5-2018

Sex, Culture, and the Politics of Fashion in Stuart England

Emilie M. Brinkman
Purdue University

SEX, CULTURE, AND THE POLITICS OF FASHION IN STUART ENGLAND

by

Emilie M. Brinkman

A Dissertation

Submitted to the Faculty of Purdue University

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Department of History

West Lafayette, Indiana

May 2018

THE PURDUE UNIVERSITY GRADUATE SCHOOL
STATEMENT OF COMMITTEE APPROVAL

Dr. Melinda S. Zook, Chair
Department of History
Dr. James R. Farr
Department of History
Dr. A. Whitney Walton
Department of History
Dr. Silvia Z. Mitchell
Department of History

Approved by:

Dr. John L. Larson
Head of the Graduate Program

To Theodore F. Lyon, Ph.D.,

The first doctor.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT

Author: Brinkman, Emilie, M. Ph.D.
Institution: Purdue University
Degree Received: May 2018
Title: Sex, Culture, and the Politics of Fashion in Stuart England
Major Professor: Melinda S. Zook

This dissertation is the first full-length study to analyze the politicization of dress and material objects, exploring the manner in which fashion served as a site for political discourse and agency, during the seventeenth century, specifically from 1603–1702, an era characterized by profound political, religious, and social turmoil as well as increased international trade and luxury consumption. This dissertation demonstrates how fashion, which encompassed clothing, accessories, hairstyling, and cosmetics, was an important facet of political culture within Stuart England and, furthermore, was absolutely fundamental to how the English understood themselves, others, and the turbulent world they lived in. I argue that dress often figured, in both a rhetorical and material sense, at the center of political debates during the Stuart period, particularly in regards to issues of foreign influence, the threat of Catholicism, regicide, the problem of succession, "party" politics, and conceptions of "Englishness." This study analyzes a variety of primary sources including cheap printed works, royal household records, state papers, personal correspondence and diaries, as well as extant objects and court portraiture, in order to reveal how political and material culture were deeply entwined. While current histories of early modern dress emphasize the continuities of fashion during this period, this dissertation offers a reinterpretation of this traditional perspective but demonstrating how, while some styles and garments certainly changed over time, the particular political attitudes associated with such garb, such as anti-French and anti-Catholic sentiment, remained constant threads within the rich

tapestry of Stuart politics. Furthermore, this dissertation contributes to not simply the cultural and political history of Stuart England, but also important scholarship on the political agency of early modern women, seventeenth-century notions of "whiteness" and "blackness," the development of Britain's trade empire, and the concept of an English national identity.

CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

This dissertation examines the politicization of dress and other material objects, exploring the process and manner in which fashion served as a site for political discourse and agency, from the beginning of the Stuart era with the accession of James I in 1603 to the end of his grandson James II's reign and the Revolution of 1688–89.[1] As a time of intense political, religious, and social turmoil, the Stuart era represents an ideal period for this study. The seventeenth century was a period of great political change, marked by treasonous plots, civil war, regicide, parliamentary rule, succession crisis, and, ultimately, revolution. The political instability of the Stuart period affected every aspect of English life; these events not only shaped the English polity and people in a political, religious, and social sense, but also in terms of fashion and dress.

Yet, despite such continuous upheaval, Stuart England also experienced substantial luxury consumption and cultural borrowing, particularly from the Continent as well as the East and the Americas.[2] Indeed, it was during the seventeenth century that England's global empire truly began, due in great part to the acquisition of trading rights with Brazil as well as the colonies of Bombay and Tangier upon the marriage of Charles II (1660–85) to the Portuguese princess, Catherine of Braganza in 1662.[3] The material nature of England's imperial interests

[1] My dissertation utilizes the term "politicization" to refer to the process of making material goods, such as clothing, cosmetics, or furniture, a site for political discourse during the seventeenth century. T.H. Breen pioneered this concept in his analysis of how goods, like tea and stamps, were "politicized" in New England on the eve of the American Revolution. See T.H. Breen, "'Baubles of Britain:' The American and Consumer Revolutions of the Eighteenth Century," *Past & Present*, no. 119 (May 1988): 73–104. Furthermore, this dissertation utilizes the titular "Revolution of 1688–89" over the more common, yet inherently biased, name "Glorious Revolution" to describe the removal of King James II from power and the subsequent co-reigns of his son-in-law, the Dutch stadtholder William III, (r. 1689–1702) and daughter Mary II (r. 1689–94).

[2] See Linda Levy Peck, *Consuming Splendor: Society and Culture in Seventeenth-Century England* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005).

[3] Edward Corp, "Catherine of Braganza and cultural politics," in *Queenship in Britain, 1660–1837: Royal Patronage, Court Culture and Dynastic Politics*, ed. Clarissa Campbell Orr (New York: Manchester University Press, 2002), 64. See also Carla Gardina Pestana, *The English Conquest of Jamaica: Oliver Cromwell's Bid for Empire* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2017).

meant that the objects traded and imported into the isles had overt political connotations. The goods, garments, and artwork that were used, worn, and displayed throughout London as well as the great noble and genteel households reflected these imperial interests abroad. Fashion was one of the most significant, and popular, aspects of seventeenth-century consumption and thereby figured prominently within both England's imperial ambitions and, consequently, ongoing political debates within the metropole.

The Stuart era is also an optimal period for this study due to the vast wealth of both visual and printed primary sources. In particular, the seventeenth century was marked by the flourishing of print culture. Religious publications had traditionally dominated English print until the defeat of the Spanish Armada in 1588, which was followed by the subsequent appearance of victorious war ballads and pamphlets with a more political and xenophobic focus.[4] As the seventeenth century progressed, print culture became even more politicized with the expansion of parliamentary publications from the 1620s to the 1640s and again with the re-opening of the playhouses and proliferation of printed works during the Restoration.[5] The rise of the coffeehouse in late Stuart London also contributed to the development of print culture by enabling English polemicists to gather, discuss, debate and comment on significant matters of state. By the end of James II's reign in 1688, approximately one thousand booksellers and publishers operated within London.[6] This was also the period wherein the first fashion magazines emerged, following the 1678 publication of the French periodical *Nouveau Mercure Galant,*

[4] Jason McElligott, *The Perils of Print Culture: Book, Print and Publishing History in Theory and Practice* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014), 1–2.
[5] Parliamentary diaries, newsletters, separates, petitions, and copies of proceedings were printed and widely circulated throughout the country beginning in the 1620s. Such a proliferation of printed parliamentary material made it possible for a reader to obtain information regarding Parliament's daily activity. Chris R. Kyle, *Theater of State: Parliament and Political Culture in Early Stuart England* (Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 2012), 8.
[6] Helen Berry, *Gender, Society and Print Culture in Late-Stuart England: The Cultural World of the Athenian Mercury* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003), 17.

which vividly depicted the newest styles donned by European royalty and nobility.[7] Moreover, dress prints and woodcuts from France grew incredibly fashionable within Restoration London; even the celebrated diarist Samuel Pepys owned a large collection of these prints that featured detailed illustrations of the French style of dress that was all the rage at the Restoration court.[8]

Additionally, Stuart London witnessed an explosion of political literature with the proliferation of cheap print, particularly between 1660–95. This is what Mary Fissell refers to as the "lowest common denominator of print," since all social classes consumed these pamphlets, treatises, broadsides, ballads, chapbooks, petitions, sermons, gossip sheets, almanacs, poems, periodicals, and small books.[9] Indeed, pamphlets especially were one of, if not *the*, greatest form of political propaganda during the seventeenth century, particularly during moments of crisis such as the Civil Wars and the Revolution of 1688–89.[10] Cheap print was easily accessible in terms of content and availability and could be read and shared among a wide social spectrum, making it an excellent representation of English popular (or mass) culture during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

Such documents are prioritized here not simply because the subject and imagery of fashion figured most prominently within cheap printed works during the seventeenth century, but also due to the manner in which they reveal both individual and collective English voices engaged in significant political and religious debates. Cheap print allowed a significant portion

---

[7] Angela McShane and Clare Backhouse, "Top-Knots and Lower Sorts: Print and Promiscuous Consumption in the 1690s," in *Printed Images in Early Modern Britain: Essays in Interpretation*, ed. Michael Hunter (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2010), 339.

[8] Alice Doran, "An adorned print: Print culture, female leisure and the dissemination of fashion in France and England, around 1660-1779," *V&A Online Journal* 3 (Spring 2011).

[9] Mary E. Fissell, *Vernacular Bodies: The Politics of Reproduction in Early Modern England* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004), 2. See also McShane, 337.

[10] See Marcus Nevitt *Women and the Pamphlet Culture of Revolutionary England, 1640–1660* (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2006); Jason Peacey, *Politicians and Pamphleteers: Propaganda during the English Civil Wars and Interregnum* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004); Joad Raymond, *Pamphlets and Pamphleteering in Early Modern Britain* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006).

of the English population who were traditionally excluded from the realm of formal governance, either by way of their social status, gender, or ethnicity (among other factors), to participate in these debates of a national, political significance. Anonymity enabled writers to pen their beliefs, opinions, and jokes without fear of prejudice and reprisal. Although anonymous works may not always provide definitive proof of authorship, despite both contemporary and scholarly speculations, they remain fundamental sources for this dissertation.

This dissertation analyzes the following questions: How did Englishmen and women throughout the politico-religious spectrum utilize material culture as a means to participate within the dynamic world of seventeenth-century politics? And, what does such an examination reveal about the nature of political culture within Stuart England? I argue that dress very often figured, in both a rhetorical and material sense, at the center of political debates during the Stuart period. Highly conspicuous and of general interest to the vast majority of the English population, fashion was a universal medium that allowed both men and women of varying social classes and faiths to communicate political and confessional loyalties in several ways, be it through ink and paper or also their actual, physical attire. This dissertation contends that fashion, which encompassed clothing, accessories, hairstyling, and cosmetics, as well as material objects, including cabinets and even chinaware (as seen in the last chapter), were important facets of political culture within Stuart England and, furthermore, were absolutely fundamental to how the English understood themselves, others, and the turbulent world they lived in. Certain clothing and other physical items were inherently politicized within seventeenth-century England because they exemplified rampant foreign cultural influence at a time characterized by profound politico-religious crisis, international conflict, and imperial competition. Ultimately, my dissertation

argues that the political nature of dress and material objects shaped conceptions of "Englishness" at a critical moment within Britain's national narrative.

1.1 Defining "Fashion" and the Historiography of Dress

Within the field of dress history, terminology remains a constant problem, largely due to the interconnected and entangled nature of key terms and concepts. However, although terms such as "dress," "clothing," "costume," and "fashion" may seem wholly synonymous or interchangeable with one another, they actually maintain distinct meanings within the study of historical dress.[11] Joanne Eicher and Susan Kaiser utilize "dress" as a rather inclusive term, one that encompasses all adornment and modification of the body. "Clothing," attire or apparel, refers to material objects that are physically worn, while "costume" is used to describe clothes associated with a particular historical period or group of people or ethnicity. However, the word costume also commonly relates to "dress worn for specific events," including, within the context of seventeenth-century England, theater productions as well as masques and other formal court functions.[12]

The English word "fashion" derives from the Old French term *façon*, which translates to "manner" or "way."[13] In this sense, the term fashion shares the same meaning as the French

---

[11] See Roland Barthes, *The Language of Fashion* (New York: Berg, 2006); Christopher Breward, *The Culture of Fashion: A New History of Fashionable Dress* (New York: Manchester University Press, 1995); Amy de la Haye and Elizabeth Wilson, eds., *Defining Dress: Dress as Object, Meaning and Identity* (New York: Manchester University Press, 1999); and Shoshana-Rose Marzel and Guy D. Stiebel, eds., *Dress and Ideology: Fashioning Identity from Antiquity to the Present* (New York: Bloomsbury, 2015).

[12] Charlotte Niklas and Annebella Pollen, eds., *Dress History: New Directions in Theory and Practice* (New York: Bloomsbury, 2015), 2; Joanne Eicher, ed., *Berg Encyclopedia of World Dress and Fashion: Global Perspectives, vol. 10* (Oxford: Berg Publishers, 2010), xiii; Susan Kaiser, *The Social Psychology of Clothing: Symbolic Appearances in Context, 2nd rev. edition* (New York: Fairchild Publications, 1998), 4–5. For more on early modern costumes, see Robert I. Lublin, *Costuming the Shakespearean Stage: Visual Codes of Representation in Early Modern Theatre and Culture* (Farnham, Surrey: Ashgate, 2011).

