

Introduction
The Intellectual Span of Margaret Cavendish,
Duchess of Newcastle
Brandie R. Siegfried and Lisa Walters

Margaret Lucas Cavendish, one of the most prolific and fascinating intellectual figures of the seventeenth century, was a poet, natural philosopher, dramatist, biographer, novelist, social philosopher, and essayist. Thanks to recuperative efforts that began in the mid-twentieth century, interest in her work has accelerated considerably, and in recent years she has been the subject of monographs, essay collections, and scholarly editions from specialists representing a wide array of disciplines.¹ Cavendish's popularity among scholars is matched by her celebrity outside academia, for she frequently appears in popular culture as well as lecture halls. Recent award-winning fiction takes Cavendish as central to thematic development, as in Siri Hustvedt's novel, *The Blazing World* (2014), or as a protagonist in her own right, as in Danielle Dutton's biographical fiction, *Margaret the First* (2016). On the basis of Cavendish's *Blazing World* and its unique place in the history of genre fiction, she has become a topic of interest at science fiction and fantasy conventions, and her works are excerpted by fans on a multitude of related websites and fanzines. *Wired* magazine recently listed *The Blazing World* first out of twenty-five science fiction books that everyone should read.² Cavendish's revival by science fiction fans is mirrored in popular biography, where Katie Whitaker's emphasis on the *Extraordinary Life of Margaret, Duchess of Newcastle* (2002) updates previous tomes developed about Cavendish's fascinating life.³ No surprise that Cavendish is featured in a short film titled *The Blazing World* (2018), which was nominated at Sundance for the 2018 Short Film Grand Jury Prize.⁴

¹ See the Select Bibliography in this volume for several fine examples.

² "25 of the best science fiction books everyone should read," *Wired* (October 28, 2020).

³ See Katie Whitaker, *Mad Madge: The Extraordinary Life of Margaret Cavendish, Duchess of Newcastle, The First Woman to Live by Her Pen* (New York: Basic Books, 2002). Despite the unfortunate main title, this is the most thorough biography currently available.

⁴ www.imdb.com/name/nm2584304/awards, last accessed June 23, 2020.

Thankfully, the “harebrained” straitjacket proffered Cavendish early in the twentieth century by literary critic and author Virginia Woolf has been mostly discarded, despite the seductive delights of Woolf’s biting dismissals. Of course, Woolf was actually lamenting, in her barbed and witty way, the fact that Cavendish had not been given the educational opportunities of her male peers. In contrast to Woolf’s assessment, late twentieth-century feminists celebrated the Duchess’s literary quirks, creativity, and penchant for parody, and more recent treatments of Cavendish’s philosophy have stressed the systematic development of ideas across the span of her *oeuvre*, demarcating ground shared with other philosophers (her contemporaries as well as the ancients) and mapping the new intellectual territory that was, in fact, properly Cavendish’s. A range of interdisciplinary perspectives upon this diverse and prolific figure provides a rich understanding of her life and works.

Cavendish’s Life and Works

Born Margaret Lucas in Essex (c. 1623), Cavendish tells us she had a happy childhood, but civil war broke out during her late teens and her family eventually resettled in Oxford (the royalist stronghold where the court temporarily resided). In Oxford two things happened: Cavendish became a maid of honor to Queen Henrietta Maria and found herself – at least temporarily – living in the heart of Oxford’s university. Regarding the latter circumstance, Marina Leslie reminds us that

Margaret’s relationship to, and experience of, the university as an institution of higher learning was more complex than a straightforward narrative of gendered exclusion might suggest. She literally came of age at the storied university. . . [when] Merton College, as Henrietta Maria’s residence, was transformed into a center of female power. Meanwhile, across Oxford, the wives and daughters of Royalist lords and cavaliers intermingled with soldiers, students, and dons in the once all-male preserve.⁵

Her early experience at Oxford was formative, and Margaret would reimagine such academic intermingling in a variety of literary forms throughout her career.

Later, having followed the Queen to exile in Paris, Margaret Lucas met and was wooed by the Royalist commander William Cavendish (then

⁵ Marina Leslie, “The Pre-Neo-Liberal Education of Margaret Cavendish: University, Convent, Scientific Society, and the Institutions of Seventeenth-Century Knowledge Production.” Paper presented at the Biennial Meeting of the International Margaret Cavendish Society, Trondheim, Norway, June 2019. With permission of the author.

