for her, Hamilton wrote: "But since many tyms out of our evill god brings good, I hartily pray that this may be for hir owne good & others that may be concerned in it, & gods glory."[50] Reason, it appeared, was not enough to argue for the bending of gender convention to accommodate a financially beneficial use of Dorothy's new talents – not even to facilitate the pursuit of God's calling.

---

[48] HP 9/11/18B.
[49] Dorothy had always argued that all people ought to use their God-given reason to discern their own talents and how they might be used in service of a calling – HP 21//7/1B.
[50] Ibid.

Since Dorothy's thoughts regarding both distilling itself and the interventions of the Hartlib Circle do not survive, it is unclear how she reacted to these criticisms. However, since the shop never opened, it appears likely that John and Dorothy took the concerns of Worsley and Hamilton to heart. This did not mean that Dorothy stopped distilling. An entry in Hartlib's *Ephemerides* records that several months after Hamilton's letter, not only was John Dury relaying possible medicinal remedies to others in the circle, but Dorothy was herself experimenting with receipts. Between February and March of 1650, "Mr Dury was telling of some wonderful cures of the spleene and other obstructions, of which a maid was cured at my Lady Monmouth's…Mr Dury is to give the Receipt of it to Mr Sadler, who likewise is to make a trial of it. Also my Lady Ranalagh and Mris Dury are doing the like."[51] It appears that Lady Ranelagh, who was herself interested in chemical distillation and even alchemy throughout her life, had found another way in which she and her aunt were kindred spirits.[52] It is unclear whether Dorothy and Lady Ranelagh were performing the trials of "Maids Physick" together or separately, but it is likely in either case that they would have shared their experiences with one another. While this is the only reference to Dorothy and Ranelagh communicating over their shared interest in chemistry, there is evidence that Ranelagh continued to encourage Dorothy not to abandon her pre-marital convictions to reform women's education.

4.4 The Effort to Reform Education (1649-1650)

[51] HP 28/1/59A.
[52] For more on Lady Ranelagh's interest and work in distillation, see: DiMeo, *Lady Ranelagh*, 61-89; Hunter, "Sisters of the Royal Society," 178-197.

A reform in young people's education was an interest shared by John and Dorothy Dury from the beginning of their relationship. For Dorothy, a reform in women's education had been the goal insofar as it would better prepare women to exercise their talents more extensively while serving in a Christian society. In a similar way, John Dury argued that a reformed system of education would serve a vital role in a reformed society – the creation of which was the mission of the Hartlib Circle as a whole – and the maintenance of both national and international peace, which was his primary vocation. Part of the impetus for signing his 1642 covenant with Comenius and Hartlib, Dury claimed, was that the tasks of education and ecclesiastical peace would both be served, since he had not the time to devote himself wholly to both:

> I have endeavoured to let you see some more light concerning the two objects [education and peace amongst Protestant churches] which you chiefly pitch upon: whereof the one is Mr. *Comenius* proper taske, and the other is mine, although wee are bound not to doe in publique or to bring to perfections either of these Methods without one anothers advice and consent…so that the meanes of perfecting both were to have us both set apart for our taskes and setled [*sic.*] together.[53]

By 1649, however, John Dury had once again taken up writing on reform in English education. He felt that the very grounds of the grand-scale reformation of society in England that the Hartlib Circle worked toward ought to be done primarily through a reformation of religion and learning.[54]

As part of a greater movement of intellectual humanism that emphasized logic, science, and nature (all of which were of interest to the Hartlib Circle more widely), John Dury wrote one of his most widely recognized works: *The Reformed School,* published

[53] John Dury, *A Motion Tending to the Publick Good of this Age and of Posteritie Or, the Coppies of Certain Letters Written by Mr. John Dury* (London: 1642), 40-41.
[54] John Dury, *A Seasonable Discourse* (London: 1649), A1r.

by Samuel Hartlib in 1649.[55] Refocusing on Christian truth as the primary aim of education and the means by which division and wickedness could be purged from society, John Dury's plan for education emphasized "infusing the whole of education with a spirit of dedication,"[56] and subordinating the prevailing focus on classical languages to a curriculum that emphasized arts and sciences more generally.[57] To achieve this goal, Dury outlined a robustly-structured primary education, centered on the principles of sense, tradition, and reason as the three sources of knowledge, or "means of learning."[58] Above all, the students were to be prepared to enter a reformed society as faithful and productive contributors:

> The Rule then according to which their education is to be Reformed fundamentally, is this. That no time of the day is to be lost without some teaching exercise; and that nothing is to be taught but that which is usefull in it self to the Society of mankind, therin fitting them for employments approvable by the Gospel; and which will bring them to behave themselves so as it becometh those who are called to walke with the lamb upon the mount Zion in the presence of God, that is, as Saints in his Church.[59]

The curriculum filled the moments of each child's day with exercises and activities beneficial to their spiritual, intellectual, and physical development – all necessary for the

---

[55] For an in-depth discussion of linguistic vs. intellectual humanism in the world of John Dury, see: Thomas H. H Rae, *John Dury and the Royal Road to Piety*, vol. 37 (Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1998), 20-23.
[56] Rae, *John Dury and the Royal Road to Piety*, 37.
[57] Batten has summarized Dury's turn away from the pre-existing seventeenth-century education as a refocusing on "things" rather than "words," subordinating the learning of classical languages to a more all-encompassing curriculum of arts and sciences more generally – J. Minton Batten, *John Dury: Advocate of Christian Reunion* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1944), 137.
[58] Dury, *The Reformed School*, 43.
[59] Dury, *The Reformed School*, 19; John Dury was repeatedly critical of learning that focused on philosophy alone as functionally useless in preparing students to enter into and contribute to their society: "they are made to learn by hear[ing] the Generall Rules, sentences and Precep[ts] of Art, before they are furnished with any matter whereunto to apply those Rules an Precepts. And when they are taught these things wherein Reason is to be employed, they are lead into a Mace of subtile [*sic.*] and unprofitable Notions wherby their minds of puft up with a windy conceit of knowledge: their affections taken off from the plannesse of usefull Truths; theur natural Corrupt inclination to pride, vain glory, and contentiousnesse not reformed, but rather strengthened in perversitie." – Dury, *The Reformed School*, 38-39.

students to one day enter society as well-rounded adults with a desire to work toward a common good.[60]

While John's most detailed and widely recognized treatise on education has survived, Dorothy's treatise on the education of young women has not. Dorothy herself seemed certain that her own writings on women's education were not likely to be well received: "I have not much hope that this Draught [*sic.*] will be either received or approved; but I expect rather that it shall meet with disdain and contempt…"[61] But never one to back down from a challenge, Dorothy assured Lady Ranelagh that she was still as resolved as she had ever been that her calling from God superseded submission to culture: "I am not ashamed of laying downe this meane and simple way to breed youth in…(for I hope we have not so learned Christ) as to conforme or comply with the world, what ever good might seeme plausibly to arise out of such a conformity or compliance."[62] Though she no longer viewed the work of becoming a teacher herself as within her vocational purview, Dorothy remained as implacable in the face of criticism as she ever had been, writing of reform just as her husband did the same.