[13] "fashion, n." *OED Online*. December 2017. Oxford University Press. http://www.oed.com.ezproxy.lib.purdue.edu/view/Entry/68389?rskey=VA9PzA&result=1#eid (accessed December 8, 2017).

mode, which, in turn, stems from the Latin *modus*, or the "'way' of doing things." Etymologically, fashion relates to the manner of changing or doing something, be it speaking, walking, eating, dancing, or, as it is often associated with, dressing.[14] Kaiser argues that fashion indicates a change in dress over time, as well as the "dynamic social *process*" by which that change occurs.[15] Consequently, during a given period, the wearing of certain clothes may make an individual "in fashion," but not all clothing is considered fashionable. This dissertation follows the definition proposed by Kate Haulman in her *The Politics of Fashion in Eighteenth-Century America* (2014), in which she states that "fashion" is "a shape-shifting vessel of an idea that people fill up with various meanings depending on time, place and circumstance, and as changing styles of personal adornment, whether [the French] *la mode* or other modes of the day." Haulman argues that fashion serves as "a set of symbols that members of a community recognize" but may not always view, interpret, or act upon in the same manner. Furthermore, Haulman also notes that while fashion may extend to include forms of bodily practice and performance, articles of fashion in dress are "immediately and always on display," thereby making these material commodities central to "imperial commerce and political economy."[16]

Terminology is not the only aspect of dress history that is contested. As Lou Taylor and Angela McRobbie emphasize, scholars have questioned the legitimacy of fashion as a serious subject of historical inquiry, as well as the field of dress history in general, since the mid-twentieth century.[17] In addition to this scholastic prejudice against clothing, there also remains a

[14] Frederic Godart, *Unveiling Fashion: Business, Culture, and Identity in the Most Glamorous Industry* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012), 27.
[15] Kaiser, 4.
[16] Kate Haulman, *The Politics of Fashion in Eighteenth-Century America* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2014), 3.
[17] See Lou Taylor, *The Study of Dress History* (New York: Manchester University Press, 2002) and *Establishing Dress History* (New York: Manchester University Press, 2004); as well as Angela McRobbie, *British Fashion Design: Rag Trade or Image Industry?* (New York: Routledge, 1998).

misconception that the area is underdeveloped. In actuality, dress history has fostered and maintained a considerable body of scholarship since the creation of the first costume book, *The Book of Clothes*, an unpublished manuscript written by the German father and son, Matthaeus and Veit Konrad Schwarz, between 1500–70.[18] However, the study of apparel is not without its limitations and obstacles, primarily due to the issues concerning primary sources. Object sources from the seventeenth century are invaluable to any examination of dress but their availability remains extremely limited. Extant clothes from seventeenth-century England are indeed difficult to locate, as garments usually disintegrated or were recycled since first worn. In early modern London, luxury garments were often pawned and thus resulted in a thriving second-hand clothing trade, which was further enriched by the costumes from court masques that were usually sold or rented to actors.[19] Thus, clothing exchanged many hands during the seventeenth century and when such materials are discovered after centuries of wear and tear, their origins prove problematic to definitively determine. Furthermore, like most, if not all, primary sources, be they print, visual, material or audio, the choice and decision regarding which to preserve is always inherently biased. Over the centuries, the clothing and material objects worn and utilized by the elite classes have been prioritized for perseveration over those everyday items used by the lower orders. Indeed, Clare Backhouse and Angela McShane note that historical garments of a precious

[18] This manuscript was recently translated and published by Bloomsbury for the first time ever and serves as an invaluable primary source account for Renaissance dress. Ulinka Rublack, Maria Hayward, and Jenny Tiramani, eds., *The First Book of Fashion: The Book of Clothes of Matthaeus and Veit Konrad Schwarz of Augsburg* (New York: Bloomsbury, 2015). See also Ulinka Rublak, *Dressing Up: Cultural Identity in Renaissance Europe* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2010).

[19] Christine M. Varholy, "'Rich Like A Lady': Cross-Class Dressing in the Brothels and Theaters of Early Modern London," *Journal for Early Modern Cultural Studies* 8, no. 1 (Spring–Summer 2008), 6–9. See also Beverly Lemire, "Consumerism in Preindustrial and Early Industrial England: The Trade in Secondhand Clothes," *Journal of British Studies* 27, no. 1 (January 1988): 1–24.

and durable nature can be found within today's museums and private collections because they were the articles of fashion "preserved by those who could afford to do so."[20]

Other forms of visual evidence, like paintings and portraits, fashion plates, and woodcuts, also present certain restrictions to the dress historian despite their profound proliferation during the Stuart era. Court portraiture by famed artists such as Daniel Mytens, Cornelius Johnson, Anthony van Dyck, and Peter Lely, offer rich depictions of the opulent garb of both male and female courtiers. However, as McShane and Backhouse emphasize, such sumptuous portrayals of court life can also mislead. Even genteel and provincial portraits by those artists who were not associated with the royal court, such as Gilbert Jackson, must also be scrutinized for authenticity. In *The Dress of the People: Everyday Fashion in Eighteenth-Century England* (2007), John Styles contends that period portraits and genre paintings were rarely accurate depictions of individuals, since the artist, or the sitter his or herself, often influenced the manner in which the subject was represented.[21] This self-fashioning could be accomplished in several ways: through the careful construction of the setting, as well as the display and performance of the subject(s), including their stance, demeanor, gesture, expression, and, most importantly, garments or accessories, the latter of which could be material like a fan, fauna such as a monkey, or even human with the presence of an African servant.[22]

In this sense, portraiture, while an essential resource for any analysis of historical dress, therefore presents a problem concerning the validity and intent of the wearer's attire. The case is the same for the engravings and woodcuts that adorned the pages of seventeenth-century cheap

[20] McShane, "Top-Knots and Lower Sorts," 339.
[21] John Styles, *The Dress of the People: Everyday Fashion in Eighteenth-Century England* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2007).
[22] See Chapter I's section on the politicization of the dildo as well as Chapter III's section on self-fashioning within Restoration portraiture for more on early modern accessories.

print. These images were usually, but not always, fictional or satirical in nature, even though Stuart court portraiture was also often allegorical in theme. Consequently, artistic license must be taken into consideration in regards to visual sources. Dress in art *can*not, and *should* not for that matter, be understood as an accurate or faithful account of who wore what when and where.[23]

Textual sources, including household records, diary entries, personal letters, and memoirs, are therefore invaluable to this dissertation. McShane and Backhouse contend that, "fictional and non-fictional texts (literary, official or personal) can suggest who wore or owned what type of garments, what they cost, or what they signified in certain contexts."[24] However, due to their often satirical nature, cheap print, like the images found within them, do not provide definitive sartorial evidence for who wore what, when, and where. On the other hand, they do provide vital insight into *how* and *why* they were worn; the examination of such sources in the first and second chapters reveals how Englishmen and women, not even those who actually donned or utilized these items, understood these articles within the dynamic material world of seventeenth-century England. Consequently, this dissertation is not necessarily interested in determining what people actually wore or used, but how other people interpreted what they wore or used.

Historians must approach fashion as a cultural phenomenon containing complex symbols and meanings for understanding the past human experience. As an important cultural signifier, fashion maintained unique significance for shaping identity within the late seventeenth-century England. Fashion is culturally constructed, being both a byproduct and a reflection of a particular people, nation, race, ethnicity, faith or gender. Furthermore, the material objects analyzed here are physically constructed by someone, be they the Huguenots who produced French silks or the

[23] McShane, "Top-Knots and Lower Sorts," 338–9.
[24] McShane, "Top-Knots and Lower Sorts," 338.

Dutch artisans who crafted delftware, and thus the process of their manufacture attached an even further dimension to their cultural significance. Consequently, ideas concerning an early modern object's cultural attribution were informed by who wore or used the item as well as where it was physically made.

There is no doubt that fashion was, and still is, a key extension of identity. Susan Vincent explains that the great significance of dress lies in its fundamental relationship with the self and its subsequent contribution to the formation of one's identity; the "vestimentary" fashioning of the human body helped shape cultural norms as well as individual personality. Additionally, Vincent argues that fashion is not simply a consequence of choice but, instead, a kind of causal agent. As Vincent states, "clothes, in a very real sense, do 'make' the man and woman."[25] In other words, a person does not determine one's dress but rather dress determines the person. Other studies of late medieval and early modern clothing also emphasize the agency of apparel within self-fashioning. Susan Crane has described how fourteenth-century European noblemen intentionally communicated dynastic and political allegiance through the "talking garments" of their livery, crests, banners, badges, and armor during the Hundred Years War. Such vestments were thus an integral, material part of what Crane terms, "self-performances," or deliberately communicative behaviors and public displays that drew upon both visual as well as rhetorical devices.[26] It is therefore quite evident how dress was able to acquire such a profound political significance within the very material world of early modern Europe, particularly in light of the royal court's emphasis upon appearance, pomp, and ceremony as well as with the rise of consumption and consumer culture by the end of the seventeenth century.

---

[25] Susan Vincent, *Dressing the Elite: Clothes in Early Modern England* (New York: Berg, 2003), 4–5.
[26] Susan Crane, *The Performance of Self: Ritual, Clothing, and Identity During the Hundred Years War* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2002), 3.

As Ann Rosalind Jones and Peter Stallybrass have revealed, clothing continued to be a great topic of social, spiritual, and political conversations well into the early modern period. Jones and Stallybrass's groundbreaking work, *Renaissance Clothing and the Materials of Memory* (2000), analyzes the profoundly performative and relational meanings of buying, wearing, and exchanging specific pieces of clothing within England, as well as Europe more broadly, throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The book pulls on a diversity of discursive threads, particularly the issues of foreign policy and idolatry with its examination of the politically charged nature of yellow starch within the Jacobean and Caroline courts. A clear influence upon Vincent, Jones and Stallybrass contend that dresses, baubles, and armor, as they appeared in picture and print, were not "the supplements to a preconceived self" but rather the materials out of which "a hybrid subject," an Englishman or women who sported foreign (Catholic) textiles, was formed.

Consequently, English Protestants attached specific meanings to French and Italian garments. To them, they were symbols of Papist idolatry and heresy. Jones and Stallybrass reveal how the English believed that one was "permeated" by what one wore; the meanings that were so intrinsically attributed to particular fashions were thus transferred to the corporeal form once donned.[27] Such meanings and symbols served as the foundation for the politicized rhetoric of dress as it appeared not simply in cheap printed works but also public codes, church canons, and private writings. Building on this historiographical thread, this dissertation furthers the scholarly discourse concerning the body politics of clothes by analyzing the significance ascribed to foreign fashions at an important moment within England's historical narrative.

[27] Ann Rosalind Jones and Peter Stallybrass, *Renaissance Clothing and the Materials of Memory* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 59.

Yet, although fashion has received a great deal of attention from these art historians and literary scholars who have demonstrated its contribution to cultural and societal formation, there still remains a dearth of historical studies that examine the political significance of dress. Historians of early modern France, led by Lynn Hunt, have thoroughly analyzed the wardrobe of Marie Antoinette and revealed how her clothing, and especially her wigs, held such a performative role within late eighteenth-century French politics that they helped shape the Revolution.[28] In the realm of English historiography, the wardrobes of Georgiana Cavendish, the Duchess of Devonshire (1757–1806) and Elizabeth I (1558–1603) have been thoroughly examined in relation to their respective political roles.[29] However, studies of the intersection of fashion and politics during the Stuart period are virtually nonexistent. Aileen Ribeiro's more recent work, *Fashion and Fiction* (2005) presents a survey of male and female dress in seventeenth-century England, although, as she acknowledges, her book only serves as "a general introduction to some aspects of clothing" as they appeared in print and picture.[30]

At the turn of the millennium, Kevin Sharpe called for a more broad interpretation of English political culture during the early modern era, one that would include previously overlooked forms such as language, literature, and art.[31] This dissertation further redefines early

---

[28] See Lynn Hunt, *Politics, Culture, and Class in the French Revolution* (Berkeley: University of California, 1984); Lynn Hunt, *The Family Romance of the French Revolution* (Berkeley: University of California, 1992); Clare Haru Crowston, "The Queen and her 'Minister of Fashion': Gender, Credit and Politics in Pre-Revolutionary France," *Gender & History* 14, no. 1 (April 2002): 92–116; Dena Goodman, ed. *Marie-Antoinette: Writings on the Body of a Queen* (New York: Routledge, 2003); and Desmond Hosford, "The Queen's Hair: Marie-Antoinette, Politics, and DNA," *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 38, no. 1 (Fall, 2004): 183–200.

[29] For the Duchess of Devonshire, see Anna Clark, *Scandal: The Sexual Politics of the British Constitution* (New Haven: Princeton University Press, 2003); and Kimberly Chrisman-Campbell, "French Connections: Georgiana, Duchess of Devonshire, and the Anglo-French Fashion Exchange," *Dress* 31 (2004): 3–14. For Elizabeth I, see Carole Levin, *The Heart and Stomach of a King: Elizabeth I and the Politics of Sex and Power* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1994); and Linda Shenk, *Learned Queen: The Image of Elizabeth I in Politics and Poetry* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010).

[30] Aileen Ribeiro, *Fashion and Fiction: Dress in Art and Literature in Stuart England* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2005), 19.

[31] Kevin Sharpe, *Remapping Early Modern England: The Culture of Seventeenth-Century Politics* (Cambridge, NY: Cambridge University Press, 2000).

modern political culture as well as redresses this gap within historiography by offering the first full-length study that analyzes English (and foreign) fashion within the unique politico-religious context of the Stuart period. My emphasis on the role of dress and material objects further reveals how the political culture of seventeenth-century England was even larger and more diverse than previously supposed. Moreover, this dissertation contributes to the field of dress history by further reinforcing how seventeenth-century dress must be understood within the period's social, cultural, and political contexts.[32] Ultimately, this dissertation seeks to conclusively prove the political value of fashion and material objects during the seventeenth century.

