Introduction

On the evidence of novels, poetry, and paintings, the Victorians were obsessed with the English Revolution. Imagining the British past as the prototype of an idealized present, the Victorian cult of domesticity drew upon the image of the Caroline royal family. Frederick Goodall's 1853 *An Episode in the Happier Days of Charles I* (fig. 1) depicts Charles I, Henrietta Maria and their young children feeding swans, while on a royal shallop barge moving slowly down the Thames. A characteristically Van Dyckian Charles I, sporting long hair, brushed-up moustache, and pointed beard, dressed in a black silk doublet with falling ruff collar, and wearing his lesser George medallion, stands over his seated wife and daughter. Henrietta Maria, her hair stylishly dressed in side ringlets, wears a deep rose satin gown with an elaborate collar and large, puff sleeves; holding a King Charles spaniel in her lap, the queen attends closely to her rosy and plump-cheeked young daughter, who is feeding two large swans.

Along with the royal family, servants and retainers crowd the flat-bottomed, six-oared royal barge, ornate with gold-leafed decoration and featuring a drapery-covered tilt or cabin for shelter, as it moves slowly towards an arched river entrance near which a waiting crowd gathers. The rich clothing, liveried retinue of servants, and elaborate barge all serve to display the wealth and status of the royal family. Goodall, as with other Victorian artists, depicts the early Stuart family with the same sentimentalized domesticity found in the portraits of Queen Victoria, Prince Albert, and their children at leisure in the nursery or in their private apartments, the children playing happily as their parents look on affectionately.[1] And yet this is also a typically middle-class moment of family leisure and pleasure: a summer-day activity of feeding the swans, in which all English subjects (albeit without the barge and retinue) could participate. No actual symbols of monarchy appear that would make the family unique rather than an idealized prototype for the nation.

Art historian Roy Strong, in an early influential study of Victorian recreations of the past, remarks that Goodall's portrait, 'in which the tragic

1 Frederick Goodall, *An Episode in the Happier Days of Charles I* (1853).

King, his beautiful Queen and even more adorable children sail down-river on a summer's day, made me a Cavalier for life'.[2] He also notes that such images, although an integral part of his own education in mid-twentieth-century Britain, have 'long been banished from school textbooks as inaccurate, misleading, and unauthentic'.[3] Strong sets out to examine why the Victorians were so interested in certain periods, including the Stuart age and the mid-seventeenth-century Revolution. Indeed, the Victorians produced more scenes of Charles I and Henrietta Maria, of Oliver Cromwell, and of the struggle of cavalier versus roundhead than they did of any other period of British history.[4] Yet, as Strong examines the Victorian transformation of seventeenth-century past into sentimentalized present, he repeats the negative judgements and charges of inauthenticity. Having noted how 'the family of Charles I [is] evoked to mirror the domestic bliss of the present royal family', Strong goes on to characterize 'the use of motifs from Van Dyck to suggest a refinement of bourgeois ideals of family life' as 'a radical distortion of what the portraits of Charles I and his court were really about'.[5] As for Victorian depictions of Henrietta Maria as 'the perfect Victorian gentlewoman', Strong objects that 'Nothing could have been further from the truth, but the artists remained undeterred by the facts staring them in the face'.[6]

But did the Victorians indeed misrecognize domesticity in Caroline portraiture? Were their renditions of Charles I, Henrietta Maria, and their children utter violations of what the original portraiture was about? Were monarchical representations – and their various appropriations and contestations – opposed to and separate from the domestic? Or have we as scholars missed a politicized use of domesticity 'staring [us] in the face' in Caroline portraiture and in civil war propaganda and print on the royal family?