The document that does survive of Dorothy's work on education is not the treatise itself, as several scholars have assumed by its title ("Of the Education of Girles"). Felicity Lyn Maxwell has suggested that the letter addressed to Lady Ranelagh is merely the introduction to her lost work.[63] The letter shows clear indications that it was a foreword

---

[60] John Dury outlined a plan for the advancement of piety that included exercises in prayer, scripture reading, catechism, and more formal duties in solemn worship on Sundays. *The Reformed School* also included an hourly guide for students to participate in these exercises and accounted for time spent sleeping, eating, physical exercise, and grooming/hygiene – Dury, *The Reformed School*, 24-28.
[61] Dorothy Moore and Lynette Hunter, *The Letters of Dorothy Moore, 1612-64: The Friendships, Marriage, and Intellectual Life of a Seventeenth-Century Woman* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004), 86.
[62] Ibid.
[63] Felicity Lyn Maxwell, "Calling for Collaboration: Women and Public Service in Dorothy Moore's Transnational Protestant Correspondence," *Literature Compass* 14, no. 4 (2017), 14; Charles Webster

to a larger piece of writing, rather than a complete work. For example, Dorothy explained that she had "left out the teaching of youth dancing and curious works; both which serve onely, to full the fancy with necessary, unprofitable and proud imaginations."[64] However, instead of ignoring these things, Dorothy's disdain for dancing and associated activities that promote vanity in young women is the predominant focus of her letter. It stands to reason that her letter to Ranelagh is merely an introduction attempting to justify her exclusion of these topics from a larger work. The letter bears no specific suggestions for what should be included in a new curriculum instead of these vain activities. Given Dorothy's belief in the significance of educational reform and the passionate argument she made to Rivet that it ought to lay the foundation for young women to gain a better understanding of their callings within society as a whole, it seems unlikely that she would pass up on a chance to propose more detailed guidelines for educational reform.

Despite the fact that anything that Dorothy wrote in the years after her marriage on the topic of women's education beyond this one letter to Ranelagh does not survive, it is a safe assumption that whatever John Dury published regarding a reform of girls' education would have been in accordance with his wife's own writings. Given John's pre-marital declaration that no person was as significant to the discussion and development of his work as Dorothy, as well as their belief that they were to act as one in the pursuit of a single vocation, it is unlikely that Dorothy would have publicly contradicted her husband's works (or vice versa). This is particularly significant given the fact that it is likely that her letter to Ranelagh was written and circulated around the same time as *The*

---

suggests something similar – Charles Webster, *The Great Instauration: Science, Medicine and Reform 1626-1660* (London: Gerald Duckworth & Co. Ltd, 1975), 220.

[64] Moore and Hunter, *The Letters of Dorothy Moore*, 86.

Reformed School.[65] Although John's work was focused almost exclusively on reforming the education of young boys, the introductory letter to the reader from its publisher, Samuel Hartlib, indicated that this was only temporary:

> The Motion [of reforming education] is not as yet come to maturitie in the Resolution of those that first made it, and the course is of some Conveniences to effect it, and the fears of unsettlement, after that it shall be set upon: and till there be a further ground laid for the prosecuting of this Designe; it is needlesse to give the Directory concerning the Education of Girls.[66]

Hartlib's language implies that a complete directory concerning the education of girls was either being written at the time of *The Reformed School*'s publication, or else had already been completed and was merely waiting upon the reception of the public and for concrete action to be taken before it was released. Other scholars have speculated that this directory may have been written in consultation with Mrs. Dury, and likely also with Lady Ranelagh, given their ongoing interest in education through their lives.[67] It is even possible that the document written by Dorothy was the very treatise that Hartlib referenced, a sort of sister-directory to her husband's work on reformed education for young boys.

Given Hartlib's qualification that *The Reformed School* would focus exclusively on boys' education, it is interesting that John begins his work with a conscious inclusion of girls. The very first sentence of the main body of the work makes this point: "Upon the motion which is made of entring [*sic*.] into a Societie, wherin a certain number of Children, Boyes & Girles, should be educated unto Religion, to Morall Sciences &

---

[65] Lynette Hunter has placed the undated letter sometime around 1650, one year after Hartlib published *The Reformed School* – Moore and Hunter, *The Letters of Dorothy Moore*, 86.
[66] Dury, *The Reformed* School, A7r.
[67] See for example: Webster, *The Great Instauration*, 220; Samuel Hartlib, Charles Webster and John Dury, *Samuel Hartlib and the Advancement of Learning* (London: Cambridge University Press), 206.

Virtues."[68] Since his earlier writings on education have a complete absence of girls, the deliberate mention of reforms to women's education as well as men's was likely influenced by time spent in conversation with his wife. Although they were not the focus of his work, John took care to mention girls throughout *The Reformed School*. He proposed that the new system ought to have a school for girls run by women and kept separate from that of the boys.[69] Although there were clear differences in the end goals of their practical training – the boys being prepared for public employment and the girls for roles as housewives – the structure of education appeared the same. John never denied young women access to the same foundational spiritual education as the boys, so that they could both contribute to the same society: "The main scope of the whole work of Education, both in the Boyes and Girls, should be none other but this, to train them up to know God in Christ, that they may walke worthy of him in the Gospell; and become profitable instruments of the Commonwealth in their Generations."[70] This goal for reformed learning echoed the same ideas proposed by Dorothy in her earlier writing: that women ought to be given enough spiritual education to be able to understand and contribute meaningfully to society, whether as single women or wives.[71] Not only this, but her belief in the distinctiveness of women's vocations naturally led to a vision of a system of education that was unique to her sex, just as it did in John's treatise. As was argued in the second chapter, Dorothy's intention in her correspondence with Rivet was to isolate a more clearly defined role for women so that future reforms could make more

[68] Dury, *The Reformed School*, 13.
[69] Ibid, 18.
[70] Ibid, 18.
[71] HP 21/3/7A-9B.

informed decisions about what ought to be taught.[72] While *The Reformed School*'s predominant focus on boys did not include suggestions for detailed reforms in girl's education, it did claim that women were as much responsible for contributing to their society as men, and that education ought to prepare them to be able to do so.

Not only did the overall goal of education proposed by John echo his wife's earlier work, but he also took time to explicitly rebuke the same vain activities that Dorothy so despised in young women's education as it existed in the seventeenth century:

> Therefore as to the Girls, the ordinary vanity and curiosity of their dressing of hair and putting an of apparell; the customes and principles of wantonness and bold behaviours which in their dancings are taught them; and whatsoever else doth tend onely to fomēt [*sic.*] pride and satisfie curiosity and imaginary delights shall be changed, by this our course of Education, into plain, decet cleanliness and health full wayes of apparrelling themselves.[73]

Further echoing Dorothy's earlier writing, John set housewifery as the primary training for most women, but also sought to allow for further intellectual training for those women who showed a proficiency in it: "And such as may be found capable of Tongues and Sciences…are not to be neglected; but assisted towards the improvement of their intellectuall abilities."[74] Taking all of this into consideration, it seems more than likely that John found himself influenced not only by his wife's ideas but also by her own experiences, having extolled her wisdom and intellectual virtue as primary reasons why he had wished to marry her at all. The lack of extant material written by Dorothy on how these reforms would be of particular use to women in their gender-specific vocations is disappointing, but nevertheless, the overall influence of her thought on her husband's

[72] Ibid.
[73] Dury, *The Reformed School*, 20.
[74] Ibid.

writing is obvious. She lurks at the edges of John's work, her voice and ideas echoing through her husband's very motivations and his inclusion of women into his vision. At the very least, what survives of Dorothy's writing points to her continued involvement in the reforming activities of the Hartlib Circle, and her shared effort with John to push toward the realization of the particular reforms that they viewed as so essential to their calling.