1.2 Structure

This dissertation is not organized chronologically, although it often reads linearly, but rather thematically for several reasons. Early modern costume histories are typically structured in a chronological fashion in order to emphasize shifts in certain styles and trends over time and demonstrate the development of modern dress. Yet, such a linear approach to the study of fashion can often obscure the deeper historical significance of dress, privileging the shifting material characteristics of clothing over the social, cultural, and political undercurrents that actually prompted these changes; scholarship with such a chronological focus has typically been more concerned with *how* fashion changed, rather than *why*. My work is less interested in emphasizing the sartorial continuities of the Stuart period, for other dress histories of early modern England have sufficiently demonstrated these changes.[33] Instead, this dissertation's

[32] See Vincent, 4–5; and Crane, 3.
[33] See Ribeiro, *Fashion and Fiction*; Jane Ashelford, *The Art of Dress: Clothes and Society, 1500–1914* (New York: Harry N. Abrams, 1996); and Francois Boucher, *20,000 Years of Fashion: The History of Costume and Personal Adornment* (New York: Harry N. Abrams, 1987).

thematic approach reveals the entangled nature of fashion and politics during the Stuart era, thereby examining how each was informed by and affected the other throughout this dynamic period. Furthermore, my study determines that although garments may have changed over the course of the seventeenth century, certain political issues and social and cultural anxieties, such as anti-French and anti-Catholic sentiment, remained constant underlying threads within the rich tapestry of English politics during the Stuart period.

This dissertation is structured into two sections, each containing two chapters, which focus on a different manner in which fashion was politicized during the Stuart period: the rhetorical and the material. The first section examines how fashion was employed as a rhetorical device within print and image as a means of political expression. By the turn of the seventeenth century, a rich and vibrant sartorial discourse emerged within cheap printed works that played upon themes of fashion and dress to discuss the current social, religious and political issues that permeated every aspect of English life. Both Englishmen and women spanning the social and politico-religious spectrums utilized dress in order to address these issues, including the fear of foreign influence, the threat of Catholicism, the question of regicide, the problem of succession, and conceptions of "Englishness."

Chapter I, "What Not to Wear: Foreign Dress and Xenophobic Sentiment in Stuart England," sets the stage by examining the foundation for understanding the political nature of fashion and material objects during the seventeenth century: the underlying and consistent xenophobic feelings towards foreign culture. The chapter analyzes how certain clothing and objects reflected English anxieties regarding the power of foreign influence within Stuart England. Xenophobic sentiment was always present throughout early modern England but was particularly prevalent throughout the entirety of the seventeenth century, an era heralded by the

ascension of a new *Scottish* king and a Catholic assassination plot in 1605, then followed by several political and military conflicts with other European powers, most notably the Anglo-Dutch Wars. Additionally, cultural borrowing from the Continent was rampant throughout the seventeenth century, due in great part to the prevailing tastes of the Stuart monarchs and their respective courts. The diffusion of foreign, particularly French and Catholic, culture was always a constant concern for many Englishmen and women and remained one of the most prominent themes within the printed rhetoric of dress. After an analysis of the many culturally diverse objects that adorned the stalls of the late Stuart marketplace, the chapter then turns to the dildo, an early modern accessory that embodied profound xenophobic and anti-Catholic sentiment within both print and actuality. The second chapter, "Dressing the Body Politic: The Political Anatomy of Fashion during the Civil Wars and Interregnum," further builds upon this theme of xenophobic sentiment by analyzing how writers across the politico-religious spectrum interpreted, often in the manner but for different political purposes, foreign fashions upon English bodies.

The second section analyzes how fashion was politicized in a more tangible, material sense, examining the different ways in which clothing itself physically represented political issues or was utilized to convey particular meanings or messages within political spaces, such as the royal court. Chapter III, entitled "Dress for Success: The Politics of Display in the Late Stuart Court," investigates the donning of clothing and accessories as well as the display or other material objects, such as furniture and curiosities, as a means of political agency within the Restoration court. Revisionist historians such as Conrad Russell and Kevin Sharpe have argued that the Palace of Whitehall maintained an equal, if not greater, political significance than Westminster. Traditionally, Whiggish scholars emphasized Westminster as the space wherein

Members of Parliament, who held the "true" political power within early modern England, decided the most important matters of state.[34] Indeed, the royal court was not simply a center of conspicuous display and ceremony but also a political institution itself, a site wherein important matters of state were conducted, patronage granted, and alliances forged.[35] Moreover, the men and women of the royal court were visual representations of the English government, and thus what the court did, ate, and *wore* was particularly significant within the realm of seventeenth-century European politics. The royal court was certainly a space that emphasized the visual and material. Early modern English monarchs, particularly the Tudors and Stuarts, were keenly aware of the power of presentation, performance, ceremony, and display within the court.[36] Consequently, the Stuart sovereigns, and their courtiers for that matter, utilized clothing and other material objects to convey certain images of themselves (and others) for political purposes.

This dissertation contributes to the history of women and politics during the early modern period, specifically relating to the agency of elite women in close proximity or physical approximation to the English Crown through blood, station, or patronage. Historians during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries tended to focus primarily upon women's roles within "behind the scenes" or "boudoir" politics, in which elite women indirectly influenced policy through manipulation and corruption.[37] Such scholarship, which includes Hugh Noel

---

[34] David Underdown, "Yellow Ruffs and Poisoned Possets: Placing Women in Early Stuart Political Debate," In *Attending to Early Modern Women*, ed. Susan D. Amussen and Adele Seeff (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1998), 231.

[35] Ronald G. Asch, "Introduction: Court and Household from the Fifteenth to the Seventeenth Centuries," *In Princes, Patronage, and the Nobility: The Court at the Beginning of the Modern Age, c.1450–1650*, eds. Ronald G. Asch and Adolf M. Birke (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991).

[36] See Kevin Sharpe's recent trilogy regarding how the Tudors and Stuarts utilized their image to cement royal authority. See Kevin Sharpe, *Selling the Tudor Monarchy: Authority and Image in Sixteenth-Century England* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2009); *Image Wars: Promoting Kings and Commonwealths in England, 1603–1660* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2010); and *Rebranding Rule: The Restoration and Revolution Monarchy, 1660–1714* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2013).

[37] See Elaine Chalus, *Elite Women in English Political Life c.1754-1790* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), 1–3.

Williams' *Rival Sultanas: Nell Gwyn, Louise de Kéroualle, and Hortense Mancini* (1915), relied almost exclusively upon the gossipy court memoirs of Anthony Hamilton and Marie Catherine Baronne d'Aulnoy in order to depict a titillating image of the Restoration court filled with the vices of drinking, gambling, and sex.[38] In these histories, royal mistresses were depicted merely as squabbling shrews and clothing was addressed merely to convey the gross opulence of the late Stuart court. While such works are indeed entertaining, they fail to address the deeper significance of fashion, court politics, and female agency. However, recent scholarship from historians such as Melinda Zook has demonstrated that Englishwomen at the center of government, like Mary II, as well as those on the margins of society were active political agents during the Stuart era, thereby providing the "back door" political support that allowed men to partake in the more public "out-of-doors" politics.[39] This dissertation also analyzes women across the social, religious, and political spectrums, from Henrietta Maria to Mary Evelyn, daughter of John Evelyn, to anonymous female authors, in order to explain how their clothing and possessions allowed them to engage in Stuart politics.

The fourth and final chapter, "Fashioning 'Englishness': The Fabrication of English Dress and Commodities," investigates government attempts to fashion a sense of "English" national sentiment within material objects, specifically the vest as well as delftware. Ultimately, my dissertation proposes a new definition of "Englishness" in regards to late seventeenth-century material culture. The concept of the English nation and English national identity continues to be a polemic issue within historiography, primarily due to intense debates regarding how to define "nation," the origin of the English nation, and the presence of nationalism throughout the history

[38] See Hugh Noel Williams, *Rival Sultanas: Nell Gwyn, Louise de Kéroualle, and Hortense Mancini* (New York: Dodd, Mead & Company, 1915).
[39] Melinda S. Zook, *Protestantism, Politics, and Women in Britain, 1660–1714* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013), 12.

of the British Isles.[40] Most scholarly positions on the origin of the English nation are divided into two camps: the premodernist view, which identifies the emergence of an English nation *before* the eighteenth century, and the modernist interpretation that argues that the nation appeared *after* the beginning of the eighteenth century.[41]

However, many other historians, such as Robert Colls, suggest a less definitive and more fluid date of origin. Colls argues that many "moments" of English nationalism occurred before, during, and after the beginning of the modern period.[42] Indeed, many scholars identify the roots of nationalism in the decades before the turn of eighteenth century and the unification of Great Britain in 1707. I agree with scholars such as Steven Pincus and Linda Colley, who maintain that the later Stuart era, with its unique social, political, and cultural milieu, was the key to the creation of English nationalism and modern Britain.[43] My dissertation argues that conceptions of "Englishness," an intangible feeling or quality that characterizes the English population while at the same time distinguishing it from other peoples, were present here during the late seventeenth century and were heavily informed by cultural modes such as dress.[44]

---

[40] See Krishan Kumar, *The Making of English National Identity* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003).
[41] See Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (New York: Verso, 1983); Susan Reynolds, *Kingdoms and Communities in Western Europe, 900–1300* (1984; repr., New York: Oxford University Press, 1997); Adrian Hastings, *The Construction of Nationhood: Ethnicity, Religion and Nationalism* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997); and Liah Greenfeld, *The Spirit of Capitalism: Nationalism and Economic Growth* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2001).
[42] John Hutchinson, Susan Reynolds, Anthony D. Smith, Robert Colls, and Krishan Kumar, "Debate on Krishan Kumar's *The Making of English National Identity*," *Nations and Nationalism* 13, no. 2 (2007): 183.
[43] See Steven Pincus, "'To protect English liberties': The English Nationalist Revolution of 1688–1689," in *Protestantism and National Identity: Britain and Ireland, c.1650–c.1850*, ed. Tony Claydon and Ian McBride, 75–104 (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1998); "The Making of a Great Power? Universal Monarchy, Political Economy, and the Transformation of English Political Culture," *The European Legacy* 5, no. 4 (2000); and *1688: The First Modern Revolution* (New Haven: Yale University, 2009); and Linda Colley, *Britons: Forging the Nation, 1707–1837* (1992; repr., New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2009).
[44] It is important to note that the concept of "Englishness" differs from "Britishness," an alternate form of national identity that encompasses the varying peoples, the English, Scottish, and Welsh, of the United Kingdom.

CHAPTER 2. WHAT NOT TO WEAR: FOREIGN DRESS AND XENOPHOBIC SENTIMENT IN STUART ENGLAND

On April 23, 1661, Charles II processed through the streets of London with his royal entourage to Westminster Abbey for his coronation as King of England, Scotland, and Ireland. James Heath, an ardent Royalist and historian who recorded the day's festivities, was one of the myriad well-wishers and spectators in attendance of this grand procession. The son of Robert Heath, the royal cutler to Charles I, Heath travelled with the exiled court of Charles II to The Hague during the Interregnum, before returning to London at some point before the restoration of the monarchy in 1660.[45] Heath reveals how struck he was by the majesty and universal joy of the king's return, remarking that "it is almost inconceivable, and much wonder it caused in Outlandish persons, who were acquainted with our late troubles and confusions (to the ruine almost of Three Kingdoms,) which way it was possible for the *English* to appear in so rich and stately a manner?"[46] Heath further observed the magnificence of the spectacle:

> it is incredible to think what costly cloaths were worn that day, the Cloaks could hardly be seen what silke or sattin they were made of for the gold and silver laces & Embroidery that were laid upon them: the like also was seen in their foot-cloathes. Besides the inestimable value and treasures of Diamonds, Pearle and other Jewels worn upon their backs and in their hats, to omit also the sumptuous, and rich Liveries of their Pages and footmen, (some suits of amounting to fifteen hundred pounds;) the numerousnesse of these Liveries and their orderly march of them, as also that stately Equipage of the Esquires attending each Earl by his Horse-side: so that all the world that saw it, could not but confess, that what they had seen before was but

[45] A cutler "makes, deals in, or repairs knives and similar cutting utensils," or cutlery. See "cutler, n." *OED Online*. January 2017. Oxford University Press. http://www.oed.com.ezproxy.lib.purdue.edu/view/Entry/46379?redirectedFrom=cutler#eid; Wendy A. Maier, "Heath, James (1629?–1664), historian," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, eds., H.C.G. Matthew and Brian Howard Harrison, 22 vols. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004). [henceforth cited as *ODNB*].

[46] James Heath, *The glories and magnificent triumphs of the blessed restitution of His Sacred Majesty K. Charles II from his arrival in Holland 1659/60 till this present* (London, 1662), 207–8.

> solemn mummery to the most August, noble and true glories of this great day.[47]

Samuel Pepys shared a similar opinion of the day, as he concluded his observations with the following lines: "Now after all this, I can say that besides the pleasure of the sight of these glorious things, I may now shut my eyes against any other objects, or for the future trouble myself to see things of state and shewe, as being sure never to see the like again in this world."[48]

Yet, while the coronation procession was certainly grandiose and worthy of lengthy note, the king's personal apparel commanded singular attention amidst the large crowd of extravagant vestments. Heavily trimmed with gold and silver lace, Charles II's rich coronation suits were, as dress historian Jane Ashelford notes, "of course, in the French style."[49] Such royal garb projected a majestic image of kingly power modeled after Charles's maternal first cousin, Louis XIV of France (1643–1715). Charles's regal dress very publically conveyed to the English people that the monarchy had finally returned after decades of tumultuous civil war and staunch parliamentary rule. An exile only a year earlier, Charles began his reign with all the splendid pomp and ceremony that had been absent during the preceding years of the Interregnum. Onlookers, especially Royalists like Heath and Pepys, certainly marveled at these opulent trappings from the Continent. However, while the general public celebrated French fashions at this magnificent moment, profound xenophobic sentiment characterized the Stuart period.