Introduction: The Intellectual Span of Margaret Cavendish 3

Marquise of Newcastle).⁶ The couple eventually settled in Antwerp where they rented Peter Paul Rubens' old house for the duration of their exile during the 1650s. From late 1651 to sometime early in 1653, Margaret Cavendish returned to London with her brother-in-law Charles for an interlude meant to stitch up the family's post-revolution finances. As a polymath possessed of a prodigiously inquisitive nature, during this visit she wrote and published her first two books, *Philosophical Fancies* and *Poems, and Fancies* (1653, later revised and reissued in 1664 and 1668). Charles was a significant influence in this endeavor. He was an avid participant in the international republic of letters, maintaining a lively correspondence with several of the most prominent European thinkers of the day, and apparently shared a good deal of that correspondence with Margaret.

Additionally, we are told that Charles brought with him to England a very large barrel of books, and Margaret seems to have worked her way through many of those tomes, often, as she acknowledges in her early memoir of 1656, with Charles's attentive and instructive aid. She ranged through classical works such as Euclid's *Elements*, Aristotle's *Ethics*, and Lucretius's *On the Nature of Things*, while writing her poems on geometry, perspective, and natural phenomena. She wove into her book recognizable threads from writers such as Spenser, Shakespeare, Wroth, Montaigne, Donne, and many others as she poetically mapped the terrain of the human psyche and its place in the larger frame of a world made up of energy and matter.⁷

Cavendish would publish twelve separate volumes between 1653 and 1668, revising and reissuing many of them. Her first three publications — *Poems, and Fancies* (1653), *Philosophicall Fancies* (1653), and *The Philosophical and Physical Opinions* (1655) — each stake a claim for her steadily evolving scientific theories.⁸ *The Worlds Olio* (1655)⁹ extended her proclivity for literary experimentation, a trend that continued in 1656 with *Natures Pictures Drawn by Fancie's Pencil to the Life*, which included the

⁶ William was made Marquise in 1643. See Margaret Cavendish, *The Life of the Thrice Noble, High and Puissant Prince William Cavendish, Duke, Marquess, and Earl of Newcastle* (London, 1667), p. 36.

⁷ For a more expansive introduction to Cavendish's engagement with these authors, see the introduction in *Margaret Cavendish, Poems and Fancies with The Animal Parliament*, ed. Brandie R. Siegfried (Toronto, ON: Iter Press, 2018), pp. 1–54.

⁸ *Philosophicall Fancies* was revised and expanded as *The Philosophical and Physical Opinions* in 1655 and 1663. The latter, in turn, would be further revised, expanded and reissued as the *Grounds of Natural Philosophy* in 1668.

⁹ Cavendish tells us this was her first book, written before *Poems, and Fancies*, though released for print later.

autobiographical *A True Relation*. Afterwards *Playes and Orations of Diverse Sorts* (1662 and 1663), and *CCXI Sociable Letters* (1664) deepened her mastery of rhetorical modes, while her revised edition of *Philosophical and Physical Opinions* (1663), a work she frequently mentions in subsequent philosophical treatises, expanded her scientific repertoire. In 1664 she also published *Philosophical Letters* and completed the much-revised second edition of *Poems and Phancies*,¹⁰ before moving on to *Observations upon Experimental Philosophy* to which was appended a science fiction romance, *the Description of a New World, Called the Blazing World* (1666).¹¹ The story was further published the same year as a standalone edition.¹² Her next publication was the biography of her husband titled *The Life of the Thrice Noble, High and Puissant Prince, William Cavendish, Duke, Marquess and Earl of Newcastle* (1667), which became something of a sensation, and Samuel Pepys – who claims not to have been a fan of Cavendish – nevertheless, stayed home from work all day to read it.¹³

The following year, 1668, Cavendish published *Grounds of Natural Philosophy* and *Plays, Never Before Printed*. Besides these, in 1668 she republished another standalone edition of *The Blazing World*; *Orations of Divers Sorts*; another edition of *Observations upon Experimental Philosophy* with *The Blazing World* again appended; and the third edition of *Poems, or, Several Fancies in Verse*. In 1671, second editions of *Natures Pictures* (minus *A True Relation*) and *The Worlds Olio* appeared in print, and three years after Cavendish's death in 1673, her husband William published *Letters and Poems in Honour of the Incomparable Princess Margaret, Dutchess of Newcastle*.¹⁴ This last volume included items written in memoriam, as well as letters and poems addressed to Cavendish during her lifetime.