The Durys' vision of education would not be realized. Thomas Rae has suggested that one of the reasons for this may have actually been that John's educational ideas "suffered" from association with his greater irenic mission, and in particular, his ever-shifting political associations. The criticisms, which Rae believes to be largely unjust and unfounded, nevertheless contributed to the growing public distrust of John Dury, both in England and beyond.[75] The distrust began with John's change in allegiance from Charles I to the Commonwealth regime in 1649, one that John argued in *A Declaration of John Durie* that was made for the benefit of his mission over all else.[76] John Dury was successful at winning Cromwell's support for his peacemaking mission, and in the years following 1650, he would begin traveling once more, endangering the mutual support that he and Dorothy had provided for one another.

4.5 The Anxiety of Separation: Dorothy's Supporting Role in the Later Years (1653-1658)

[75] Rae writes that: "Europe was too full of suspicion and distrust, too much in the grip of brutal religious warfare, to be really interested in his schemes which called for more faith and trust than could be found in most people. When his religious proposals failed, so too did his educational ones." – Rae, *John Dury and the Royal Road to Piety*, 276.
[76] Dury, *A Declaration of John Durie*, 2-3.

If the extant writing from and about John and Dorothy Dury in the five years following their marriage demonstrates their shared mind and heart for their vocation, the physical distance between them in the years following 1653 seemed to put great strain upon Dorothy's ability to directly influence John's uphill trudge towards their goal. At the behest of Cromwell, John began traveling again in 1652.[77] Dury had published several pamphlets in support of the new Commonwealth since the execution of Charles I, on the grounds that peace – both civil and ecclesiastical – must come before all else.[78] His defense of the new English government cultivated a trust that John hoped would prompt the new regime's leaders to support his mission of ecclesiastical union.[79] Public opinion of the Commonwealth on the continent was less than favorable, and John's own mission for peace and his pre-existing connections with several governments pre-disposed him to act as an ambassador during his travels.[80] In 1654, John set out on a long journey to Switzerland with the mathematician and fellow Hartlibian, Dr. John Pell.[81] The vague nature of extant accounts and Dorothy's omission of her own address from her letters have led to conflicting opinions as to whether Dorothy remained in London,[82] or accompanied John as far as Amsterdam and settled there.[83] In either case, what is clear is that Dorothy and John were separated by a great physical distance and that she could not accompany him. This may have been because of her pregnancy with their second child at

[77] Turnbull, *Hartlib, Dury and Comenius*, 272.
[78] John Dury discouraged ministers from meddling in politics, and encouraged peace and obedience to the government – John Dury, *A Case of Conscience Resolved: Concerning ministers meddling with State Matters in their Sermons* (London: 1649); He further defended his stance against criticism a year later – John Dury, *A Case of Conscience Concerning Ministers medling with state matters in or out of their Sermons resolved more satisfactorily then heretofore* (London: 1650).
[79] Batten, *John Dury: Advocate of Christian Reunion*, 125.
[80] Ibid.
[81] Turnbull, *Hartlib, Dury and Comenius*, 273.
[82] Ibid.
[83] Batten, *John Dury: Advocate of Christian* Reunion, 155.

the time of his departure, or was perhaps due to the fact that it was a diplomatic mission. Dorothy gave birth to a daughter, Dora-Katherina, in John's absence, another child who seemed to have suffered from ill health in her first few years of life.[84]

Although few letters of Dorothy's survive from this time, John's references to his ongoing correspondence with his wife in his updates to Hartlib indicate how supportive Dorothy continued to be of her husband's work abroad. In a letter to Hartlib in May of 1654, Dury thanked him for relaying one of Dorothy's letters to him in Zurich: "I haue received it with a great deale of Comfort, as finding in it her full acquienscence & Closure with the will of God ouer me, in the way wherin hee hath set mee…"[85] Unable to supply the support needed by his wife in the final months of her pregnancy, Dury relied on Hartlib to update him on Dorothy's condition.[86] His concern at leaving her to endure the difficulties of pregnancy and the early months of new motherhood alone were also clear in his effort to repair what appeared to have been a temporary rift in the friendship between Hartlib and Dorothy in July of the same year: "My wife in hir last writes to me that you are such a stranger with her that since my departure you haue not beene once with her, which I am sorry for, whether the occasion of it bee in her, or in you; I pray let it not continue so."[87] These letters indicate consistent communication between the Durys in the early portions of John's trip, even though any letters not written directly to Hartlib appear to have been lost.

---

[84] In a postscript of a letter written to Hartlib in June of 1654, Dorothy indicated that her daughter required medicine, which she asked Hartlib to send along – HP 21/5/23A-24B; Hartlib also accounted that a remedy called "spirit of stags" was "tried vpon Mris Dury's child and others" in 1656, showing that the ill health was not short-lived – HP 29/5/104B.
[85] HP 4/3/7A-B.
[86] Ibid.
[87] HP 4/3/13A-B.

Despite not being able to travel with her husband, Dorothy continued to manage their finances from afar. Her efficiency and faithfulness impressed even John's travelling companion, John Pell, who wrote critically to his own wife in October of 1654 that her handling of his finances left much to be desired:

> Mrs. Dury sent her husband's 100*l*. unnibbled. I thought I have reason to look for 150*l*. You say, you sent 145*l*.; the merchant says 140*l.* Out of 200*l*. a-year you cannot abate the fees of the money-teller, solicitor, &c.; but out of my money you must abate 5*l*. (it may be 10*l*.) a-quarter. I have no reason to thank you that you did not keep it all; without my order to you take some, and thereby you make me uncertain of the rest.[88]

Dr. Pell's assessment seems to indicate that Dorothy was more than adept: every pound was accounted for. John's letters also make it clear that Dorothy was petitioning on his behalf and ensuring that he was paid what had been promised to him despite his absence. Beginning in 1654 and carrying into 1655, the Durys fought to maintain an annual allowance that had been granted to John by Parliament from a fund for the Maintenance of Ministers, despite the best efforts of one Edward Cresset to stop the payments. Cresset claimed that the trustees could not continue to pay the £200 per annum that had been granted to Dury unless he returned to England.[89] In response, the Durys commenced a letter-writing campaign to those trustees and parliamentarians who might support their case. Although no letters written by Dorothy on this issue are extant, John's surviving letters indicate that Dorothy made copies of letters that he wrote to send out and relayed his own writings, and likely also wrote letters of her own on his behalf.[90] John wrote not

---

[88] Robert Vaughn. *The Protectorate of Oliver Cromwell, and the State of Europe during the Early Part of the Reign of Louis XIV. Illustrated in a Series of Letters between Dr. John Pell, Resident Ambassador with the Swiss Cantons, Sir Samuel Morland, Sir William Lockhart, Mr. Secretary Thurloe, and Other Distinguished Men of the Time,* ed. Robert Vaughn, vol. 2 (London: H. Colburn, 1839), 392-393.
[89] HP 4/3/89A-B.
[90] HP 4/3/82A-B; 4/3/76A-B.

only to Hartlib, but also to Henry Jesse, Mr. Sadler, and Cresset himself.[91] Dorothy dealt with the issue on the ground. John complained that Cresset was saddling Dorothy with trouble in his absence, taking advantage of his wife without bothering to reach out to John directly: "I am informed, hee [Cresset] hath raised all trouble to my wife about it; upon some pretences, which I haue not beene particularly informed of…"[92] John certainly saw his wife as anything but defenseless, trusting her to distribute his writing and handle the bulk of the issue, even in his absence.

Despite his trust in Dorothy to handle what money they managed to secure, John was unable to shed his guilt over being unable to financially support his family. In November of 1655, John wrote to Hartlib under the pseudonym "J. Robertson" from Cassel, inquiring after Nathaniel Bacon regarding a petition that he hoped might provide some financial relief for his wife: "I pray remember my seruice to Mr Nath. Bacon & put him in mind of the Petition wherof [*sic.*] although I know not the Contents, yet I belieue it is necessary for the settlement of those outward comforts which are necessary for my wife & family in mine absence, when I can not [*sic*.] take care of them."[93] John's travels abroad were unexpectedly extended, and it appears that he left Dorothy and his daughter to fend for themselves far longer than he had originally intended. For reasons that are difficult to discern, John's direct communication with Dorothy during this extension of his travels seems to have ceased for a time, inciting a deep anxiety in his wife.