Even before the restoration of the monarchy and the respective reigns of Charles II and James II, many Londoners were deeply concerned with the issue of foreign cultural appropriation and its subsequent negative effects upon English politics, the economy, and the population at

---

[47] Heath, 208.
[48] Samuel Pepys, *The Diary of Samuel Pepys*, eds., Robert Latham and William Matthews, 11 vols. (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1971), 2: 88.
[49] Jane Ashelford, *The Art of Dress: Clothes and Society, 1500–1914* (New York: Harry N. Abrams, 1996), 88.

large. This chapter sets the cultural scene in Stuart England, discussing not simply the items that were worn and used throughout seventeenth-century London but also the xenophobic feelings towards foreign fashions and goods that underscore this dissertation. Consequently, this chapter examines how fashion was often utilized as a rhetorical device within cheap printed works, treatises, drama, erotic literature, and court lampoons in order for English writers to elucidate their anxieties regarding foreign cultural influence throughout the seventeenth century. One of the most popular themes within late Stuart print was the adoption and permanence of foreign culture as international conflicts with France and the Dutch Republic as well as domestic political crises were projected onto the material world. While some writers celebrated how the developing consumer culture added vibrancy and sophistication to English life, others expressed their fears of foreign influence as they searched for a sense of "Englishness" within the exotic commodities that filled the streets of London. Furthermore, as in the case of the Italian dildo, other authors drew upon the foreign nature of such goods in order to address their concerns regarding the danger these objects posed to the England's political order during the Restoration.

2.1 The French Connection

French cultural influence had been present in England and Scotland for several centuries before the accession of the first Stuart monarch in 1603. Indeed, the origins of French culture within the Isles can be traced as far back as the Norman invasion and the reign of William I (1066–87). The Hundred Years War at the beginning of the twelfth century contributed further to Anglo-Franco cultural exchange, while Richard II (1377–99) revolutionized the English royal court by establishing a decidedly Continental court style during his short reign. The Yorkist connection to Burgundy during the Wars of the Roses (1455–85) led to a more sophisticated and cosmopolitan royal court, which only developed further during the reign of Henry VIII (1509–

47) in the sixteenth century. The pro-French leanings of Cardinal Thomas Wolsey (1515–29) and Anne Boleyn (1533–6) also contributed to the proliferation of Franco culture within the Henrician court.[50] Elizabeth I's extensive wardrobe included myriad articles of dress in the French mode, while James I's queen Anne of Denmark continued to follow Elizabeth's unique style while incorporating other Continental styles within Jacobean court culture.[51] Yet, French cultural influence reached new heights as the seventeenth century progressed further into the reigns of James's son and grandsons.

The Continental court styles of Charles I (1625–49) and later his sons Charles II (1660–85) and James II (1685–88) were cause for concern among a great portion of the English populace. The Caroline court of the early seventeenth century certainly experienced profound French cultural influence under Charles I and his (supposedly domineering) wife Queen Henrietta Maria, the daughter of Henry IV of France (1589–1610) and Marie de' Medici. Eveline Cruickshanks argues that Charles I was "the greatest connoisseur of the arts who ever occupied the [English] throne" due to his enthusiastic acquisition of Spanish, French and Italian (i.e. Catholic) paintings.[52] However, scholars have also recently attributed the flourishing of Continental culture to Henrietta Maria, who wielded considerable political and cultural agency within the space of the royal court. In her cultural biography of this queen consort, Erin Griffey reveals how Henrietta Maria acted as Charles I's "cultural counterpart" due to her frequent patronage of acclaimed European playwrights and artists including Orazio Gentileschi, the

[50] Maria Hayward, *Dress at the Court of King Henry VIII* (New York: Routledge, 2007).
[51] See Eleri Lynn, *Tudor Fashion: Dress at Court* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2017); and Leeds Barroll, *Anna of Denmark, Queen of England: A Cultural Biography* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2000), 36–75.
[52] Eveline Cruickshanks, "Introduction," in *The Stuart Courts* (Thrupp, Gloucestershire: Sutton Publishing, 2000), 5.

Italian painter who previously served her mother at the French court.[53] However, the proliferation of French culture throughout Stuart England reached a new zenith with the Restoration.

The Restoration brought more than simply the return of the English monarchy; it reinstated the Continental court culture that Charles I and Henrietta Maria had previously promoted and had been later suppressed during the Interregnum. In drastic contrast to the somber and puritanical style of Oliver Cromwell's Protectorate, the Restoration reinitiated a cultural shift à la French *mode*. The royal sons of Charles I and Henrietta Maria, Charles, James, then Duke of York, and Henry, Duke of Gloucester, spent the majority of their nine-year exile at The Hague with their sister Mary, Princess of Orange, as well as the court of Louis XIV in Paris. In France, both Charles and James developed a taste for the Catholic faith of their mother as well as the opulent style characteristic of the Sun King's court.[54] Fears regarding the dominance of foreign culture throughout England did not abate but only grew after the restoration of the monarchy, as the French mode became *the* prevailing cultural influence throughout the reigns of both Charles II and James II, dominating literature, painting, music, food, theatre, architecture, and most especially, fashion. Historian Arthur Bryant argues that the cultural developments of the Restoration period were so profound that they led to "a change in English taste far greater than any transient turn of fashion. For it affected everything, our [Britain's] architecture, our dress, food and manners, our books, our whole attitude of life."[55]

---

[53] Erin Griffey, "Introduction," in *Henrietta Maria: Piety, Politics and Patronage* (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2008), 2. See also Griffey, *On Display: Henrietta Maria and the Materials of Magnificence at the Stuart Court* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2015).
[54] Aileen Ribeiro, *Fashion and Fiction: Dress in Art and Literature in Stuart England* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2005), 215–16. See also Gesa Stedman, *Cultural Exchange in Seventeenth-Century France and England* (Burlington: Ashgate, 2013).
[55] Arthur Bryant, *King Charles II* (New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1931), 110.

Particularly during the late seventeenth century, the French royal court in Paris was the cultural center of Europe.[56] The world of fashion certainly revolved around the Sun King's orbit.[57] Bryant notes that in Restoration England "everything new came from Paris, the Mecca of the civilised world, from sedan chairs, and dainty silver brushes for cleaning the teeth, to Châtelin's famous fricassées and râgouts."[58] The most stylish Englishmen and women constantly looked to France for the latest fashion trends. In *The parable of the top-knots* (1691), by John Dunton, the prominent London bookseller and devout Anglican, the female character begs, "What News from Paris? In what Arroy did the Dauphiness appear last Ball? I am told, my Commode is a Tire too low, as they adjust it at the French Court."[59] Within this satire, the modish Englishwoman seeks to model her own attire after French court dress with her *arroy*, "A Suit of Cloaths."[60] Furthermore, she finds that her commode or *fontage*, a headdress of wire construction that was covered with silk, lace or luxury fabrics as well as ribbons or lappets that reached down to the shoulders, was not sufficiently tall or elaborate enough in comparison those donned by the French ladies of Louis XIV's court.[61] Dress remained the most pronounced form of French cultural influence throughout the entirety of the seventeenth century, especially under both Charles II and James II's reigns. Indeed, Thomas Shadwell's *The Miser* (1672), a comedy of manners modeled after Molière's work of the same name, further demonstrates the dominance

[56] Louis XIV began the enlargement of Versailles, previously a hunting lodge, into a royal palace during the 1660s. It would become the official location of the royal court in May 1682, although construction would continue on into the eighteenth century.
[57] See Iris Brooke, *Dress and Undress: Restoration and Eighteenth Century* (1958; repr., Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1973), 5.
[58] Bryant, *King Charles II*, 110.
[59] Helen Berry, "Dunton, John (1659–1732), bookseller," *ODNB*; John Dunton, *The parable of the top-knots* (London: R. Newcombe, 1691), 1.
[60] *Mundus foppensis: or, the fop display'd* (London, 1691), 25.
[61] Valerie Cumming, C.W. Cunnington and P.E. Cunnington, *The Dictionary of Fashion History* (New York: Berg, 2010), 53. See also "commode, n." *OED Online*. January 2017. Oxford University Press. http://www.oed.com.ezproxy.lib.purdue.edu/view/Entry/37187?rskey=kbHNY6&result=1#eid

of French fashion within Restoration London. Shadwell, who often collaborated with court wits including John Wilmot, the second earl of Rochester, Sir Charles Sedley, Sir George Etherege, and William Wycherley, claims in the Prologue that "France, that on Fashion does strict laws impose / the Universal Monarchy for Cloaths / That rules our most important part, our dress / Should rule our wit, which is a thing much less."[62]

As evident by the language employed by Shadwell above, many English authors interpreted this French influence as not simply cultural but also political in nature. These writers understood "Frenchified" fashions to be an sartorial extension of Louis XIV's perceived rule over the monarchy as well as throughout the English nation at large. Some feared that Charles II functioned as a puppet for Louis XIV often via the English king's foreign courtesans Louise de Kérouaille and Hortense Mancini. Similarly, contemporaries and subsequent Whig historians believed that Henrietta Maria dominated Charles I. Throughout the Stuart period, many Englishmen and women assumed, perhaps rightly so, that this French cultural influence currently reflected the Crown's pro-French, and by extension pro-Catholic, political policies. Ribeiro notes that anti-French sentiment remained "a constant undercurrent in English society" during the late Stuart era and particularly intensified during periods of warfare, including the Second Anglo-Dutch War (1665–7), and other periods of further devolved Anglo-Franco relations during the 1660s and 1670s.[63] Such fears reached its zenith upon the birth of James II's son and heir, James Francis Edward, in June 1688, and inevitably led to the Revolution and the subsequent rule of James's daughter Mary II (1689–1694) and her Dutch husband William III (1689–1702). Yet, such fears regarding the French cultural influence did not immediately abate after 1689, as the ascension of William and Mary did not eradicate French fashions from the Isles. Indeed, as we

[62] Thomas Shadwell, *The Miser: a comedy acted by His Majesties servants at the Theater Royal* (London, 1672), iv.
[63] Ribeiro, *Fashion and Fiction*, 257.

shall see in the following chapter, even during the Interregnum, Continental styles persisted throughout mid seventeenth-century London, much to the chagrin of many English writers. The French cultural influence was therefore so profound that it endured within England upon the turn of the eighteenth century, despite both popular as well as state, which are discussed in the fourth chapter, attempts to fashion more "English" commodities.

2.2 The Foreign Treasures of the Female and Foppish Wardrobe

A prime example of xenophobic sentiment within cheap print is the satirical pamphlet *Mundus muliebris: or, The ladies dressing-room unlock'd, and her toilette spread in burlesque* (1690). *Mundus muliebris* presented, as the title suggests, a window into "the world of the feminine" within late Stuart England through its biting tetrameter couplets. The work sought to reveal an insider glimpse behind boudoir doors and into the private realm of Englishwomen with observations on fashionable dress, accessories, cosmetics and furnishings as well as reflections regarding decidedly "feminine" pastimes, behaviors, and personal qualities. The pamphlet contains a particularly sharp and extensive criticism of French fashions but also demonstrates the pervasiveness and great diversity of foreign culture within Stuart England, with vivid descriptions of fashionable material objects ranging from the Continent to the East. Evelyn's inventory of fashionable items included innumerable foreign terms regarding clothing, accessories, cosmetics, and even household furnishings that were later explained in detail within the "Fop Dictionary," a brief encyclopedic piece attached to the end of the pamphlet to aid the reader's understanding of all these new exotic items.

Mary Evelyn, the daughter of John Evelyn and his wife Mary (née Browne), has been traditionally credited with writing *Mundus muliebris*. In several ways, Mary's short life paralleled the Restoration period; her familial position afforded her insight into the intricacies of

the royal court, including its opulent fashions. Mary was born on October 1, 1665, during the early Restoration, and died after she was exposed to smallpox at the Evelyn estate at Sayes Court on March 14, 1685, a month after the death of Charles II.[64] Mary spent the majority of her short years at Sayes Court, where she was educated in and excelled at French, Italian, history, literature, music and dancing. In his diary, Evelyn portrayed an image of his daughter as the embodiment of Christian virtue and feminine grace:

> The Virtues and perfections she was endow'd with best would shew; of which the justnesse of her stature, person, comelinesse of her Countenance and gracefullnesse of motion, naturall, & unaffected (though more than ordinaryly beautifull), was one of the least, compar'd with the Ornaments of her mind, which was truly extraordinary.[65]

Mary Evelyn's charm, her father asserted, was not enhanced by the material adornment that was vehemently criticized within *Mundus muliebris*, but rather by her morality and intellect. Instead of wasting away her time at courtly activities like playing cards or enjoying the theater, which John Evelyn pronounced as an "unaccountable vanity," Mary read verse, prose, and "most of the best practical Treatises extant in our tonge."[66] Additionally, her other writings primarily included religious meditations and rules for personal conduct. The image of Mary described within John Evelyn's diary thus represents a foil to the ladies of the Stuart courts, whom took such delight in the fashionable pleasures denounced by both Mary and John Evelyn.