Cavendish, Literary Culture, and the Scientific Revolution

Cavendish's achievements took place among male peers whose formal education seemed a formidable barrier to serious intellectual conversation.

¹⁰ For clarity, the present volume spells all three editions of Cavendish's book of poems as *Poems and Fancies* without variant grammar and spelling.

¹¹ For more on the dual nature of the volume, see Sara H. Mendelson, "Introduction," in Margaret Cavendish, *A Description of the Blazing World* ed. Sara H. Mendelson (Peterborough, ON: Broadview, 2016), pp. 21–2.

¹² The full title is *The Description of a New World, Called the Blazing World* (1666), but is generally known today as *The Blazing World*.

¹³ Samuel Pepys, *The Diary of Samuel Pepys*, eds. Robert Latham and William Matthews, 11 vols. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1974), IX, 123–4.

¹⁴ A Latin translation of her biography was also published in 1668. In 1675, two years after her death, another English edition of it was published.

Introduction: The Intellectual Span of Margaret Cavendish 5

Nevertheless, she was resolute. In a period when few women published – and even fewer published their own theories on topics belonging to the natural and social sciences – Cavendish’s intrepid determination to send her own ideas sailing into the public realm of inquiry remains a bright spot in the history of science. Indeed, Cavendish is an important figure for understanding the seventeenth century’s collective efforts at advancing knowledge (now popularly known as the scientific revolution), particularly given that her natural philosophy engaged with – and frequently challenged – the work of luminaries in both ancient and contemporary science and philosophy. Plato, Aristotle, Epicurus, the Stoics, Bacon, Descartes, Hobbes, Gassendi, Hooke, Boyle and many more are taken up in her writing, and additional accounts of her place in the history of science are even now being written.

Thanks to her extensive reading, Cavendish realized that her own ideas about the natural world overlapped with some of the philosophical works she encountered, but she also understood that her theories departed radically from most. As chapters in this volume demonstrate, she developed a complex vitalist-materialist ontology meant to explain Nature’s self-moving and self-knowing parts. Moreover, though classical philosophers often couched their science in poetry, the seventeenth century saw a preference for essays and treatises. Cavendish explored her philosophical and scientific inquiries in an unusually wide variety of popular literary forms, something relatively rare in the period: Francis Bacon narrated some of his natural philosophy in his fictional *New Atlantis*, Galileo opted for dramatic exchange in his *Dialogue Concerning the Two Chief World Systems*, and Henry More set his philosophy to poetry.¹⁵ However, no other natural philosopher of the early modern era developed the sheer breadth of literary versatility and inventiveness peculiar to Cavendish, who explored her philosophy and science in poetry, romance, orations, fictional letters, science fiction, and drama. In turn, while Cavendish drew from the works of a range of literary figures such as Thomas More, William Shakespeare, Aemilia Lanyer, John Donne, and Mary Wroth, none of her literary forbears or contemporaries shared the depth and breadth of her philosophical and scientific thinking. In *Poems and Fancies*, for example, Cavendish developed delightful poems on nature, yet layered them with meditations on recent developments in algebraic geometry, advances she put to use in her thoughts about particle theory, space, and time.¹⁶ In

¹⁵ See, for example, Henry More’s *Democritus Platonissans* (1646) or *Philosophical Poems* (1647).

¹⁶ For more details, see Cavendish, *Poems and Fancies*, pp. 22–34.

short, Cavendish's scientific endeavors included investigations into an impressive range of topics – atomism, political theory, biology, chemistry, medicine, the plenum, folklore, psychology, anatomy, optics, magnetism, astronomy, meteorology, mathematics, race, moral philosophy, ecology, education, and the status of women – while her literary experimentation gave those same investigations pleasurable modes meant to welcome all readers.