From the months of June to August, 1656, Dorothy wrote a series of letters to Hartlib showcasing her increasing anxiety at being separated from John and receiving no

[91] HP 4/3/103A-104B; 4/3/118A-B.
[92] HP 4/3/118A.
[93] HP 4/3/128A-B.

word from him. What began as simple venting of frustration that John was away longer than she had expected at the beginning of June, led to her inquiring after those visiting Hartlib from the continent to know whether they had heard any word from John.[94] There was a clear presence of worry in her tone by the end of the same month, a lonely wife wondering whether her husband's silence meant that something bad had befallen him: "it is his [God's] goodness to quiet my spirit under the several disapointed [*sic.*] expectations of mr Durys coming…you will oblige mee to Let mee know, if there be any news of his being safe and well…"[95] By the early days of August, Dorothy appears to have been in a panic over his safety, writing that any arrival of the post without a letter from John left her with "sume fearfull apprehentions [*sic*.]."[96] The intense anxiety that Dorothy felt in the absence of communication from her husband suggests that she was used to frequent letters from him before this time, and of being privy to his plans and decisions. Not knowing where he was, why he had not returned, or even whether he was well caused her great concern. Interestingly, the determination to quell her own panic was realized in Dorothy's submission to the original terms of their shared vocation.

On 19 August 1656, Dorothy wrote once more to Hartlib, her much calmer tone a stark contrast to her letter from only a few weeks prior: "I finde mr Dury Lengthening [h]is stay abroad still, I beleeue it is that which hee iudgeth his duty and therfore am fully silenced…"[97] Whether her peace had arrived with a letter from her husband or from her own assessment of their situation is unclear, but her language concerning John's duty being put before her harkens back to the terms of their relationship. Both spouses had

[94] HP 2/11/1A-B; HP 2/11/2A-B.
[95] HP 2/11/4A-5B.
[96] HP 2/11/7A-B.
[97] HP 2/11/8A-9B.

agreed in all of the covenants taken during their friendship that devotion to the calling came first, and any personal desires or private interests came second. The primary purpose of the marriage had always been to serve their shared calling, and it was on this basis that Dorothy recanted her anxious thoughts and desires for John to come home. Dorothy, who seems to have grown accustomed to being part of John's travels and decisions, came to accept that the mission that she was meant to share with her husband came before everything – even at the expense of her direct participation in it.

4.6 The Final Years: A Mission with Waning Support (1658-1664)

Unfortunately for Dorothy, her husband's return to England did not mean an improvement in their circumstances over the next few years. In October of 1658, a letter written from John to Hartlib indicated that Dorothy's ill health had returned, and their finances were at the point where they were forced to begin the "pawning of some things which are lesse usefull [*sic.*] to us."[98] The restoration of a king to the English throne a few years after forced John to confront the accumulative damage that his changing of political allegiances had done to his reputation, and Dorothy would continue to battle her ill health. Through these difficulties, the Durys attempted to lean on one another and remain true to their calling, though it would do little to benefit them in the end.

The official restoration of Charles II to the English throne in May of 1660 proved detrimental to John Dury's pursuit of his mission under British auspices. John had already lost the trust of many Scottish Presbyterians in his support of the Engagement over the Solemn League and Covenant between 1649 and 1651.[99] English Puritans also criticized John's co-operative stance toward the rule of Independents, which can be seen in a 1650

[98] HP 2/12/3B.
[99] Batten, *John Dury: Advocate of Christian Reunion*, 126.

pamphlet titled *A Pack of Old Puritans: maintaining the unlawfulness & inexpediency of subscribing the new engagement*.[100] John Dury's support of Cromwell had gone beyond mere co-operation, since Cromwell was perhaps the greatest supporter of John's mission of the leaders that Dury had worked with. In 1660, John published his *Declaration of John Durie*, in which he argued that his support was not self-serving:

> I desired nothing further from the Protector but his countenance and support; that he would only own me, as a Gospel Minister, setting myself a part for the work of Peace and Unity almongst [*sic.*] Protestants…I did of set purpose decline to receive any commission in this business from him; or any instruction to act anything for him in State affairs; because I neither would be, nor would I be lookt upon as an Agent of his going abroad to serve any of his ends…[101]

John claimed that he merely worked for Cromwell to obtain written recommendations from him to negotiate ecclesiastical peace with churches on the continent, which just happened to align with Cromwell's own desires for Protestant alliances.[102] In his justification of his actions, John even cited the very covenant that he had made twenty years prior, binding him to pursue his vocation, "namely, *that I should without all selfe ends of respect of Persons and Parties prosecute amongst the Protestant, when and wheresoever God should give me ability and opportunity…Separate from all worldly interests*."[103] He argued that despite all slander to the contrary, his beliefs had remained consistent throughout his career.

It was in this declaration that John Dury referenced his activities during Charles I's trial, and his efforts to defend the previous king's life. In light of his circumstances,

---

[100] *A Pack of old Puritans: maintaining the unlawfulness & inexpediency of subscribing the new engagement. Professing the dissatisfaction of their judgements, and the unresolvedness of their Consciences, with Mr. JOHN DURY's Considerations and just Reproposals concerning it* (London: Printed by the Company of Covenant-Keepers, dwelling in Great Brittain, 1650).
[101] Dury, *A Declaration of John Durie*, 24.
[102] Ibid.
[103] Original emphasis; Ibid, 2-3.

John's explicit mention of Dorothy's involvement in delivering his written defenses of the King to those involved in the trial could have been an effort to use her good reputation to his defense. Given the other reputable royalist names that John uses in the same section – most notably Lady Monmouth and Dr. William Juxon – it seems likely that John was attempting to prove himself virtuous by association.[104] John himself admitted that there were no extant copies of the writing that had been delivered to the appropriate persons, so by listing his wife and Lady Ranelagh as complicit in his efforts, they also became witnesses, able to testify to his actions.[105] In this way, Dorothy's name remained tied to her husband's more public efforts even into the final years of her life.

John's attempt to assuage the new king was unsuccessful. Realizing that the hostility of the new English government would inhibit his reunion efforts, John Dury left England for the continent in March of 1661, likely unaware that he would never return. Dorothy did not accompany him, possibly due to her continued struggle against ill health. Their permanent separation from one another seemed to be what finally barred Dorothy from contributing to their shared vocation. Dorothy's illness seems to have made it difficult for her to write, as only three letters are extant written by or to her are extant after 1660 – a brief exchange between herself and Samuel Hartlib.