Yet, several scholars, including de Beer, Nevinson, and Greer, attribute joint authorship of *Mundus muliebris* to John Evelyn based on one particularly suggestive reference within his

---

[64] John Evelyn, *The Diary of John Evelyn*, eds., E.S. de Beer, 6 vols. (Oxford University Press, 1955), 3: 205; Joan K. Perkins, "Evelyn [née Browne], Mary (c. 1635–1709), correspondent," *ODNB.*
[65] Evelyn, *Diary*, 3: 323.
[66] Evelyn, *Diary*, 3: 324–5.

diary.[67] Similarly, Ribeiro proposes that John Evelyn may have actually finished his daughter's work during the period between her death in 1685 and the pamphlet's publication in 1690.[68] *Mundus muliebris* certainly echoed John Evelyn's writings, particularly *Tyrannus: or, The mode* (1661), in which he forcefully condemned English dependence on French fashion. While I myself find the evidence for primary attribution compelling, the question of authorship is irrelevant within the context of this chapter. Whether Mary or John, the author's perspective here within *Mundus muliebris* represents one side, the xenophobic viewpoint, of an animated sartorial debate concerning the prevalence of foreign culture within Stuart England.

Mundus muliebris commences with an elegant and elaborate laundry list of every article of modish dress required for the English gentleman to outfit his lady and maintain her in fashionable comfort within late seventeenth-century London. According to this sardonic pamphlet, a woman was similar to a ship, a vessel that must be rigged out with colorful and decorative streamers, but, alas, would never be "sufficiently adorned, Or satisfy'd, that you [the gentleman] have done enough to set them forth."[69] As the pamphlet reveals, the *de rigueur* of late Stuart London costume required that these decorations follow the French mode.

Among the necessary French accouterments listed within *Mundus muliebris*, several items in particular maintained unique political significance within the late Stuart London due to their direct connection to the French court. Indeed, Evelyn listed the *fontage,* the commode or top-knot, which garnered its name "from Mademoiselle de Fontange, one of the French King's Mistresses, who first wore it." Numerous perfumes were also required for the Englishwoman's toilette, including "Twelve dozen *Martial,* whole, and half," so named after the official perfumer

[67] See Germaine Greer, ed., *Kissing the Rod: An Anthology of Seventeenth-Century Women's Verse* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1989), 324–32.
[68] Ribeiro, *Fashion and Fiction*, 252.
[69] Evelyn, *Mundus muliebris*, 1–2.

to Louis XIV who reportedly emulated the floral "Frangipani of Rome."[70] Evelyn also made special note of "Colbertine," which was "a kind of open lace with a square ground," which grew especially popular during the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.[71] As its name also indicates, the textile was attributed to Jean-Baptiste Colbert, being "of the Fabrick of Monsieur Colbert, Superintendent of the French Kings Manufactures," who passed much legislation within France between 1661-83 to promote the consumption of French clothing at home as well as abroad across the Channel.[72]

Evelyn concludes the pamphlet with a grave observation of England's dependence upon French culture: "We have submitted to, and still continue under the Empire of the French, (for want of some Royal or Illustrious Ladies Invention and Courage, to give the Law of the Mode to her own Country, and to vindicate it from Foreign Tyranny)."[73] Evelyn emphasizes the agency of royal women and female courtiers of the Restoration in their embrace of Continental culture and rejection of a more "English" style dress. Indeed, these final lines clearly identify the women of the royal court as the forerunners for fashionable dress within late Stuart period, and therefore attribute primary blame for the dominance of French fashions throughout late seventeenth-century London to them. Such criticism is not unfounded, for as we shall see in the third chapter, the women of the Restoration court, most notably Louise de Kéroualle, were instrumental in utilizing "the arts of fashion as an essential part of French cultural propaganda."[74] In *Mundus muliebris*, fashionable women were portrayed as coquettish surrogates of foreign culture

---

[70] Evelyn, *Mundus muliebris*, 18.
[71] "colbertine, n." *OED Online*. January 2017. Oxford University Press. http://www.oed.com.ezproxy.lib.purdue.edu/view/Entry/36087?redirectedFrom=Colbertine#eid
[72] Evelyn, *Mundus muliebris*, 16; Negley Harte, "Silk and Sumptuary Legislation in England," in *La Seta in Europa Sec. XII-XX*, ed. Simonetta Cavaciocchi (Florence, 1993), 185.
[73] Evelyn, *Mundus muliebris*, 22.
[74] Ribeiro, *Fashion and Fiction*, 36. See also Chapter III for more on the contrast of French and "English" styles within the royal court.

obsessed solely with expensive baubles and frivolous trinkets. Yet, Evelyn is also critical of men for their role in the adoption of French culture in England. Male suitors showered their ladies with these French trifles and thus contributed to the problem regarding the English reliance on foreign goods and culture as well as endangered English notions of masculinity as "fops."

French fashions are certainly prioritized within *Mundus muliebris*, yet the pamphlet included objects from other significant Continental powers such as Italy, Spain, Flanders, and the Dutch Republic. Evelyn states that the following items were also needed to appropriately fashion the Englishwoman:

> With a broad *Flanders* Lace below: Four pair of Bas de soy shot through With Silver, Diamond Buckles too, For Garters, and as Rich for Shoo. Twice twelve day Smocks of *Holland* fine, With Cambric Sleeves, rich Point to joyn, (For she despises Colbertine.) Twelve more for night, all *Flanders* lac'd, Or else she'll think herself disgrac'd"[75]

Evelyn emphasizes the necessity for Flemish lace and cambric, a very fine quality of white linen that originated in Cambray. "Holland" here refers to another fine linen that was originally imported from its namesake during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, but was later universally applied to any fine white linen by the beginning of the Stuart period.[76] Household records from the Restoration era reveal that, within the royal court, holland was primarily utilized for undershirts and caps for servants, bed sheets, and even funerary linen.[77] Dutch clothing was certainly of fine quality, but lacked the embellishment and ostentation of characteristic of French fashions. This simplicity combined with the fact that the Dutch Republic, despite its commercial rivalry with England, was a Protestant state, explains why

[75] Evelyn, *Mundus muliebris*, 3.
[76] Cumming, *Dictionary of Fashion History*, 236, 251.
[77] MS Folger X.d.679.2–23; MS Folger X.d.76; MS Folger X.d.617.

Dutch commodities were not criticized within printed works to the same severe degree as French styles and goods.[78]

The colorful catalogue of foreign accouterments found within *Mundus mulierbris* also included commodities from transoceanic trade with Continental Europe and the East. Evelyn describes Eastern wares such as "Three Night-Gowns of rich *Indian* Stuff," a "Pearl Neck-lace, large and *Oriental,*" and "Short under Petticoats pure fine, Some of *Japan* Stuff, some of *Chine.*"[79] Such goods grew increasingly ubiquitous in England by the end of the seventeenth century with the rise of the East India Company and the signing of Charles's marriage treaty to the Portuguese princess Catherine of Braganza on June 23, 1661, which allowed England to gain a strategic foothold in Asia and stimulated a flow of Eastern goods into London. Additionally, *Mundus muliebris* details the residence of a fashionable female and stated that a suitor must furnish her apartments with a "Tea-Table, Skreens, Trunks, and Stand, Large Looking-Glass richly Iapan'd."[80] According to Evelyn's "Fop Dictionary," *Iapan'd* indicated a doubly foreign meaning: either lacquered with "China Polishing" or an item considered "odd or fantastical" by English standards.[81] The Portuguese influence on English culture was also evident within the pamphlet with the inclusion of tea as a fashionable beverage: "But I had almost quite forgot, A

[78] Similar to France, the Dutch Republic experienced an ebb and flow of amicable relations with England due to the Anglo-Dutch Wars throughout the late 1660s and 1670s. Although Charles and James spent much of their exile at The Hague, the Dutch cultural influence only became truly significant within the space of the royal court by the dual monarchy of William III and Mary II, and never to the same degree as that of France. However, the Dutch cultural influence was certainly present in Stuart England long before the Dutch invaded in 1688. Lisa Jardine's *Going Dutch* (2008) provides a detailed survey of how the Dutch influenced English government, trade, science, gardening, philosophy, music, and art throughout the seventeenth century. Jardine argues that an "extraordinary process of cross-fertilisation" began as early as the 1630s with Charles I and Henrietta Maria's patronage of Dutch art and music. See Lisa Jardine, *Going Dutch: How England Plundered Holland's Glory* (London: Harper Collins, 2008), xv. See also Chapter IV, which demonstrates how the English were greatly influenced by the Dutch system of international trade as well as their very successful delftware industry.

[79] Evelyn *Mundus muliebris,* 2–4.

[80] Evelyn, *Mundus muliebris,* 8. John Evelyn would view such items himself within Catherine of Braganza's royal apartments as Whitehall. See Chapter III.

[81] Evelyn, *Mundus muliebris,* 15. See Chapter II for more on English perceptions regarding foreign fashions as odd, fantastical, and artificial.

Tea and Chocolate Pot, With Molionet, and Caudle Cup, Restoring Breakfast to sup up: Porcelan Saucers, Spoons of Gold, Dishes that refin'd Sugars hold."[82] Indeed, Catherine of Braganza is credited with the introduction of tea as a popular beverage and cultural pastime within England, while chocolate and sugar further represented the fruits of trade with the New World.

Restoration England experienced an explosion of different and exotic cultural influences due to the nation's growing international trade, much to the detriment of England's own culture. Evelyn's work also reveals that French culture remained within London after the reigns of both Charles II and James II. Ribeiro states that under the Restoration the French mode, reached "an ascendancy it was to retain well beyond the end of the Stuart period."[83] *Mundus muliebris* was published in 1690, following the death of Charles and the short subsequent rule of James that ended with the Revolution of 1688/89 and the dual monarchy of William and Mary. Although French fashions did not dominate court dress at this time, John Evelyn, who ensured that his daughter's pamphlet was published, obviously felt that the issues addressed in *Mundus muliebris* were still relevant.

Evelyn's *Mundus muliebris* demonstrates how the material culture of late Stuart London had been completely transformed by the end of the seventeenth century, due to the prevailing cultural influence of France promoted by the royal court as well as the rise in luxury consumption and international trade. Yet, the foreign lexicon used throughout the pamphlet likewise reveals how the English language itself had also drastically changed as a result of this consumption. The inclusion of the Fop Dictionary within *Mundus muliebris* was not just for the reader's convenience and edification but was also intended to mock this ridiculous new language of fashion that had forever altered the English tongue. Indeed, Alison Scott's *Literature and the*

[82] Evelyn, *Mundus muliebris*, 11.
[83] Ribeiro, *Fashion and Fiction*, 19.

Idea of Luxury (2015), which examines the "cultural lexicon" of luxury within early modern England, demonstrates how the rise of luxury consumption during the seventeenth century created a new fashionable vernacular.[84] Furthermore, Ribeiro states that French words for fashion and fashionable pastimes began to make a serious impact on the English language during the Restoration.[85] Contemporaries certainly acknowledged this new lexicon; John Selden draws upon the theme of fashion and dress in order to emphasize just how dramatically the English lexicon had developed since the turn of the seventeenth century. Indeed, Selden laments how colorful the new English tongue was, much like the ostentatious apparel that was donned by men and women:

> If you look upon the Language spoken in the Saxon Time, and the Language spoken now, you will find the Difference to be just, as if a Man had a Cloak that he wore plain in Queen Elizabeth's Days, and since, here has put in a piece of Red, and there a piece of Blue, and here a piece of Green, and there a piece of Orange-tawny. We borrow Words from the French, Italian, Latin, as every Pedantick Man pleases."[86]

When foreign clothes, cosmetics, accessories, and pastimes were adopted into English popular culture, their exotic designations became common terms in the English tongue. Due to this appropriation of French into the English vernacular, numerous fashion dictionaries and encyclopedias emerged within late Stuart print culture. These works attempted to communicate specific aspects of Continental culture to fashionable Londoners with extensive lists and vivid descriptions. The *Dictionnaire Anglois et Francois* (1660) by the English lexicographer Robert Sherwood was clearly aimed at those who wished to be "*á la mode*, or *au fait* with the latest styles." Sherwood's dictionary revealed what particular French styles and garments were popular

---

[84] Alison V. Scott, *Literature and the Idea of Luxury in Early Modern England* (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2015).
[85] Ribeiro, *Fashion and Fiction*, 19.
[86] John Selden, *Table-talk being the discourses of John Selden, Esq., or his sence of various matters of weight and high consequence relating especially to religion and state* (London, 1689), 30.

among the upper echelon of society in late seventeenth-century England. Francophone terms like *déshabillé,* a state of artful undress made popular within the court portraits of Charles's mistresses, were incorporated into the English vernacular in their original French form or Anglicized as "dishabille."[87]

Another great source for French fashion was *The Ladies Dictionary: Being a General Entertainment of the Fair-Sex* (1694) published by Dunton, who was one of the first booksellers to acknowledge the market potential for female audiences in London.[88] In 1693, Dunton began an extension of his *The Athenian Mercury* periodical specifically directed towards Englishwomen. The publication, entitled *The Ladies' Mercury*, was an advice column that offered a public forum for women to discuss popular feminine topics such as love and marriage. In the edition from March 10, 1693, a proposal was made in *The Ladies' Mercury* that inquired after a general interest in a "Ladies Dictionary" that would "contain answers (alphabetically digested) to all the most nice and curious questions concerning Love, Marriage, the Behaviour, Dress, and Humours of the Female Sex, whether Virgins, Wives, Widows" and such.[89] The response was assuredly positive because a year later *The Ladies Dictionary* circulated among the fashionable women of London.