Cavendish's Influence and Reception

In their investigation into printed auction catalogues during the late Restoration period, Marie-Louise Coolahan and Mark Empey discovered that Cavendish was the most circulated British female author in advertisements aimed at those eager to supplement their personal libraries.¹⁷ The only female writer who featured more prominently in such catalogues was the French author Madeleine de Scudéry. While both Cavendish and Scudéry were unusually prolific (such that their work might necessarily be in more frequent circulation), this data nonetheless challenges previous assumptions about Cavendish's general reception. Not only do auction catalogues show that Cavendish's work was in frequent circulation, but comments from her contemporaries also indicate that her works were well known, widely disseminated, and often admired. While discussing her "Incomparable POEMS," the dramatist George Etherege wrote that Cavendish's "Fame" in her own "Countrey has no Bounds!"¹⁸ In 1653, Robert Creyghtone, a fellow of Trinity College who would eventually become Bishop of Bath and Wells, enthusiastically initiated a correspondence with Cavendish, asserting that if

those Antients [were] now alive, who first discoursed of Atomes, Matter, Form, and other Ingredients of the Worlds Fabrick, they would hang their Heads, confounded to see a Lady of most Honourable Extraction, in Prime of youth, amidst a thousand fasheries of greatness, say more of their own Mysteries.¹⁹

¹⁷ See Marie-Louise Coolahan and Mark Empey, "There Are Numbers of Very Choice Books': Book Ownership and the Circulation of Women's Texts, 1680–98," in Jennie Batchelor and Gillian Dow (eds.), *Women's Writing, 1660–1830: Feminisms and Futures* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016), pp. 139–57.

¹⁸ George Etherege, "To the most Illustrious and most Excellent Princess," in William Cavendish (ed.), *Letters and Poems in Honour of the Incomparable Princess, Margaret, Duchess of Newcastle* (London, 1676), p. 153.

¹⁹ Robert Creyghtone, "Utrecht, Dec. 2. 1653," in *ibid.*, p. 87.

Introduction: The Intellectual Span of Margaret Cavendish 7

If the compliment seems a bit baroque, such were the manners of the day. In fact, Creyghtone and Etherege were not the only prominent intellectual men to admire and respond to her work. Members of the Royal Society such as Walter Charleton and Joseph Glanvill claimed that Cavendish was proof that women could be philosophers, or as John Evelyn wrote (following Descartes and François Poullain de la Barre), “There is no sex in the mind.”²⁰ Cavendish was commended not only by a number of male scientists and philosophers, she was also publicly praised by women such as Sarah Jinner, author of a popular almanac, who invoked prominent female authors such as Cavendish to justify her own choice to publish. Similarly, when championing education for women, Bathsua Makin turned to Cavendish as an example she knew would be well known to (and popular with) her audience: “The present Duchess of Newcastle, by her own genius rather than any timely instruction, over-tops many grave grown men.”²¹ In short, there were many in Cavendish’s day who immediately thought of the Duchess when reaching for an example of a woman who was a successful – if notorious – public intellectual.

There were certainly negative responses to Cavendish, illustrative of the cultural mores of the day. In this regard, Derek Hughes’s point about Aphra Behn is instructive: Behn’s “status as the first British woman to earn her living as a creative writer might make her seem a vulnerable and marginal figure, and it is easy to quote misogynist satire mocking her.”²²

²⁰ John Evelyn, quoted in Whitaker, *Mad Madge*, p. 311. According to Walter Charleton, Cavendish has “Convinced the world, by her own heroic example, that no studies are too hard for her softer sex, and that ladies are capable of our admiration as well for their science as for their beauty.” Walter Charleton, quoted in *ibid.*, p. 315. Similarly, Joseph Glanvill claimed that Cavendish “hath convinced the World, by a great instance, that Women may be Philosophers, and, to a Degree fit for the Ambitious emulation of the most improved Masculine Spirits.” See Joseph Glanvill, “Madam,” in William Cavendish, *Letters and Poems*, p. 136. For a summary of why men such as Kenelm Digby, Charleton, Glanvill, Nehemiah Grew, and Constantijn Huygens were eager to share their science interests with Cavendish, see Brandie R. Siegfried, “The Natural Philosophy of Margaret Cavendish, Duchess of Newcastle: Nature, Self-Knowing Matter, and the Dialogic Universe,” in Claire G. Jones, Alison E. Martin, and Alexis Wolf (eds.), *The Palgrave Handbook of Women and Science since 1660* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2021), pp. 27–45.