Despite being left under the weight of debt and sickness, Dorothy wrote letters that showcase her devotion to using her connections to help her friends in the absence of her husband. Samuel Hartlib, who was sick and in dire financial straits, reached out to Dorothy for whatever aid that she could offer him in a letter than is not extant sometime

[104] Ibid, 11-12; See also: footnote 13.
[105] Ibid, 12.

before September of 1661.[106] Dorothy wrote back in September, explaining that she was just as ill, and was herself languishing under the weight of her husband's debts: "I am sory [*sic.*] your condition exposeth you to straights and difficulties, when my estate is not able to releeue them, I assure you were I not in the same condition you speake of and left by mr Dury indepted [*sic.*] to all people I deale with, you should not want necessarys."[107] Despite her inability to help Hartlib financially, Dorothy reached out on his behalf to the Earl of Anglesey to inquire whether he might be able to lend some support: "I did acquaint Lord Anglesey with your condition, and alsoe with your desire of hauing a purr [*sic.*] made for you, hee answered to that particuler [*sic*.], the hee could not doe it, but that hee would himself sent assist you in your want, soe as I hope you will heare from him to that effect."[108] Hartlib asked whether Dorothy might "blesse" him with an update on Anglesey's promise of support in January of 1662, hoping that "he intends to doe something for my very great necessities, & utterly forsaken condition."[109] Hartlib's reliance on Dorothy to use her connections, even when she herself was broke and unable to aid him, indicates that she continued to hold sway with significant officials that Hartlib did not, and was willing to petition them on behalf of her friends. Just as John's account

---

[106] Turnbull and the University of Sheffield's online transcription of Hartlib's Papers have placed two of Dorothy's last undated letters at the end of the year 1661. A letter written by Hartlib was dated by him as being written in January of 1661, but the two undated letters written by Dorothy contain information that indicates that they were more likely to have preceded one written by Hartlib. Both Dorothy and Hartlib's letters mention Arthur Annesley as Earl of Anglesey, a title that was not granted until the 20th April 1661. This means that both Dorothy and Hartlib must have written after this date. In addition to this, Hartlib's letter to Dorothy mentions a medicine that John Dury had requested from "Mr. Serrurier" on Hartlib's behalf. Dury's own letter that mentions this medicine and Mr. Serrurier by name is dated September 27/ October 7, 1661 [HP 4/4/36A]. Therefore, it is more than likely that Hartlib's letter, in which he relays this information to Mrs. Dury, was written in January of 1662 by the Gregorian Calendar, only a few months before his own death.

[107] HP 4/4/34A.

[108] HP 4/4/37A; Arthur Annesley would have recently inherited his father's Irish titles at this time, and was granted the title of first early of Anglesey in April of 1661. See: M. Perceval-Maxwell, "Annesley, Arthur, first earl of Anglesey (1614-1686), politician," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (2004).

[109] HP 7/5A.

of his activities during the trial of 1649 cite Dorothy's relationships as an invaluable to his work, Hartlib, too, seemed aware that Dorothy was willing to use her standing and connections to help him. Even when she was unable to directly influence John's vocational work, she propped up the cause by supporting its workers.

4.7 Conclusion

Samuel Hartlib's death in March of 1662 meant that any letters written by Dorothy Dury after this year were not copied or preserved. Dorothy's own death was reported in London in June 1664, and any knowledge of her activity, or lack thereof, in the last few years of her life seems to be lost. Her daughter Dora-Katherina was left in the care of John Dury's correspondent and first secretary of the Royal Society, Henry Oldenburg, while her father remained on the continent. Oldenburg would marry Dora-Katherina in 1668 with conflicting accounts of the size of her dowry, and therefore an unclear account of the finances of Dorothy or John in the final years of their lives.[110]

What can be surmised through the accounts that survive is that Dorothy remained a woman devoted to fulfilling a purpose, even in the last nineteen years of her life. Rather than serving as evidence of inactivity, the lack of extant letters written by Dorothy forces examination of the letters and publications around her, which reveal the influence and impressions that she left on the life and works of her husband, as well as the significant weight that her name and reputation seemed to hold amongst her peers. Extant correspondence written after Dorothy's marriage shows a woman attempting to navigate a world in constant intellectual and political flux. Dorothy attempted to negotiate a space

[110] While several sources indicate that the Durys left their daughter a hefty £400 dowry, Turnbull has suggested that an earlier confusion between Dora-Katherina and the first wife of Henry Oldenburg (who was also recorded to have left a £400 dowry) likely meant that this was not the amount left by the Durys, given their continuous financial hardship – Turnbull, *Hartlib, Dury and Comenius*, 299.

for herself within her husband's mission, and to push against pre-existing boundaries of gendered social convention to pursue her calling. Her relationship with John Dury reveals John's own recognition of her talents, his willingness to lean upon her support, and his own defying of social expectation in an effort to better serve his calling first and to partner more equally with his wife to this end.

Through the trials and roadblocks of family, finances, politics, and illness, Dorothy worked to advance the irenic and educational vision for a reformed and peaceful international Christian society that she shared with her husband. In the end, it was physical distance that proved the insurmountable challenge to Dorothy's efforts, forcing her to resubmit to the covenant to which she committed when she married John: that serving in their shared vocation took priority above all else, even their own relationship. Despite an apparent inability to directly influence their mission in the final years of her life, Dorothy appeared to guard her faith in the sanctity of their shared purpose, and to remain hopeful that God's will would be accomplished, even if it was not done by her.

CHAPTER 5 – CONCLUSION: THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF DOROTHY MOORE

5.1 Summary of Findings

In the conclusion of her book on seventeenth-century English feminists, Hilda Smith recognizes that most female writers were quickly forgotten after their deaths, no matter what influence they might have wielded in their own lifetimes. It was around the turn of the century, Smith writes, that early English feminists' "stress on women's rational ability and on the uneven distribution of power within marriage permeated other thought briefly, but the ties between feminists and general social thought in the period remained slight, at least as compared with what women's advocates hoped to accomplish."[1] While George Ballard's eighteenth-century *Memoirs of Several Ladies of Great Britain Who Have Been Celebrated for their Writings or Skill in Learned Languages* revived the memory of a number of seventeenth-century writers, the women of the Hartlib Circle were not recognized in its pages. Despite possessing an international reputation for skills in languages comparable to those of Tudor queens and being involved in one of the most recognized intelligence networks of the seventeenth-century, Dorothy Moore-Dury simply disappeared from public consciousness for over three centuries after her death.

Dorothy's decision to write letters and her reticence to publish are likely a significant reason for the lapse in communal memory of her life and work. Her primary interest in collaboration, the incomplete state of many of her ideas, and the obvious holes in her extant correspondence are all closely tied to her choice medium of letters. Any of Dorothy's letters that were not circulated directly through or copied by Hartlib appear not

[1] Hilda L. Smith, *Reason's Disciples: Seventeenth-Century English Feminists* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1982), 192.

to have survived. Despite this disappearance, details about what is not extant can be gleaned from what is. As the introduction stated, Dorothy's international reputation must have been at least partially established even before the first extant letter of hers that was preserved by Samuel Hartlib. Anna Maria van Schurman wrote several letters to Dorothy in 1640 and 1641 – several years before the first extant letter in the Hartlib Papers.[2] While one of van Schurman's letters was an introduction, she had enough knowledge of Dorothy's skills to commend her, and to write the letter in Hebrew. This indicates that Dorothy must have been engaging in some sort of writing – potentially even in other languages – before her involvement with the Hartlib Circle began in 1641. Even after her marriage to Dury, the only indication that letters not exchanged through Hartlib existed at all are references to them in letters written by others that *were* preserved by Hartlib.[3] Credit for the survival of nearly all traces of Dorothy's existence are due to the efforts of Hartlib to preserve and disseminate knowledge for all within his network.