The extensive volume was addressed to "the Ladies, Gentlewomen, and Others of the Fair-Sex" and offered an extensive catalogue of all things feminine during the late seventeenth century.[90] *The Ladies Dictionary* included a wide range of entries—from lists of prominent women from antiquity and Scripture to directions for making sweets and tips for accessorizing. While the dictionary is varied in theme, the work contained countless French fashion terms. A

[87] Ribeiro, *Fashion and Fiction*, 19.
[88] Berry, *ODNB.*
[89] *The Ladies Mercury* 1, no. 3 (London, 1693).
[90] *The Ladies Dictionary: Being a General Entertainment of the Fair-Sex* (London, 1694), 1.

"Choux*"* was described as "the round bow behind the Head, resembling a Cabbage, and so the French according so name it." Like Sherwood's dictionary, Dunton's version included Anglicized forms such as "*Colberteen*," the type of lace frequently mentioned in *Mundus muliebris* and its Fop Dictionary.[91] From "Attache" to "Settée," the Fop Dictionary was filled with innumerable French entries and even included several Portuguese articles such as *Polvil*, "the Portugal term for the most exquisite Powders and Perfumes."[92] These various dictionaries revealed the integration of French culture into the very language of the English, and therefore represented the extensive permanence of Continental fashion within late seventeenth-century England.

2.3 *Mundus foppensis* and the Defense of French

Mundus muliebris directly condemned the adoption of French culture in England and abhorred the foreign slang utilized among the English. However, the anonymous pamphlet *Mundus foppensis: or, the fop display'd* (1691) defended French terminology. Published a year later in direct response to Evelyn's provocative thesis, *Mundus foppensis* sought to redress the many issues raised in *Mundus muliebris,* including the appropriation of foreign styles, the absence of an "English" national dress, and criticism of the female sex as frivolous consumers of French culture. Directed at a female audience, this vindication condemned the trespass of the woman's private dressing room in *Mundus muliebris* as "a very great Piece of ill Manners, to unlock your [women's] Dressing-Rooms without your Leave, so was it no less indecent…to expose your Wardrobes to the World."[93] Furthermore, the pamphlet refuted Evelyn's arguments concerning the danger of French culture within England.

---

[91] *Ladies Dictionary,* 10.
[92] Evelyn, *Mundus muliebris,* 20.
[93] *Mundus foppensis,* 1.

The unknown author of *Mundus foppensis*, who adopted a female persona in the prose, maintained that Continental culture added a sense of style and vibrancy to the English way of life. French terms embodied a level of elegance and style for Englishmen and women wishing to emulate the fashionable lifestyle, since they signified the exoticism of Continental luxury and elegance. The pamphlet argued that women should not be reproached for their desire to brighten the English tongue with the tools of their feminine trade. *Mundus foppensis* stated that "Printers speak Gibb'rish at their Cafes; And Weavers talk in unknown Phrases; And Blacksmith's 'Prentice takes his Lessons From Arabick (to us) Expressions: Why then mayn't Ladies, in their Stations, Use novel Names for novel Fashions?" *Mundus foppensis* argued for the agency of women in the designation of female fashion: "May not the Head, the Seat of Sense, Name its own Dress, without Offence?" Fanciful names allowed women to appropriately designate the feminine articles of the boudoir and wardrobe. *Mundus foppensis* explained that these labels afforded efficiency to a woman's toilette. The pamphleteer sardonically inquired:

> Shall Lady cry to Chamber-maid, Bring me my Thing there, for my head; My Thing there, quilted white and red; My Thing there for my Wrists and Neck; 'Tis ten to One the Maids mistake; Then Lady cries, The Devil take Such cursed Sots; my other Thing; Then 'stead of Shoes, the Cuffs they bring. 'Slife--Lady crys, if I rise up, I'll send thee to the Devil to sup; And thus, like Babel, in conclusion, The Lady's Closet's all Confusion; When as if Ladies name the Things, The Maid, whate'er she bid her, brings; Neither is Lady chaf'd with Anger, Nor Bones of Maiden put in danger.[94]

A rich and vibrant vocabulary of all the latest French terms was a practical requirement for any fashionable woman in London. The modish female or "Artist" of the mode required "gay Words" to suitably describe her "Gay Cloaths."[95]

---

[94] *Mundus foppensis*, 4, 5, 6-7.
[95] *Mundus foppensis*, 5.

Mundus foppensis maintained that the words contained in the English language were inadequate substitutes for the wondrous French garments and goods that were so central to English culture. The pamphlet's author noted that words from other European languages, such as Dutch and Italian, were already existent within the English vernacular "to enrich and fructifie our barren Speech, We owe to their Vocabulary, That makes our Language full and airy…Where things want Names, Names must be had."[96] The pamphlet celebrated the French language for its beautifully creative vocabulary while the English tongue appeared plain and paltry in comparison. One final section of the document remarked:

> Why should not *Gris*, or *Jardine*, Be as well allow'd as Bien gaunte; Cloaths is a paltry Word Ma foy; But Grandeur in the French *Arroy*. Trimming's damn'd English, but le Grass is that which must for Modish pass. To call a Shoe a Shoe, is base, Let the genteel Picards take Place. Hang Perriwig, 'tis only fit For Barbers Tongues that ne'er spoke Wit; But if you'd be i'th' Fashion, choose The far politer Term, *Chedreux* What Clown is he that proudly moves, With on his hands what we call Gloves? No Friend, for more refin'd converse Will tell ye they are *Orangers*.[97]

Consequently, *Mundus foppensis* did not simply advocate that the English should dress in French clothing and use Continental goods but rather supported the fundamental absorption of French culture within late Stuart London.

2.4 'A Noble Italian Call'd Signior Dildo': Italian Culture and the Politicization of the Dildo

Mundus foppensis represents one side of the animated literary debate regarding foreign culture in Stuart London. Yet, the xenophobic perspective was certainly the dominant viewpoint within these printed works, as certain foreign objects maintained overwhelmingly negative

[96] *Mundus foppensis*, 6.
[97] *Mundus foppensis*, 14–15.

characteristics in seventeenth-century England. The dildo represents another excellent example of how a fashionable, yet politically-charged, material object, an accessory, embodied profound xenophobic sentiment within printed works during the Stuart era, since contemporaries universally considered the device to be both a foreign and Catholic commodity. As evident by its frequent presence within Renaissance English literature, the dildo was a recognizable ware in London by the turn of the seventeenth century and would further develop into a rather refined cosmopolitan good by the end of the period. To English consumers, the dildo maintained a particular air of foreign exoticism (and eroticism for that matter) as well as metropolitan refinement, despite its often rather crude appearances within printed works. Indeed, Karen Newman identifies the dildo as a "marker of a certain urban and mercantile sophistication" within early modern London.[98] The anonymous author of the pamphlet *The Practical Part of Love* (1660) comments that ladies may "appease their lecherous itch" by purchasing "artificial Dildo's at the change," or Royal Exchange, arguably, the center of London commerce during the early modern era.[99] The bawdy and satirical poem *Signior Dildo* by John Wilmot, the second earl of Rochester, describes a similar scene for the English consumer: "At the Signe of the Crosse in Saint James's Streete, When next you endeavor, to make your selfe sweete, by Buying of Powder, Gloves, Essence, or soe, You may chance to gett a sight of this Signoir Dildo" (9–12).[100] As Rochester reveals, the dildo was a luxury good frequently found alongside other fashionable merchandise in the London marketplace, like those detailed within Evelyn's *Mundus muliebris* or *Mundus foppensis*.

---

[98] Karen Newman, *Cultural Capitals: Early Modern London and Paris* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2007), 143.
[99] Anon., *The Practical Part of Love* (London, 1660).
[100] John Wilmot, "Seigneur Dildoe [Version A]" and "Additions to Seigneur Dildoe," in *The Works of John Wilmot Earl of Rochester*, ed. Harold Love (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999), 248. [henceforth cited as "Seigneur Dildoe"].

The dildo was certainly a unique luxury item as well as a functional object. Yet, recent scholarship from Will Fischer and Liza Blake also identifies the early modern dildo as an *accessory*, an article that could be attached to the human form while still retaining its functionality and "thinghood," rather than "serving a supplemental or signifying role to the body and its identity."[101] Blake argues that the dildo, a fashionable material object that could be (and often was) worn on the human body as a strap-on, functioned in the same pleasurable manner in which gloves or perfumes did. The dildo did not embody or replace a body part but actually "added to the body and assisted in its pleasures," signaling fashionableness or "being in the fashion" rather than an actual penis.[102] English consumers understood the dildo to be a foreign accessory and luxury good, being either an Italian and/or French invention.

Although the dildo was refined by French and Italian craftsmen during the early modern period, the device dates back to antiquity, being made of stone or tar construction. The first dildo satire originated with the sixth mimiamb of Herondas, written during the c. third century B.C.E.[103] The dildo's etymological origins remain unknown, although the term most likely derives from the Italian word, *diletto*, meaning "beloved one" or "delight, pleasure."[104] Indeed, Stephen Skinner's *A New English Dictionary*, published posthumously in 1689, confirms that the term "dildo" was **"**contracted from the Ital. Diletto," although Skinner provides a rather novel translation of the word as "woman's delight" within the English tongue.[105] Alternatively, Skinner

---

[101] Liza Blake, "Dildos and Accessories: The Functions of Early Modern Strap-Ons," in *Ornamentalism: The Art of Renaissance Accessories*, ed. Bella Mirabella (2011; repr., Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 2016), 132.
[102] Blake, 137.
[103] Harold Love, "A Restoration Lampoon in Transmission and Revision: Rochester's(?) 'Signior Dildo,'" *Studies in Bibliography* 46 (1993), 250; Mary R. Lefkowitz and Maureen B. Fant, ed., *Women's Life in Greece and Rome* (4th. ed., New York: Bloomsbury, 2016), 216.
[104] "dildo, n." *OED Online*. January 2017. Oxford University Press. http://www.oed.com.ezproxy.lib.purdue.edu/view/Entry/52768 (accessed January 10, 2017).
[105] Stephen Skinner, *Gazophylacium Anglicanum* (London, 1689). This dictionary was republished two years later as *A New English Dictionary* (1691).

also notes that "dildo" may have been "drawn from our [English] word Dally," meaning "a thing to play withal."[106] The term "dildo" served as a common ballad refrain throughout the early modern period, although the first known written occurrence of the word as a "penis succedaneus [or substitute]" was within Thomas Nashe's *The Choice of Valentines*, which was composed c. 1592.[107] This use of the word soon passed into common usage, beginning a rich tradition of dildo satires within Renaissance English literature and prompting comical cameos by the device in well-known works such as John Donne's "Elegy II," William Shakespeare's *The Winter's Tale*, Ben Johnson's *The Alchemist*, and Thomas Middleton's *A Chaste Maid in Cheapside*.[108] Despite the humor usually attached to the object within these works, many Englishmen and women did not always view the presence of the dildo as a "laughing matter." Indeed, the dildo maintained great political connotations within late Stuart England as a decidedly foreign and transgressive item.

Dildos were politicized in several ways during the seventeenth century, the first and perhaps most obvious manner being in a social sense, as objects that transgressed early modern sexual and gender politics. Literary evidence indicates that women were the primary consumers of dildos during the early modern period, although men were certainly capable of using them as well. Karen Newman states that the early modern dildo represented "a socially censured, threatening and nonreproductive sexuality and a bid for female agency" that could be presented in either positive or negative terms.[109] Furthermore, Blake argues that when dildos joined the

---

[106] Skinner, *Gazophylacium Anglicanum*, 58.
[107] Elisha Coles, *An English dictionary explaining the difficult terms that are used in divinity, husbandry, physick, phylosophy, law, navigation, mathematicks, and other arts and sciences* (London, 1677), 82; Ian Frederick Moulton, *Before Pornography: Erotic Writing in Early Modern England* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 183. According to OED, "dildo" was also often used during the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries as a ballad refrain, being a nonsense word with no literal meaning. Blake argues that it was not until the 1670s that the word, "dildo," came to be understood and used solely to mean an artificial penis.
[108] Moulton, *Before Pornography*, 183.
[109] Newman, *Cultural Capitals*, 143.

female body as strap-ons, "they opened up new avenues for female action," including cross-dressing, urination while standing, female marriages, and, most importantly, "a form of sex recognized as penetrative and potentially sodomitical act by the law."[110]

Many understood the mere possession of a dildo by an Englishwoman to be a *political* act that emasculated men. The solitary use of a dildo by a woman indicated that her male partner (be it husband, lover, or client) was incapable of either performing or satisfying her, thus placing sexual power and dominance, literally, in female hands. A woman, therefore, set the tone within the bedroom for she determined or evaluated sexual performance and, accordingly, wielded her *own* phallus not to the man's satisfaction, but her own. A husband is made a "cuckhold" by the dildo, a prevalent theme within erotic literature and dildo satires. Additionally, a sex act with a dildo, either solo or especially with a female partner[s], could not result in procreation, which, after all, was the sole purpose of sexual intercourse within the early modern religious mindset. Thus, in this sense, the dildo was a socially as well as religiously transgressive object.