While Strong seems to contrast the authenticity of Victoria's family life with the artistic 'distortion' of the realities of the Caroline court, recent work on Victorian visual culture has stressed the highly constructed nature of the domestic even within the nineteenth-century portraiture of Victoria, Albert, and their large family.[7] Such portraiture staged, rather than revealed, the 'private' family image. Victoria herself, although notoriously ambivalent about her young children, was pleased with the family propaganda, writing that 'They say *no* Sovereign was *more loved* than I am . . . and that from our *happy domestic home* – which gives such a good example.'[8] Yet such domestic portraiture also showed the gendered tensions of female rule: Queen Victoria could secure her power only by seeming to cede it as deferential wife and loving mother.[9]

Despite the undeniable differences between sentimentalized portraits of Victoria and Albert and the opulent glamour of Sir Anthony Van Dyck's

Charles I and Henrietta Maria, I would argue that these royal representations share the use of the domestic as a political tool.[10] Van Dyck's depictions of the king and queen as husband and wife, mother and father, and of the royal children deployed a strikingly new combination of the dynastic and domestic in 1630s England, with powerful but mixed effects. And long before Goodall and other Victorian artists sentimentalized and refashioned Van Dyck images in the Victorian cult of domesticity, the image of the Stuart family had been appropriated, contested, and boldly reworked in popular print through civil war, regicide, and republic. This book aims to recover and examine the significance of that important seventeenth-century mode of royal representation, as well as the discourses that contested and opposed it, from parliamentary polemic to John Milton's epic poem.

This book examines the politicizing of the domestic in representations of sovereign power in England from the 1630s to the 1660s, including both the thematizing of the household and royal family in visual and printed representations and such representations themselves becoming domestic objects. Tracing politicized uses of domesticity in representations of Henrietta Maria and Charles I, Elizabeth and Oliver Cromwell, and Milton's Adam and Eve reconstitutes a contemporary discourse that has been unrecognized, or told piecemeal in separate scholarly disciplines or sub-disciplines. The images are domestic in that they are produced in England with a sense of English identity and imagined community.[11] They depict domestic relations (marriage, motherhood, fatherhood), domestic activities such as housewifery or household devotion, and domestic spaces such as closets, cabinets, bedrooms, bowers, and kitchens. And they become material objects in the domestic realm, well used by early owners and readers in their own closets and cabinets.

Politics, especially the high politics of the court and narratives of Whitehall and Westminster, have traditionally been seen as having little in common with the domestic or private sphere, or with women and the middle classes. Yet, as the Victorian portraiture suggests, politics and domesticity come together in a powerful if contested mode of monarchical representation in the years of the English Revolution and beyond. Attentive to the etymological derivation of 'politics' from the *polis* or state, involving matters of public life, authority, government, and power, I use 'politicizing' to mean engaged in or talking about high politics, making political or politically aware; 'propagandizing'.[12] Drawing on the resonant meanings of domesticity, as 'the quality or state of being domestic, home, or family life; devotion to home; homeliness', derived from '*domus* (house, home)',[13] I look at the shifting and contested uses of the domestic in representing sovereign power in a period of unprecedented upheaval and change.

Scholars have long recognized that the language of family encodes political power in the early modern period. Most broadly, the king's power was seen as patriarchal, emanating from Adam. That paternal (and Adamic) authority grounded kingly authority was reiterated in texts going back to Aristotle and much cited in royalist polemics, including Robert Filmer's *Patriarcha* (written in the middle of the century although not published until the later seventeenth century).[14] The king was seen as head and father, not only of his family but of his subjects, although other uses were made of the state–family analogy in this period.[15] And the analogy between father and king does not account for the powerful and contested domestic representations of Charles I and Henrietta Maria. Part of what was revolutionary in mid-seventeenth-century England was a seeming intimacy with the royal couple, a look into their private affairs and recreations. Yet the language of the domestic, particularly when gendered feminine and linked with queens and their wifely or even housewifely activities, destabilized the very dynasty it was meant to undergird.

Fraught with tension in the Caroline court itself, domesticized representations paradoxically became more effective in the absence of the monarchy, preserving the royal image and forging new affective bonds between monarch and subject. Such representations began in the 1630s, but the English Revolution – which seemed initially to turn the language of privacy, family, and marriage against the king and queen – actually enhanced the uses of the domestic in royal representations. Indeed, posthumously, the representation of Charles as father, husband, and family man was more successful than in life, and, in exile, the controversial and disliked Catholic Queen Henrietta Maria could be fully domesticated as England's 'Sovereign Mistress'. The royal domestic as a kind of political imaginary took fullest form in the absence of monarchy. Domestic representations of sovereign power became a lasting hallmark of the British monarchy not despite but because of the English Revolution.