For the most part, Dorothy appeared far more concerned with the quality and ability of her ideas to convince others of their potential than their wide availability to public readership. André Rivet's approval of the theological rationale behind Dorothy's initial desires to reform women's public service and education were of the utmost importance to Dorothy. His refusal to contribute to the development of her plans may well have been one of the closed doors of vocational opportunity that Dorothy later claimed led her to marry John Dury.[4] She also claimed that her frustration over Hartlib's

---

[2] Dorothy Moore and Lynette Hunter, *The Letters of Dorothy Moore, 1612-1664: The Friendships, Marriage, and Intellectual Life of a Seventeenth-Century Woman* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004), 1-3.
[3] John wrote several letters to Hartlib in the 1650's that indicated that he and Dorothy were writing to one another directly, as was shown in chapter four.
[4] In the defense of her marriage to Dury, Moore wrote that: "I found God denying me all the other wayes that I proposed or sought out, for the fulfilling of that which I Iudged [*sic.*] must be the end, & labour of my whole Life…" – HP 3/2/119A.

decision to publish her defense of marriage stemmed from a concern that the rudimentary nature of her writing would result in the critical public's dismissal of her argument. Although undoubtedly invested in the reform of society, Dorothy Moore-Dury appeared most comfortable contributing to its development ensconced in the safety and freedom from perfection that epistolary writing provided. Letters permitted Dorothy to discuss her ideas in community without an expectation that her writing be thoroughly edited or her ideas be fully formed. Smith argues that lapses in common memory of early English women were due, at least in part, to the lack of widespread change effected by their writings. When considering Dorothy's long-term impact and her refusal to publish her work, Smith's assessment appears to be correct. But in spite of her own apparent failure to inspire change in the roles of women, recognizing Dorothy's life-long belief in the potential that her interpretation of vocation had to improve women's experiences makes a significant contribution to contemporary scholarship surrounding early English proto-feminism.

Dorothy was not only a seventeenth-century women who sought a more defined role in public religious and intellectual spaces, but one who believed that a reformed education for women held the power to make such a dream possible. By grounding her ideas in both theology and rationalism, Dorothy was able to conceive of a kind of female agency that was both biblically and logically justified. Her steadfast focus on the primacy of vocation speaks to the age-old human desire to discover the best ways to relate to one another, to live in community, and to find shared purpose in life. In a time rife with political and religious conflict, Dorothy pursued growth and change while simultaneously standing firm in scripture and established doctrine.

The letters and publications of Dorothy Moore-Dury and her peers offer evidence not only of the intricacy and distinctiveness of Dorothy's ideas, but also of the devotion that she and John Dury had to the theology of vocation. Dorothy framed her contribution to the *querelle des femmes* through the idea of calling: she addressed how women ought to employ their unique talents – both spiritual and otherwise – in a way that ultimately served God's plan. Dorothy remained so committed to walk in the path of vocation that her actions were recorded and debated amongst her peers, even when few of her own letters survive in later periods of her life. The vast majority of her decisions – whether social, financial, or political – were all justified through their ability to enable Dorothy to fulfill her calling.

The correlation between vocation and women's relationship with work and marriage has been explicit from the earliest Protestant expositions of the doctrine. What Dorothy's life and writing demonstrates is that the *interpretation* and *application* of the theology of vocation played an indisputable role in the agency and opportunities of seventeenth-century women. Without attempting to make changes to the existing doctrine of vocation or to dispute the physical and spiritual distinctiveness of women, Dorothy was able to develop an argument for new and expanded roles for women in the public sphere, as well as truly companionate marriages in which calling acted as a spousal equalizer. Dorothy sought to improve the potential and opportunities for other women without attempting to make radical changes to the theological underpinnings of society or to detract from women's traditional roles and spaces. When compared with the writings of her female contemporaries, Dorothy's ideas present a middle way, neither wholly maintaining social expectations in their existing form, nor tearing them down to build

afresh. While several of her arguments find parallels in the writings of other female intellectuals of her age, Dorothy's focus on vocation as the root of future change for women gave femininity a potential for a power of its own, one that was at once distinct from and justified by the same doctrine that supported the existing power of men.

Without an understanding of the precise nature of the Durys' marriage, it is easy to interpret Dorothy's submission to the expectations of wives as the greatest roadblock to her success as a reformer. In her book on Mary Astell's life and writing, Ruth Perry argues that it was Astell's maintenance of feminine identity *outside* of marriage that set her writing apart from that of her predecessors and allowed her to build a more successful argument for increased women's agency.[5] However, unlike Astell, Dorothy saw the potential for marriage to act as a facilitator rather than an inhibitor of vocational opportunity. As this thesis has demonstrated, Dorothy's decision to remarry was not a capitulation to social convention, but an effort to change the very understanding of the purpose of marriage. John and Dorothy Dury committed to a different kind of marriage, one in which John supported Dorothy's hopes for a wider array of opportunities. It was criticism from their peers that endangered the Durys' reputation and ability to work toward their greater purpose, and was likely the main factor that caused the Durys to yield to social expectation. The relationship of the Durys exemplifies why better understanding of the nature of individual marriages is necessary before regarding the marital institution itself as an obstruction to reforming women's agency. Dorothy argued that marriage was not what kept women confined to strict domestic roles, and that it was

[5] Perry writes that "She [Astell] rejected marriage, not because she did not want to be a woman, but because she thought that the institution limited a woman's agency and volition more than was good for her." – Ruth Perry, *The Celebrated Mary Astell: An Early English Feminist* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1986), 327.

not vocational doctrine itself that did so either. Instead, Dorothy demonstrated that it was socially constructed gender and class expectations that relegated women to such constricted roles in marriage, ones that were rooted in strict and specific interpretations of vocational doctrine.

5.2 Possibilities for Further Inquiry

With the exception of more recent works by Evan Bourke and Felicity Lyn Maxwell, most existing scholarship has opted to separate the individual writings of John Dury and Dorothy Moore from their relationship with one another. This thesis has argued that to view John and Dorothy as nothing more than a footnote in each other's lives turns a blind eye to the collaborative nature of their relationship. The Durys' understanding of shared vocation entwines their marriage and life's purpose together. Not only was John incapable of separating his own success as a writer and peacemaker from Dorothy's influence for much of his career, but contemporaries of the Durys were also unable to condemn the actions of one spouse without taking the other into consideration. The Durys' interpretation of vocation provides an interesting basis for future scholarship and investigation into other marriages in which spouses partnered in similar ways. Can modern scholarship legitimately separate the work of husbands from the contributions and influence of their wives when the couple professed to share a vocation? Donica Belisle and Kiera Mitchell have recently argued that the support of nineteenth- and twentieth-century "faculty wives" like Mary Quayle Innis were instrumental in the academic success of their husbands, intellectually as well as pragmatically.[6] Contemporaries of Dorothy Moore such as Margaret Fell-Fox and Elizabeth Lilburne

[6] Donica Belisle and Kiera Mitchell, "Mary Quayle Innis: Faculty Wives' Contributions and the Making of Academic Celebrity." *The Canadian Historical Review* 99, no. 3 (2018): 456–86.

were intimately connected with the work of their famous husbands George Fox and John Lilburne through their own writing. Might there be more to say about the role of shared vocation in the successes of early modern English married couples such as the Lilburnes and the Foxes? The framework of shared vocations presents a new way in which to locate women's impact both in religious and intellectual circles, as well as society as a whole.

This framework may even be extended to covenants of spiritual friendship between intellectual men and women such as the one maintained by John and Dorothy in the years before their marriage. The spiritual friendship between seventeenth-century diarist John Evelyn and Margaret Godolphin analyzed in detail by Frances Harris is one such relationship that presents an interesting avenue for further investigation of these questions. John Evelyn defined his covenant of friendship "as a kind of spiritual betrothal," and relied heavily upon Godolphin for spiritual and emotional support in all of his endeavors.[7] For Godolphin, their covenant of friendship was a means to pursue a private, devotional calling outside of the existing social expectations for women– that is to say, marriage.[8] The relationship between covenants of marriage, spiritual friendship and the interpretation of vocation are certainly deserving of further exploration. At the very least, seeking to understand how women viewed God's call on their lives may shed light on their attempts to find contentment and exercise their talents in spaces that early modern society afforded to them.