A prime, and rather graphic, example of the gendered political nature of the dildo is found within Nashe's own *The Choice of Valentines* (c. 1592–3). The erotic poem tells the tale of Tomalin, who on St. Valentine's Day, visits his former lover Frances in the brothel wherein she currently resides and works.[111] After a rather lengthy and ultimately disappointing sexual encounter involving Tomalin's premature ejaculation and, thereafter, his inability to achieve an erection, Frances is compelled to use a dildo in order to find her own sexual release and satisfaction.[112] Frances is empowered by her use of the dildo, as this act symbolizes male sexual inadequacy and female sexual autonomy. Works like *The Choice of Valentines* are satirical in

[110] Blake, 135.
[111] It is no coincidence that Nashe named the prostitute in his poem, "Frances," a clear play on the state of France.
[112] MS Folger Add 368 53v.

nature and do not necessarily reflect early modern social realities. The use of a dildo should be understood as an indicator of *perceived* (not real) social power during the seventeenth century.[113]

Although the social and gendered aspects of the dildo are certainly important, this chapter is more concerned with its political significance as a foreign commodity that reflected profound anti-Italian, anti-French, and anti-Catholic sentiment. The foreign nature of the dildo within Stuart England was deeply tied to ideas concerning its physical construction and manufacture. Early modern dildos were made of wood, leather, horn, wax, ivory, or glass. These glass dildos were usually hollow and filled with, preferably warm liquid (usually water but often milk) to simulate semen and ejaculation.[114] The dildos themselves were oftentimes decorative, some were painted with intricate patterns of veins or gold leaf, while others were stored in embellished pouches. Additionally, they were also often outfitted in different luxury fabrics, such as silk, satin, velvet or "tabby," a thick and glossy taffeta material, for comfort and stimulated sexual pleasure.[115]

English writers further played on the theme of dress within printed works by attiring these accessories in their own clothing, thereby personifying the devices and adding yet another dimension to their extravagance. *The Westminster Whore* (c. 1610–20) describes a taffeta-covered dildo: "As I went to Westminster Abby, I saw a young wench on her back cramming in a Dildo of Tabby Into her—till 'twas ready to crack."[116] Furthermore, Rochester also describes how Signoir Dildo was originally dressed in "a plaine Leather-Coate," but was later changed into fine "Sateen" by Lady Southeske when she brought him with her to the royal court (13–8).[117] In

[113] Moulton, *Before Pornography*, 186.
[114] Moulton, *Before Pornography*, 184.
[115] Cumming, *Dictionary of Fashion History*, 272.
[116] Quoted in Gordon Williams, *A Dictionary of Sexual Language and Imagery in Shakespearean and Stuart Literature*, Volume I (London: Athlone, 1994), 389.
[117] Wilmot, "Seigneur Dildoe," 248–9.

The Choice of Valentines, Nashe provides one of the most detailed descriptions of the early modern dildo: "He is a youth almost two handfuls highe, Streight, round, and plumb, yet having but one eye, Wherin the rhewme so ferventlie doeth raigne, That Stigian gulph maie scarce his teares containe; Attired in white velvet or in silk, And nourist with whott water or with milk; Arm'd otherwhile in thick congealed glasse" (269–75). Most importantly, Nashe also notes that the device was initially created and functioned by means of "forraine artes," for these translucent dildos were usually crafted from the finest Venetian or Murano glass (260).[118]

Murano glass imports, possibly dildos, had circulated throughout England as early as the fourteenth century while several Muranese glassmakers immigrated to London during the mid to late sixteenth century. One craftsman in particular, Jacapo Verzelini, received a royal patent to produce Murano glass during the 1570s and also manufactured Venetian glass for at least fifteen years.[119] It is indeed very probable that glass dildos were among Verzelini's fashionable wares. Murano glass was certainly one of, if not *the* most, popular materials for dildos, which prompted the invention of several new designations that reflected the objects' exotic Italian origins. Florio's Italian-English dictionary, *A Worlde of Words*, published in 1598, defines *pastinaca muranese* or a "murano parsnip" as a "a dildoe of glasse."[120] This rather clever label was not the only Italian nickname for the dildo as *passo-tempo*, which roughly translates to "pastime" or "passing the time," was also commonly applied to describe the device.[121]

There can be no doubt that seventeenth-century Englishmen and women understood the dildo to be a thoroughly Italian invention, yet the object was also strongly associated with France by the turn of the eighteenth century. Samuel Butler's burlesque poem, *Dildoides* (1706),

---

[118] MS Folger Add 368 53v.
[119] Newman, *Cultural Capitals*, 143.
[120] Florio, *A Worlde of Words* (London, 1598), 102.
[121] Coles, 183. See also Williams, *Dictionary of Sexual Language*, 387.

identifies the dildo as a "fantastick new French Fashion."[122] According to the satirical poem, *Monsieur Thing's Origin: Or, Seignior Dildo's Adventures in Britain* (1722), the dildo, which was herein aptly referred to as "Monsieur Thing," was a French innovation with a "pedigree…of the Gallick Race."[123] The author states that: "if my Information is but true, A Place it [the dildo] came from nearer to our View. To France He owes his Birth or first Extraction, By Doctors there he had his first Creation, And is Originally of that Nation."[124] Dildos were often prescribed by early modern physicians for those girls or young women who were diagnosed with greensickness, an anemic disease that caused an unhealthy or pale pallor in girls about the age of puberty. Indeed, doctors believed that these virginal *mademoiselles* were made physiologically ill by their troublesome sexual fantasies, and therefore the dildo could supply the rather obvious remedy.[125]

Furthermore, French merchants were often viewed as the premier purveyors of dildos within Stuart London, as purposefully specified within several political tracts, broadsides, and pamphlets during the later seventeenth century. In one such pamphlet entitled, *The Character of a Town Misse*, which first circulated throughout the capital in 1675, the anonymous author details all the necessary accoutrements for an English gallant's mistress, or a "town-misse." Dildos, also known as *bijoux indiscrets* (meaning "indiscreet toys" or "talking jewels") within the French tongue, are prominently included among the collection of fanciful baubles.[126] The pamphlet states that "a French Merchant" must "supply her [the town-misse] with Dildo's, or in default of those she makes her Gallants Purse maintain two able Stallions (that she loves better

[122] Samuel Butler, *Dildoides, A burlesque poem* (London, 1706), 10.
[123] Anon., *Monsieur Thing's origin* (London, 1722), 7–8.
[124] *Monsieur Thing's origin*, 7–8.
[125] Williams, *Dictionary of Sexual Language*, 621.
[126] Williams, *Dictionary of Sexual Language*, 387.

than him) for performance of points wherein he is Defective."[127] The town-misse utilizes her dildo, herein described as a *French* good, to compensate for the sexual deficiencies of her *English*man, thus emphasizing the sexually corruptive and emasculating influence of France upon the women of England. The material possessions of the "town-misse," namely her dildo, reflects the "xenophobic English view of exotic and commercial sexual practices and their fruits," which, as has been discussed, was particularly prevalent throughout late seventeenth-century London.[128]

As evident by the English literary and printed works previously examined, the dildo was thoroughly associated with the Continental, Catholic powers of the Italian peninsula and France. The dildo's frequent appearance within satirical works demonstrates English anxieties regarding this exotic luxury good's presence within seventeenth-century England. Additionally, the dildo's status as an alien commodity also allowed writers, such as Rochester, not simply a means to pen these anxieties concerning the prevalence of foreign cultural influence but also their fears regarding the issue of royal succession and the political power of Catholicism during the 1670s. Such concerns were projected onto the material world within Rochester's *Signior Dildo*, which was written in response to the marriage of James II, then Duke of York, to Mary of Modena.

On March 31, 1671, Anne Hyde, the first (and Protestant) wife of James, the heir to the throne, finally succumbed to illness months after the birth of her last child. The decision regarding James's second marriage would be the subject of much political debate in the following two years and particularly intensified after the passing of the Test Act on February 4, 1673.[129] The openly-Catholic Duke of York's new bride-to-be was Mary Beatrice d'Este,

[127] Anon., *The Character of a Town Misse* (London, 1675), 7.
[128] Newman, *Cultural Capitals*, 144.
[129] The Test Act was issued by Parliament on February 4, 1673. The act required all persons holding any civil or military office to swear allegiance to the Church of England and receive the sacrament within three months. Most

princess of Modena. Mary, born Maria in 1658, was the daughter of Alfonso IV d'Este, Duke of Modena and Reggio, (1658–62) and his wife Laura Martinozzi, the fourth eldest niece of Cardinal Mazarin and, therefore, one of the famed "Mazarinettes."[130] Hence, although Mary was an Italian princess by birth and title, she also maintained familial and political connections to France through her great-uncle, the chief minister from 1642–61 who served Louis XIII (1610–43), the queen regent Anne of Austria (1643–51), and ultimately Louis XIV before Mazarin's death. James's marriage to this Italian princess was very controversial, prompting strong objections from both Parliament as well as a very significant portion of the English population.

Mary arrived in London on November 26, 1673 with her Italian retinue in tow. Shortly after, Rochester's *Signior Dildo* began to circulate throughout the court, perhaps penned, as some scholars have argued, for a celebration directly connected with the royal wedding. The court lampoon, which remains, as Love states, "the only poem in the English language wholly devoted to the advocacy of masturbation," was specifically directed at the future Duchess, as well as the ladies of the Restoration court more broadly, due to their supposed obsession with this Italian device.[131] The lampoon tells the tale of Signior Dildo, a personification of the device, and his companion Count Cazzo (meaning "prick" in Italian), who were satirically listed among Mary of Modena's entourage when she first arrived in London. In the sarcastic, witty, and crass style

---

significantly, the act stated that these men must also denounce transubstantiation, the cornerstone of Catholic theology. Consequently, the act's purpose was to expose and exclude Catholics from formal governance. In the case of the duke of York, it intended to exclude this "closet" Catholic from the succession. Charles II exempted his younger brother and heir presumptive from the test, however James's Catholic faith became public knowledge as a result.

[130] The "Mazarinettes" is a title given to the seven nieces of Cardinal Mazarin: by his sister Laura, Anne Marie, Princess of Conti, and Laura, Duchess of Modena (mother of Mary of Modena); by his sister Girolama, Laura, Duchess of Mercœur, Olympe, Countess of Soissons, Marie, Princess de Colonna, Hortense, Duchesse Mazarin (mistress of Charles II), and Marie Anne, Duchess de Bouillon. Mazarin sent to Rome for his sisters and nieces, who were renown for their "exotic" beauty, to join him at the French court of Louis XIV, wherein he brokered their marriages to the Continent's most powerful nobles.

[131] Love, "A Restoration Lampoon," 250. As Harold Love demonstrates, there is considerable evidence that Rochester did not actually write *Signior Dildo*. Although such evidence is rather persuasive, this dissertation adheres to the general scholarly attribution of the work to Rochester.

characteristic of Rochester, the poem seeks to sardonically convey the advantages of an Italian-Catholic union with England, as Signior Dildo visited and sexually satisfied the most prominent ladies of the Restoration court, including Barbara Palmer and Frances Stuart, who, among others, are specifically named. Indeed, in a letter to Sir Joseph Williamson in Cologne on January 26, 1674, Walter Overbury mentions "a song of a certain senior that came in with the Dutchesse of Modena…it reaches and touches most of the ladys from Westminster to Wapping."[132]

The political implications of Rochester's poem were clear: the association of the dildo, a symbol of Italian sexual deviancy and popish vice, with foreign, and most importantly Catholic, aristocratic women, including Mary of Modena and the king's mistresses, who were in close, intimate proximity to the English Crown. As always, the primary concern was centered on Mary's Catholic faith, and the political and cultural influence that she, as an avowed papist, would wield as the potential future Queen of England. Many feared that Mary would wield considerable influence over James (and perhaps even Charles II) similar to her mother-in-law, Henrietta Maria. Additionally, the foreign mistresses of Charles II, especially Louise de Kérouaille and Hortense Mancini were similarly criticized. Hortense Mancini was the favorite niece of Cardinal Mazarin, making her also a "Mazarinette." Mary and Hortense were, therefore, first-cousins once removed, and such a strong familial connection was one of the reasons why Mary helped to bring Hortense over from Colonna in 1675 and promote her as Charles's mistress. Hortense was notorious within Restoration England for her promiscuity, which earned her the epitaph, the "Italian Whore." Indeed, she reportedly had an affair with her royal lover's own illegitimate daughter by Barbara Palmer, Anne, Countess of Sussex.[133] Such gossip earned

[132] *Williamson Letters*, II, 132.

[133] Contemporaries and subsequent scholars have strongly suggested that Hortense and Anne had a sexual relationship, although, to my knowledge, there remains no definitive evidence. The two women were certainly intimates. John Manners, the first duke of Rutland, observed how the Duchess Mazarin and Countess of Sussex

her a reputation for sexual depravity and even prompted one author to assign Hortense as the true creator of the dildo. *Monsieur Thing's Origin* states that, "Some say it was the Dutchess Mazarine Was first Contriver of this Fine Machine; From Italy it was that first it came, And from that Country it had first its Name."[134] Aristocratic women, like Hortense and Mary, it was believed, were therefore carriers of strange cultural, religious and sexual practices that would seek to corrupt the English nation through their foreign fashions.