Recognizing the politicized deployment of the domestic in representations of Charles I and Henrietta Maria cuts across fields and categories by which we have become accustomed to think about the seventeenth century. The monarchy is, seemingly by definition, public, and represented itself by ceremonial display before assenting observers. By tracing a tightly connected group of visual images and printed texts at a time of profound crisis, this project shows not only the deep instabilities of the binaries of public/private, domestic/political, sovereign/subject, but the transformation of the royal family image, its move out of court, and its uses as material object in the domestic sphere. This moment of domesticated sovereignty both speaks

to the power of propaganda and public debate at a moment of particular crisis and makes possible a mode of sovereign representation that will recur from Charles I and Henrietta Maria, to the Stuart queens Mary and Anne, to Queen Victoria and beyond.

Scholars continue to debate the causes and effects (long-term or short-term) of the English civil wars. The relationship of culture, including art and literature broadly defined, to high politics in this period has been part of that debate. Was the Caroline court isolated and out of touch? Or did the court successfully propagate an image of harmony, order, and virtue that was overshadowed only in the late 1630s with the crisis in Scottish–English relations? Was there a successful republican culture after 1649? Or, did monarchical forms continue to dominate, part of the long-term failure of the republic and the Cromwellian Protectorate?

This book offers an alternative to the binaries of successfully disseminated or isolated court culture and of successful or failed republican culture. Focusing on political culture from the 1630s through to the 1660s, I look at the tensions, fault-lines, and contest over one central strand of representation of sovereign power. We shall see that images of marriage, family, and domestic relations, beginning with Charles I and Henrietta Maria, were strikingly new and effective. But we shall also explore how visual and printed images of the royal couple and family could enhance the very anxieties – about the French, Catholic queen and the seemingly uxorious king – that they were designed to forestall.

That court painter Sir Anthony Van Dyck idealized and publicized the Stuart monarchy through images of family has been recognized.[16] But precisely how that representation both addressed and heightened anxieties has been less noted. And little scholarly attention has been given to the crucial intersection of high politics and the domestic in royalist and republican propaganda during the civil wars, under the republic, and after the Restoration.[17] How did the Caroline court represent the king and queen's relationship? How were private household matters used against the king in civil war propaganda? How did domestic representations of the king and queen both preserve and transform the monarchical image in conditions of defeat and exile? How did the royal image itself become a material object within the households of loyal subjects? In turn, how were purported disclosures of private spaces and domestic practices used to satirize the upstart protectoral court of Oliver and Elizabeth Cromwell before and after the Restoration? How did Milton's literary epic meditate on the failure and rehabilitation of domestic and civic virtue?

ORGANIZATION AND OVERVIEW

Organized chronologically and focused on an exchange of texts in moments of crisis, the six chapters of this study aim to answer these questions. Chapter 1 turns to the portraiture of the Caroline court, beginning with Van Dyck's elegant representations of the king and queen together and with their offspring.[18] Such portraiture strikingly combines the dynastic and the domestic, in contrast to the hyperbolic dynastic representation of Henrietta Maria's mother in Rubens's Medici Cycle. But such images could both assimilate the foreign, Catholic queen and raise anxiety about her proximity to the king, especially after a confluence of high-handed decisions and ill-considered actions. In the 1630s, Charles's rule without Parliament, fiscal innovation, ecclesiastical policies, and legal manoeuvres evoked the spectre of continental Catholic absolutism, while the queen's lavish and well-attended Catholic chapels, several highly visible Catholic conversions at court and the reintroduction of a papal envoy raised fears of a popish plot.[19] In 1638–9, Charles's imposition of the Prayer Book on the Scots resulted in war between England and Scotland, and the queen's soliciting funds from Catholics for the war only heightened suspicions and fears. Representations of the close royal marriage, under these circumstances, could have unintended effects. We shall see that even within the court, then, the royal image contained gendered instability, as the queen consort and a highly sexualized, fertile marriage were inserted into the representation of male dynasty. And outside the court, mapping the domestic on to images of the king and queen as husband and wife, father and mother, both bolstered a public image and raised expectations and doubts: and eventually outright opposition.