²¹ Sarah Jinner, “An Almanack or Prognostication for the year of our Lord 1658,” in Alan S. Weber (ed.), *Almanacs* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003), p. 17. Bathsua Makin, *An Essay to Revive the Antient Education of Gentlewomen [sic]* (1673). For more on Makin, see Francis Teague and Margaret J. M. Ezell (eds.), *Educating English Daughters: Late Seventeenth-Century Debates* (Toronto: Iter Press, 2016), p. 60. Note that Cavendish was not only famous for being a female author, but for being the only female natural philosopher invited to attend a meeting of the Royal Society. For details about this event, see Lisa T. Sarasohn, *The Natural Philosophy of Margaret Cavendish: Reason and Fancy during the Scientific Revolution* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2010), pp. 25–33.

²² Derek Hughes, “Aphra Behn and the Restoration Theatre,” in Derek Hughes and Janet Todd (eds.), *The Cambridge Companion to Aphra Behn* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), p. 29.

Yet Behn was a central figure in London theater culture and her influence continued well after she ceased penning drama, translations, and prose fiction.²³ As with Behn, so with Cavendish – the few documented attacks against her are certainly worth noting but should not be granted undue weight that would skew our understanding of Cavendish’s status and influence. Still, the negative responses can be instructive. Critics often cite, for example, an anonymous and spiteful epithet in a manuscript composed after Cavendish’s death:

Shame of her sex, Welbeck’s illustrious whore,
 The true man’s hate and grief, plague of the poor,
 The great atheistical philosophraster,
 That owns no God, no devil, lord nor master.²⁴

Referring to Cavendish as a “whore” and “Shame of her sex,” despite her husband William’s publicly proclaimed pride in her work, underscores the writer’s profound distaste for a woman entering the intellectual realm usually dominated by men. Moreover, implicit in the label “atheistical philosophraster” is Cavendish’s assertion that even the mind (or soul) is made up of matter, an explosively controversial viewpoint for early modern religious culture and certainly not in keeping with Church of England views. That Cavendish further insisted that all things have intelligence appropriate to their kind only made matters worse, for she seemed to be challenging approved hierarchies of being. Which is to say, where a modern audience might cheer for Cavendish as she shed certain doctrinal restraints, there were many in her contemporary reading audience eager to attack such relatively unfettered, female-authored natural philosophy. That is, gender was certainly at issue, but so was the core of her philosophy. Indeed, Cavendish was not the only philosopher to be attacked for views not in keeping with more traditional views on matter’s theological status: family friend Thomas Hobbes, who also eschewed notions of non-material entities, was known as the “Monster of Malmesbury, the arch-atheist, the apostle of infidelity” and “the bug-bear of the nation.” Parliament cited his theories as a probable cause of the Great Fire of 1666 and his books were

²³ Hughes notes, “in the years from 1670 to her death in 1689 Behn had at least eighteen new plays performed... During that same period, Dryden and Thomas Durfey had fourteen premieres; no man had more. In these two decades, therefore, Behn had twenty-five per cent more new plays put on than any male competitor.” Hughes, “Aphra Behn,” p. 30.

²⁴ Quoted in Sara Heller Mendelson, *The Mental World of Stuart Women: Three Studies* (Brighton: Harvester Press, 1987), p. 60.

Introduction: The Intellectual Span of Margaret Cavendish 9

banned and publicly burnt.²⁵ These historical attitudes toward his heterodox inform but do not define our current critical accounts of the man and his work. We can be comfortable treating Cavendish with similar circumspection.

To what extent were Cavendish's ideas disseminated throughout her society? She is seldom given credit for advancing Epicurean atomism in Britain, causing a stir and provoking subsequent efforts at English translations of Lucretius.²⁶ Constantijn Huygens pronounced *Poems and Fancies* (1653) a “wonderful book, whose extravagant atoms kept me from sleeping a great part of last night in this my little solitude” even as Dorothy Osborne excoriated Cavendish for venturing “at writeing book's and in vers too [*sic*].”²⁷ Publication of Cavendish's poems seems to have had a domino effect: her neighbor Lucy Hutchinson translated the entire *De rerum natura* into English a few years later and family friend John Evelyn translated the first of Lucretius' six books in 1656.²⁸ In 1682 Thomas Creech published another translation (reprinted the following year), and in 1688 Aphra Behn translated Bernard de Fontenelle's *A Discovery of New Worlds*, which explored the Epicurean theory of multiple worlds. Indeed, the numerous English translations of Lucretius emerging during this period, as well as interest in the possibility of multiple worlds, demonstrate that Epicurean ideas were increasingly gaining popularity in Britain, and Cavendish's work clearly facilitated the initial expansion of interest. A comparable trend may be seen with Cavendish's other publications (including the biography of her husband and plays featuring strong female protagonists in the habit of delivering substantial orations), suggesting a robust role for the duchess in the realm of influence studies.