[7] Frances Harris, *Transformation of Love: The Friendship of John Evlyn and Margaret Godolphin* (Oxford University Press, 2002), 153-154.
[8] Ibid, 173.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

A Pack of old Puritans: maintaining the unlawfulness & inexpediency of subscribing the new engagement. Professing the dissatisfaction of their judgements, and the unresolvedness of their Consciences, with Mr. JOHN DURY's Considerations and just Reproposals concerning it. London: Printed by the Company of Covenant-Keepers, dwelling in Great Brittain, 1650.

Calvin, Jean. *Institutionis Christianæ Religionis.* London: 1576.

Calvin, Jean. *Institution de la religion chrétienne.* Switzerland: Béround, 1888.

Calvin, John, and Henry Beveridge. *Institutes of the Christian Religion*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1970.

Caryl, Joseph. *The nature, solemnity, grounds, property, and benefits, of a sacred covenant. Together with the duties of those who enter into such a covenant.* London: 1643.

Cotton, Priscilla and Mary Cole. *To the Priests and People of England, we Discharge our Consicences, and Give them Warning*. London: 1655.

Crowley, Robert. *The Voyce of the Laste Trumpet Blowen Bi the Seue[n]Th Angel (as is Me[n]Tioned in the Eleuenth of the Apocalips) Callynge Al the Estates of Menne to the Right Path of their Vocation, Wherin are Contayned Xii. Lessons to Twelue Seueral Estates of Menne, Whych if they Learne and Folowe, Al Shal be Well and Nothynge Amise*. London: 1549.

Dury, John. *A Case of Conscience Concerning Ministers medling with state matters in or out of their Sermons resolved more satisfactorily then heretofore.* London: 1650.

Dury, John. *A Case of Conscience Resolved: Concerning ministers meddling with State Matters in their Sermons.* London: 1649.

Dury, John. *A Declaration of John Durie.* London: 1660.

Dury, John. *A Motion Tending to the Publick Good of this Age and of Posteritie Or, the Coppies of Certain Letters Written by Mr. John Dury*. London: 1642.

Dury, John. *A Seasonable Discourse.* London: 1649.

Dury, John. *Madam, although My Former Freedom…*London: 1645.

Dury, John. *Motives to Induce the Protestant Princes to Mind the Vvorke of Peace Ecclesiasticall Amongst Themselves*. Amsterdam: 1639.

Dury, John. *The reformed librarie-keeper with a supplement to The reformed-school, as subordinate to colleges in universities.* London: 1650.

Dury, John. *The Reformed School.* London: 1649.

Dury, John. *The unchanged, constant, and single-hearted peacemaker drawn forth into the world.* London: 1650.

Fox, Margaret Askew Fell. *Womens Speaking Justified, Proved and Allowed of by the Scriptures, all such as Speak by the Spirit and Power of the Lord Jesus and how Women were the First that Preached the Tidings of the Resurrection of Jesus, and were Sent by Christ's Own Command, before He Ascended to the Father, John 20:17*. London: 1666.

Gataker, Thomas. *A Mariage Praier, Or Succinct Meditations Deliuered in a Sermon on the Praier of Eleazer the Seruant of Abraham, Genes. 24. 12, 13, 14. by Thomas Gataker B. of D. and Pastor of Rotherhith*. London: 1624.

Gouge, William. *Of Domesticall Duties Eight Treatises. I. an Exposition of that Part of Scripture Out of which Domesticall Duties are Raised. ... VIII. Duties of Masters. by William Gouge*. London: 1622.

Greengrass, M., Leslie M., and Hannon M. (2013). *The Hartlib Papers*. Published by The Digital Humanities Institute, University of Sheffield [available at: http://www.dhi.ac.uk/hartlib].

Hartlib, Samuel, Charles Webster, and John Dury. *Samuel Hartlib and the Advancement of Learning*. London: Cambridge University Press, 1970.

Jackson, Abraham. *The Pious Prentice, Or, the Prentices Piety Wherein is Declared, how they that Intend to be Prentices, may 1. Rightly Enter into that Calling. 2. Faithfully Abide in it. 3. Discreetly Accomplish it. 4. and how they may be Satisfied in Conscience in such Doubts as may Arise upon some Particular Occasions and Occurrences Proper to that Calling*. London: 1640.

Knewstub, John. *Lectures of John Knewstub, Vpon the Twentith Chapter of Exodus, and Certeine Other Places of Scripture Seene and Allowed According to the Queenes Maiesties Iniunctions*. London: 1577.

Melanchthon, Philipp. *The Apology of the Augsburg Confession*. Project Gutenberg, n.d. Translated by F. Bente and W. H. T. Dau, 2004.

Moore, Dorothy, and Lynette Hunter. *The Letters of Dorothy Moore, 1612-64: The Friendships, Marriage, and Intellectual Life of a Seventeenth-Century Woman*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004.

Rogers, Daniel. *Matrimoniall honovr, or, the mutuall crowne and comfort of godly, loyall, and chaste marriage*. London: 1642.

Sanderson, Robert. *Tvvelve Sermons Preached 1. Ad Clerum. III. 2. Ad Magistratum. III. 3. Ad Populum. VI. Whereunto are Now Added Two Sermons More, the One Preached at St. Pauls Crosse, the Other at a Visitation, Concerning the Perswasion of Conscience. by Robert Saunderson, Dr. in Divinity, and Chaplaine in Ordinary to His Maiesty* [Sermons. Selected sermons]. London: 1637.

Snawsel, Robert. *A Looking Glasse for Maried Folkes Wherein they may Plainly See their Deformities; and also how to Behaue Themselues One to another, and both of them Towards God. Set Forth Dialogue-Wise for the More Tastable and Plainnesse Sake. by R. S*. London: 1610.

Speght, Rachel, and Barbara Kiefer Lewalski. *The Polemics and Poems of Rachel Speght*. Cary: Oxford University Press, 1996.

Swetnam, Joseph. *The Araignment of Leuud, Idle, Froward, and Vnconstant Women.* London: 1615.

Teague, Frances N., and Bathsua Makin. *Bathsua Makin, Woman of Learning*. Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press, 1998.

Tilney, Edmund. *A Briefe and Pleasant Discourse of Duties in Mariage, Called the Flower of Friendshippe*. London: 1571.

Turnbull, G. H. *Hartlib, Dury and Comenius: Gleanings from Hartlib's Papers.* Liverpool: University Press of Liverpool, 1947.

van Schurman, Anna Maria. *Whether a Christian Woman Should Be Educated and Other Writings From Her Intellectual Circle*. The Other Voice in Early Modern Europe. Edited and translated by Joyce L. Irwin. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998.

van Schurman, Anna Maria, André Rivet, Anne R. Larsen, and Steve Maiullo. *Letters and Poems to and from Her Mentor and Other Members of Her Circle*. New York: Iter Press, 2021.

Vaughn, Robert. *The Protectorate of Oliver Cromwell, and the State of Europe during the Early Part of the Reign of Louis XIV. Illustrated in a Series of Letters between Dr. John Pell, Resident Ambassador with the Swiss Canton, Sir Samuel Morland, Sir William Lockhard, Mr. Secretary Thurloe, and Other Distinguished Men of the Time*. Edited by Robert Vaughn, Volume 2. London: H. Colburn, 1839.

Vives, Juan Luis. *The Education of a Christian Woman: A Sixteenth-Century Manual*. The Other Voice in Early Modern Europe. Edited and translated by Charles Fantazzi. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.