Chapter 2 examines how images of gender disorder in the royal household and, concomitantly, political disorder in the nation became part of parliamentary propaganda in the English Revolution. We shall explore how *The Kings Cabinet Opened* (1645), the notorious parliamentary publication of the king's letters captured after the battle of Naseby, framed Queen Henrietta Maria as threatening and domineering and King Charles as devious, pro-Catholic, hen-pecked, and uxorious. While recognizing the tract as a crucial turning point in the English civil wars, scholars have tended to echo Parliament's own rhetoric of revelation and disclosure, of the self-evident nature of the king's own hand. By drawing on previously unpublished holograph letters from the House of Lords Record Office, this chapter shows that, despite the language of revelation and discovery, Parliament carefully selected, omitted, translated, deciphered, ordered,

and shaped the original letters to foreground gender disorder in the household and state and to undermine public confidence in the king. Yet such exposure, while immediately damaging, also gave royalists a new language of royal domesticity that could serve for a counter-appeal.

Chapter 3, in turn, looks at a crucial royalist counter-revelation, the disclosure of the solitary king's pious and 'private' prayers and deathbed meditations in the best-selling *Eikon Basilike* (1649), printed immediately after the regicide in January 1649. Bringing new print and archival materials (especially visual images added to later editions and early readers' markings) to scholarly discussion of this text, this chapter demonstrates a new emphasis on family that underscores both dynastic succession and affective family bonds. But we shall also see how, by stressing family, the text becomes a legacy to all loyal subjects and readers, its political content rewritten as martyrdom and meditation. Two contemporary readers, John Quarles and John Milton, produce starkly contrasting responses to *Eikon Basilike*, as Milton strives to bring the text into the rational debate of the public sphere, while Quarles embraces its domestic privacy, depicting a lachrymose deathbed farewell between king and queen. Milton's critique found little audience. But ironically, examination of early readers' markings on *Eikon Basilike* reveals that the very success of the domestic language that Milton opposed blunts the political edge and effect of the king's book. The book preserves the image of the monarch as father of his people, but it does not serve as a call to action.

Turning to the politics of the domestic under the Protectorate, Chapter 4 brings into scholarly light a much-reprinted cookery book, which promises to divulge the recipes presented to Henrietta Maria in her 'private Recreations'. *The Queens Closet Opened* (1655) appeared early in the Cromwellian Protectorate and was reprinted more than two dozen times by 1700. Yet I argue that while the cookery book claimed to preserve the queen's memory, it all but erased her presence; recipes list objective directions and, far from disclosing any personal habits of the queen, are attributed to a bevy of English ladies and lords, countesses and gentlewomen. Finally, we shall explore how early readers' markings in extant copies of this much-used book show that the very genre of the recipe book invited readers to be activist and to imitate, correct, and even reproduce queenly virtues.

The importance of domestic language for legitimating sovereign power after the fall of the Protectorate and, subsequently, the return of the Stuart monarchy with Charles II is examined in Chapter 5. This chapter focuses on *The Court & Kitchin of Elizabeth* (1664), a royalist cookery book that satirizes the vulgarity, avarice, and disorder of the household of the upstarts

Elizabeth and Oliver Cromwell, and the failure of Protectoral dynasty. But the satire breaks down when the lively and energetic figure of Elizabeth proves to be anything but a 'drudge', and her recipes turn out not to be noticeably different from other cookery books, including the queen's. And despite its insistence that common subjects cannot imitate royal munificence, *The Court & Kitchin* appears at a time when the hospitality of the new king's own household was faltering. Examination of early readers' markings will underscore that publishing Elizabeth Cromwell's impersonation of monarchy gives her the very status and visibility that the satiric cookery book strives to deny.