Cavendish's broad sway extended beyond writers in her immediate environs. As Carolyn Merchant notes in this volume, Cavendish

²⁵ See Samuel I. Mintz, *The Hunting of Leviathan: Seventeenth-Century Reactions to the Materialism and Moral Philosophy of Thomas Hobbes* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1962), p. vii.

²⁶ For a clear account of Cavendish's early engagement with atomism, see Sarasohn, *The Natural Philosophy*, pp. 34–53.

²⁷ For Huygens, see Whitaker, *Mad Madge*, p. 170. For Osborne, see *The Letters of Dorothy Osborne to William Temple*, ed. G. C. Moore Smith (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1928), p. 37. Mildmay Fane also thought highly of Cavendish's first volume. See *The Poetry of Mildmay Fane, Second Earl of Westmorland: Poems from the Fullbeck, Harvard, and Westmorland Manuscripts*, ed. Tom Cain (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2001), pp. 292, 316–17.

²⁸ We do not know the date Hutchinson completed her translation of *De Rerum Natura*, but Dmitri Levitin convincingly argues that Hutchinson began as late as 1658, suggesting that Cavendish was the prime influence. See Dmitri Levitin, *Ancient Wisdom in the Age of the New Science: Histories of Philosophy in England, c. 1640–1700* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), p. 335.

“anticipated and articulated ideas associated with future philosophers, such as Spinoza’s pantheism, Leibniz’s vitalism, Hegel’s dialectics, and Marx and Engel’s dialectical materialism.” Indeed, Karen Detlefsen has argued that,

Cavendish’s metaphysical claim that nature is ubiquitously rational and sensitive is among her most original contributions to early modern natural philosophy. She is not alone in conceiving nature in this way; both Leibniz after her and Spinoza roughly contemporaneously would understand the world to be essentially perceptive, and Cavendish’s affinities with these two metaphysicians have not gone unnoticed.²⁹

Spinoza likely had access to Cavendish’s ideas since both philosophers corresponded regularly with members of the Huygens family, a notable hub of philosophical and scientific inquiry.³⁰ More work on the influence and connections between Cavendish and these philosophers remains to be done. Indeed, additional analyses of Cavendish in relation to the metaphysics of later philosophers will not only tell us more about her understanding of the world by way of comparison and contrast, but also allow for a more capacious understanding of thinkers whose ideas may have evolved out of continuing discussions featuring Cavendish and her stimulating philosophy.

Similarly, in this volume James Fitzmaurice has shown that Romantic authors such as Wordsworth and Coleridge read and admired Cavendish’s works, and attention to their borrowing is sorely needed. This is equally true of subsequent social reformers, and Cavendish’s place in the genealogy of advocates for female education and emancipation certainly needs more attention.³¹ In short, thinking more broadly about Cavendish’s possible influence – whether with respect to her critique of Lucretian atomism,

²⁹ Karen Detlefsen, “Reason and Freedom: Margaret Cavendish on the Order and Disorder of Nature,” *Archiv für Geschichte der Philosophie*, 89.2 (2007), 159. Detlefsen provides an enlightening and detailed discussion on how Cavendish compares with Spinoza.

³⁰ Constantijn Huygens initiated a philosophical correspondence with Cavendish and “owned all major works on science by Cavendish, in various editions” as well as her plays, poetry, and prose narratives. It is not improbable therefore that Huygens’s son, the great Dutch philosopher Christiaan Huygens would be well-informed of Cavendish’s philosophy. Christiaan and Spinoza were friends, had philosophical correspondences and lived near each other in Paris in the early and mid-1660s. See Nadine Akkerman and Marguérite Corporaal, “Mad Science Beyond Flattery: The Correspondence of Margaret Cavendish and Constantijn Huygens,” *Early Modern Literary Studies*, Special Issue 14 (2004), para 13 and 14, and Eric Schliesser, “Spinoza and the Philosophy of Science: Mathematics, Motion, and Being,” in Michael Della Rocca (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Spinoza* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017), p. 175.

³¹ This is particularly important in light of Bathsua Makin’s admiration for Cavendish and Makin’s potential influence for future reformers.