Worthington, John. *The Diary and Correspondence of Dr. John Worthington.* Edited by James Crossley. England: Printed for the Chetham Society, 1847.

Secondary Sources

Amussen, Susan Dwyer. *An Ordered Society: Gender and Class In Early Modern England.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1993.

Batten, Joseph Minton. *John Dury: Advocate of Christian Reunion*. The University of Chicago Press, 1944.

Belisle, Donica and Kiera Mitchell. “Mary Quayle Innis: Faculty Wives’ Contributions and the Marking of Academic Celebrity.” *The Canadian Historical Review* 99, no.3 (2018): 456-86.

Bourke, Evan. “Female Involvement, Membership, and Centrality: A Social Network Analysis of the Hartlib Circle.” *Literature compass* 14, no. 4 (2017).

Bourke, Evan, “‘I would not have taken her for his sister’: Financial Hardship and Women’s Reputations in the Hartlib Circle (1641-1661).” *The Seventeenth Century Journal*. Vol. 37, No. 1, (2022): 47-64.

Coffey, John. *Politics, Religion and the British Revolutions: The Mind of Samuel Rutherford*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Connolly, Ruth. “Viscountess Ranelagh and the Authorisation of Women’s Knowledge in the Hartlib Circle” In *The Intellectual Culture of Puritan Women, 1558-1680,* edited by Johnanna I. Harris and Elisabeth J. Scott-Baumann, 150-161. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave, 2011.

Crawford, Patricia. “The Challenges to Patriarchalism: How did the Revolution affect Women?” In *Revolution and Restoration: England in the 1650s*, edited by John Morill, 112-128. London: Collins & Brown, 1992.

Crawford, Patricia. *Women and Religion in England, 1500-1720.* London: Routledge, 1993.

Davies, Kathleen M. “The Sacred Condition of Equality: How Original Were Puritan Doctrines of Marriage?” *Social History* 2, no. 5 (1977): 563–80.

Daybell, James. *Early Modern Women’s Letter-Writing, 1450-1700.* Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave, 2001.

Daybell, James. *Women Letter-Writers in Tudor England.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.

DiMeo, Michelle. *Lady Ranelagh: The Incomparable Life of Robert Boyle’s Sister*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 2021.

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

Feroli, Teresa. *Political Speaking Justified: Women Prophets and the English Revolution*. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2006.

Greengrass, Mark. "Durie [née King], Dorothy (c. 1613–1664), writer on education." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.* 23 Sep. 2004.

Greengrass, Mark, Michael Leslie, and Timothy Raylor. *Samuel Hartlib and the Universal Reformation: Studies in Intellectual Communication.* Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

Goodwin, Gordon, and Terry Clavin. “King, Sir John (d.1637), politician and landowner.” *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. 23 Sep. 2004.

Gray, Jonathan. *Oaths and the English Reformation*. Cambridge University Press, 2012.

Hall, Marie Boas. “Oldenburg, Henry [Heinrich] (c. 1619-1677), scientific correspondent and secretary of the Royal Society.” *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.* 23 Sep. 2004.

Harris, Frances. *Transformations of Love: The Friendship of John Evelyn and Margaret Godolphin*. Oxford University Press, 2002.

Hunter, Lynette. “Sisters of the Royal Society: The Circle of Katherine Jones, Lady Ranelagh.” In *Women, Science, and Medicine 1500-1700: Mothers and Sisters of the Royal Society,* edited by Lynette Hunter and Sarah Hutton, 178-197. Sutton Publishing Limited, 1997.

Hunter, Lynette. “Women and Domestic Medicine: Lady Experimenters, 1570-1620.” In *Women, Science, and Medicine 1500-1700: Mothers and Sisters of the Royal Society*, edited by Lynette Hunter and Sarah Hutton, 89-107. Sutton Publishing Limited, 1997.

Kugler, Anne. “Constructing Wifely Identity: Prescription and Practice in the Life of Lady Sarah Cowper.” *Journal of British Studies* 40, no. 3 (2001): 291–323.

Lane, Christopher J. “The Diversity of Vocations: Choosing a State of Life in Early Modern France.” Order No. 3733790. University of Notre Dame, 2015.

Lord, E. “Carey, Henry, second early of Monmouth (1596-1661), translator.” *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.* 23 Sept. 2004.

Mack, Phyllis. “The Prophet and Her Audience: Gender and Knowledge in the World Turned Upside Down.” In *Reviving the English Revolution: Reflections and Elaborations on the Work of Christopher Hill*, edited by Geogg Eley and William Hunt, 139-152. London: Verso, 1988.

Maddison, Robert E.W. *The Life of the Honourable Robert Boyle F.R.S.* London: Taylor and Francis, 1969.

Mandelbrote, Scott. “John Dury and the Practice of Irenicism,” In *Religious Change in Europe, 1650-1914: Essays for John McManners*, edited by Nigel Aston, 41-58. New York: Oxford University Press, 1997.

Marshall, Paul A. *A Kind of Life Imposed on Man: Vocation and Social Order from Tyndale to Locke*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1996.

Maxwell, Felicity Lyn. “Calling for Collaboration: Women and Public Service in Dorothy Moore’s Transnational Protestant Correspondence.” *Literature compass* 14, no. 4 (2017).

Maxwell, Felicity Lyn. “Pastoral Cares, Covenant, and Courtship in John Dury’s Personal Correspondence, 1641-5.” In *The Clergy in Early Modern Scotland,* edited by Chris R. Langely, Catherine E McMillan, and Russell Newton, 186- 206. Boydell & Brewer, Boydell Press: 2021.

Pal, Carol. *Republic of Women: Rethinking the Republic of Letters in the Seventeenth Century*. Ideas in Context. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.

Panek, Jennifer. *Widows and Suitors in Early Modern English Comedy*. 1st ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Perceval-Maxwell, M. “Annesley, Arthur, first early of Anglesey (1614-1686), politician.” *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.* 23 Sep. 2004.

Perry, Ruth. *The Celebrated Mary Astell: An Early English Feminist.* Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1986.

Quintrell, Brian. “Juxon, William (bap.1582, d. 1663), archbishop of Canterbury.” *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.* 23 Sep. 2004.

Rae, Thomas H. H. *John Dury and the Royal Road to Piety*. Vol. 37, Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1998.

Schneider, Gary. *The Culture of Epistolarity: Vernacular Letters and Letter Writing in Early Modern England, 1500-1700.* Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2005.

Smith, Hilda L. *Reason’s Disciples: Seventeenth-Century English Feminists*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1982.

Smith, Hilda, “The Radical Nature of Mary Astell’s Christian Feminism.” In *Feminist History of Philosophy: The Recovery and Evaluation of Women’s Philosophical Thought,* edited by Eileen O’Neill and Marcy P. Lascano, 301-317. Springer International Publishing, 2019.

Thomas, Keith. *The Ends of Life: Roads to Fulfilment in Early Modern England*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.

Todd, Barbara J. “The remarrying widow: a stereotype reconsidered.” In *Women in English Society 1500-1800*, edited by Mary Prior, 25-52. Florence: Routledge, 1985.

Vallance, Edward. *Revolutionary England and the National Covenant: State Oaths, Protestantism, and the Political Nation, 1553-1682*. Boydell Press, 2005.

Webster, Charles. *The Great Instauration: Science, Medicine, and Reform, 1626-1660*. London: Duckworth, 1975.

Wingren, Gustaf. *Luther on Vocation*. Translated by Carl C. Ramussen. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1957.

Wright, Louis B. *Middle-Class Culture in Elizabethan England*. The University of North Carolina Press, 1935.