Finally, Chapter 6 considers how John Milton's *Paradise Lost* (1667) boldly constructs a prelapsarian domestic space marked by republican virtues, reason, and choice, and defined against the court. Looking for the first time at the remarkable will and inventory left by Milton's widow, Elizabeth Minshull, this chapter uses the material culture of Milton's own household as a lens on the representation of domestic and civic virtue in *Paradise Lost*. Housewifely expertise evinced by the numerous cookery implements in the widow's household effects reappears in Eve's striking culinary expertise in Eden, with new emphasis on reason and choice that undergird not only the household but the state. Yet that same expertise also causes tensions within the marital hierarchy of Eden that lead to debate, separation, and fall, with the incursion into Eden of a courtier-like Satan. Rewriting *Paradise Lost* as a rhymed royalist opera, *The State of Innocence* (1677), John Dryden embraces Satanic courtly language in his dedication to a Catholic princess, Mary of Modena, and transforms Milton's Eve from rural housewife to courtly mistress.

Only pieces of this story have been explored before: by literary scholars, historians, and art historians. Biographies treat Charles I and Henrietta Maria discretely rather than as a unit and do not give sustained attention to visual, literary, and printed representations. Scholars looking at representations have focused largely on the Caroline court, debating whether the paintings, masques, and poetry that celebrated the king and queen were effective and accessible, or part of a growing cultural gap that exasperated tensions leading up to civil war.[20] The considerable body of scholarly discourse on *The Kings Cabinet Opened* has largely echoed the parliament's own rhetoric of disclosure and revelation, without consideration of the changes made to the original letters. While *Eikon Basilike* has received considerable scholarly attention, this has focused largely on martyrology, idolatry, and iconoclasm, taking too much at face value the presentation of the king as world-denying martyr. Long neglected in English cultural and

political history, Henrietta Maria has only recently begun to receive sustained attention, and this important work has largely been separate from studies of Charles I.[21] Historians are virtually silent on Elizabeth Cromwell, who is indeed absent from official records but prominent in certain royalist satires.[22] And scholars treating politics in Milton's *Paradise Lost* typically focus on the scenes in hell and heaven overtly concerned with rebellion and monarchy, relegating the domestic spaces of Eden to the private,[23] while scholars treating Eve, Eden, or gender in the poem seldom consider high politics.[24]

My study thus addresses gaps in literary, cultural, and political history. Drawing on manuscript and printed letters, newsbooks, satiric verse, polemical pamphlets, state papers, foreign correspondence, county records, cookery books, paintings, engravings, poetry, and drama, this study undertakes a rigorous analysis of the construction of domestic spaces, relations, and activities in texts purporting to represent the royal – or would-be royal – family. Bringing together texts at the centre of civil war polemics with such seemingly marginal works as cookery books and satiric playlets, this study offers a new and historically grounded account of domesticity, print, and national politics in revolutionary England. A sustained look at representations of Charles I and Henrietta Maria and of Elizabeth and Oliver Cromwell reveals the close thrust and parry of revolutionary polemics. At the same time, I situate a major canonical author, John Milton, in a precise cultural and political context that reveals how a literary epic boldly engages the contested terrain of the household in determining the values of the good citizen and the proper authority in the nation.

PUBLIC AND PRIVATE

My examination of politicized uses of domesticity both engages and modifies dominant theoretical modes of conceptualizing public and private in early modern England. Scholarship on the events of seventeenth-century England has drawn extensively on the work of Jürgen Habermas, who traced the emergence of a public sphere of rational debate growing out of and contrasted to the representative publicity of monarchy.[25] Habermas's model is present-oriented in that he wishes to critique the consumption of modern-day mass media culture, as opposed to the rational discourse and oppositional debate of the early bourgeois public sphere. For Habermas, the public depends on the private: his model draws on the ancient distinction between *polis* and *oikos*, but he in fact envisions the public sphere as consisting of private individuals who come together for rational discussion.