This court lampoon was intended to be read and consumed by the most powerful political players within Restoration England, for this genre was written *about* courtiers *by* courtiers *for* other courtiers and circulated within the royal household either at Whitehall or Windsor. Indeed, Love argues that, "the true court lampoon moves us inward from the semi-public area of the court, the presence chamber, into its two privileged recesses, the privy chamber and the bedchamber."[135] Consequently, *Signior Dildo* provides an intimate, albeit not necessarily accurate, glimpse into the boudoirs of noblewomen, much like *Mundus muliebris*, while also reflecting real and tangible concerns among the political elite regarding the marriage of the future King of England to a papist. The poem is not simply a sexual fantasy; it alludes to several historical events such as the public burning of dildos, specifically "burning the Pope and his nephew Dildo" The former is a reference to the papier-mâché images of the Pope, which were annually burned in an elaborate ceremony on November 5th, the anniversary of the Gunpowder Plot of 1605.[136] Signior Dildo is described in the poem as an intimate, familial relation of the

---

"have privately learnt to fence, and went downe into St. James Parke the other day with drawne swords under theire night gownes, which they drew out and made severall fine passes with." Their close relationship so upset Anne's husband Thomas Lennard, the first earl of Sussex, that he sent her off to their country estate. Anne enjoyed the hunting to be had in the country, but apparently missed Hortense so greatly that she "kisses Madam Mazarine's picture [miniature portrait] with much affection still." HMC, *Report on the Manuscripts of His Grace the Duke of Rutland, preserved at Belvoir Castle*, 4 vols. (1888), 2: 34; 36.

[134] *Monsieur Thing's origin*, 7–8.

[135] Love, 250–1.

[136] Wilson, 17, 19.

Holy Father, who was similarly burned in likewise fashion. In reality, the lampoon refers here to the seizure and burning of several crates filled with expensive French leather dildos a year previous in 1672, which later inspired Butler's *Dildoides*

This episode of the flaming dildos scandalized Restoration London. Henry Savile, the youngest surviving son of the baronet, Sir William Savile, related the tale to his close intimate friend, Rochester, who was currently residing away from court at his country estate. Both Savile and Rochester belonged to a raucous and rakish circle of nobles at the Restoration court often referred to as the "Ballers."[137] In his letter to Rochester (January 26, 1671), Savile details the unfortunate incident and laments the loss of such delightful goods:

> yr. Lp. has been wanting here to make friends at the custom house where has been lately unfortunately seized a box of those leather instruments [dildos] yr. Lp. carried down one of, but these barbarian farmers [the custom officers] prompted by the villainous instigation of their wives voted them prohibited goods so that they were burnt without mercy, notwithstanding that Sedley & I made two journeys into the City in their defence."[138]

Savile continues on with his sad tale and begs Rochester to join in their valiant effort to bestow revenge "on the ashes of those martyrs," since "yr. Lp. is chosen general in this war betwixt the Ballers & the farmers, nor shall peace by my consent ever be made till they grant us our wine and our D[ildo]'s custom free."[139] Interestingly, a similar episode unfolded more than a hundred years later, as detailed within a cutting from a 1773 volume of *Convent-Garden Magazine.* The clipping describes the seizure of a cargo from Leghorn "of what the Italians call *passo-tempo's* for the amusement of single ladies," which were taken by custom officers "to an adjacent Tavern" for burning, wherein they set the chimney afire, "being composed of

---

[137] David J. Sturdy, "Savile, Henry (1642–1687), courtier and diplomat," *ODNB.*
[138] Quoted in John Adlard, ed., *The Debt to Pleasure: John Wilmot, Earl of Rochester: In the Eyes of His Contemporaries and in His Own Poetry and Prose* (New York: Routledge, 1984), 46.
[139] Quoted in Adlard, 46.

combustible matter." However, during the commotion "many of these *passo-tempo's* were [heroically] rescued from the flames by female hands."[140]

2.5 Conclusion

As a thoroughly Italian (and therefore Catholic) item, the dildo, like the other articles of dress found within cheap printed works, maintained great political connotations within the unique politico-religious context of the 1670s. Within English literature and print, dildos were frequently utilized as rhetorical devices to express xenophobic and anti-Catholic sentiment throughout late seventeenth-century London. Yet, these perspectives were not always universally shared, as there was certainly a complex and nuanced discourse concerning foreign fashions within cheap print. Pamphlets like *Mundus muliebris* and *Mundus foppensis* as well as fashion dictionaries and glossaries represented these combating perspectives regarding the appropriation of Continental or French culture during the seventeenth century. Ultimately, material objects, like the dildo, should not be regarded as frivolous or obscene trifles but rather as important sites of political discourse during the seventeenth century.

[140] Quoted in Williams, 387.

CHAPTER 3. DRESSING THE BODY POLITIC: THE POLITICAL ANATOMY OF FASHION IN THE MID-SEVENTEENTH CENTURY

Within the opening lines of *Mad fashions, od fashions, all out fashions* (1642), the Royalist writer John Taylor referenced the popular "world turned upside down" print that adorned the frontispiece of his short pamphlet. As the image, as well as the text, emphasized the state of England had indeed been disrupted by the outbreak of the Civil War in 1642. The Church was literally overturned. A candlestick was likewise depicted as topsy-turvy, with its flame burning from below. The horse whipped the cart as a wheelbarrow pushed a man along. Even the animal kingdom was in disarray; a rat chased a cat and the dog fled from the rabbit. In the foreground of "this Monstrous Picture," an Englishman and his clothing further revealed how the land was "turn'd the Cleane contrary way."[141] The author explained that:

> His Breeches on his shoulders doe appeare,
> His doublet on his lower parts doth weare;
> His Boots and Spurs upon his Armes and Hands,
> His Gloves upon his feet (whereon he stands)[142]

In *The Diseases of the Times*, another of his pamphlets published that same year, Taylor employed similar imagery to further emphasize political, religious, as well as gendered disorder. He warned that "the dangerous disease of feminine divinity," as exhibited within conventicles, would seek to "deform" the Church through the guise of reform and thus usher in "a rare World when women shall weare the breeches, & men peticotes."[143] Here, as in the previous tract,

[141] John Taylor, *Mad fashions, od fashions, all out fashions, or, The emblems of these distracted times* (London, 1642), 1.
[142] Taylor, *Mad fashions*, 1.
[143] John Taylor, *The Diseases of the Times, or, the distempers of the common-wealth succinctly describing each particular disease wherin the Kingdome is Troubled* (London, 1642), 4–5.

images of male and female English bodies with inverted clothing reflected the current political state of England at the outset of the Civil Wars; in short, a world turned upside down.

This chapter analyzes the idea of the English state as a body through the lens of clothing within several printed works, including pamphlets, broadsides, ballad sheets, medical treatises, conduct books, and heresiographies. The concept of the state as a body was pervasive throughout early modern England, particularly within political literature such as Thomas Hobbes's famed *Leviathan* (1651). Accordingly, scholars, such as Ernest Kantorowicz, Lynn Hunt, Dominic Montserrat, and Carole Levin, have thoroughly examined the use of bodily metaphors for the state, culminating in a rich tradition of scholarship that emphasizes the connection between the corporeal form and the medieval or early modern monarchy.[144] Yet, the political anatomy of fashion during the Stuart period, a time of increased international trade, luxury consumption, cultural borrowing, and intense political, religious, and social turmoil, has been surprisingly neglected.

Dress was an important appendage of the corporeal form as well as a significant aspect of political culture during the early modern era. This chapter demonstrates how English authors spanning the social and politico-religious spectrums, both Royalists and Parliamentarians or Whigs and Tories, utilized fashion as a rhetorical device within political literature, allowing them to discuss significant political issues such as the fear of foreign influence, the problem of Catholicism and the question of regicide. Fantastical fashions, artificial, abnormal, or oddly shaped clothes, were often the primary outlet for these authors to vent their frustrations with the

[144] William E. Burns, "The King's Two Monstrous Bodies: John Bulwer and the English Revolution," In *Wonders, Marvels, and Monsters in Early Modern Culture*, ed. Peter G. Platt (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1999), 187. See also Burns, *An Age of Wonders: Prodigies, politics and providence in England, 1657–1727* (New York: Manchester University Press, 2002); Ernst Kantorowicz, *The King's Two Bodies: A Study in Medieval Political Theology* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1957); and Dominic Montserrat, ed., *Changing Bodies, Changing Meanings: Studies on the Human Body in Antiquity* (New York: Routledge, 1998).

current political status quo. However, while writers often criticized the concept of too much superfluous clothing upon English bodies, they also protested against too little. Near or complete nudity remains another thematic thread that was popular within cheap print throughout the seventeenth century. This chapter reveals how the men and women who figured in this vestimentary discourse were not simply English bodies but rather metaphorically represented the English body politic. Indeed, I argue that authors employed the literary themes of both the abundance as well as the absence of clothing in order to demonstrate how bizarre and revealing fashions on the English body politic threatened the natural order of Stuart England.

3.1 Too Much: Flamboyant Fashions

With the rise of early modern science, the abnormal or "monstrous" body was frequently utilized as a rhetorical weapon during the seventeenth century, specifically in relation to the theme of artificiality in dress. Excessive amounts of hair, ridiculous accessories, and flamboyant apparel, as were often worn in the royal courts of the Continent, contradicted notions of the natural English body. The greatest critique of these excessive fashions concerned their perceived artifice, the idea of clothing as a worldly façade or as a subversive force against nature. Royalists and Parliamentarians both used the literary device of dress as artificial, although each author drew upon his own particular political and religious beliefs to make their case against outlandish styles. This trend manifested within cheap printed works during the reign of James I with Nicholas Breton's pamphlet, *The Court and Country* (1618), which contained a dialogue between a "Country-man" and a courtier. The new Scottish king, who left the largest peacetime debt in English history, spent exuberantly upon his favorites and filled his royal court with

sumptuous banquets, spectacular masques, and extravagant attire.[145] Such an environment inspired Breton's commentary on Jacobean court culture, in which he contrasted the artificiality of the royal court with the simple pleasures of country life.

In the countryside, beauty was a "naturall Art" rather than "an artificiall Nature."[146] The country interpreted the court as a deceptive and dishonest realm that lacked the innocent virtue of a humble home. Breton commented that, within the court "there be certaine people that have brazen faces, Serpents tongues, and Eagles clawes, that will intrude into companies, and perswade wickednes, and flatter follies, and catch hold of whatsoever they can light on for the service of lewdnes, either money, lands, or leases, or apparell, and ever cramming, and yet ever craving."[147] The publication's frontispiece further reflected this view of the court. Within the image, the countryman and courtier greeted each other with outstretched hands, while their attire was sharply juxtaposed. The nobleman's clothing, particularly his plumed hat and decadent doublet, were, naturally, far more elaborate than his country counterpart's plain garb. However, the courtier sported a rather interesting and unusual accessory: a hissing snake posed to strike, presumably at the countryman, as it crept from out of his belt. To Breton, rich apparel and precious jewels were symbols of the court's sycophancy, immorality, and materialism.

One of the main criticisms that commentators identified within this artificial English wardrobe were flamboyant fashions, not simply ostentatious displays of wealth or status but rather styles that were perceived as colorful, exaggerated, and unusual. These included face painting, heeled shoes, dyed hair, and "top-knots," or *fontages* in France, which comprised a tall

---

[145] Robert Bucholz and Newton Key, *Early Modern England 1485-1714: A Narrative History* (Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2008), 223.
[146] Nicholas Breton, *The court and country, or A briefe discourse dialogue-wise set downe betweene a courtier and a country-man* (London, 1618), 2.
[147] Breton, 2.

headdress of ribbons and bows built from wire construction. This section focuses primarily upon three styles of dress: the choppine, a platform heeled shoe; black patches, facial ornaments or "beauty-spots;" and the farthingale, a hooped petticoat that gave the wearer an odd physical shape. These strange and, most importantly, foreign styles were considered by many Englishmen and women to be an aberration of England's natural order. As John Bulwer argued within *Anthropometamorphosis: Man Transform'd or, the Artificiall Changling* (1650), the human body was "drawn out by Nature's pencil," and such fashions rendered the corporeal form unnatural and even ungodly; they distorted the human form, as God had created it.[148]

The motif of artificial dress within vestimentary literature truly proliferated in a direct political sense during the 1630s and 1640s, as English commentators criticized the excess and opulence of the royal court of King Charles I (1625–49). This was not just a period wherein political, religious, and social tensions came to a boil, but also a time when Charles I's Personal Rule created a more insular and absolutist court style. Flamboyant clothing was under attack, just as Parliamentarian writers viewed the monarchy as an aberration of England's natural order. In this way, artifice was integrally tied to another theme that was widely used in mid seventeenth-century English political culture: monstrosity.

Early modern monsters have recently become a topic of much scholarly interest, especially in regards to the manner in which people formulated societal and cultural norms. Laura Lunger Knoppers and Joan Landes's collection of essays, *Monstrous Bodies/Political Monstrosities in Early Modern Europe* (2004), demonstrates that, with the rise of early modern science, the abnormal body served as "a weapon in political and religious propaganda and

[148] John Bulwer, *Anthropometamorphosis: Man Transform'd or, the Artificiall Changling* (London, 1653), 2.

debate."[149] Per Michel Foucault, the fashioning of monsters inherently implies a positive value. The idea of the monstrous helps to identify what is considered normal among a given people, society, or culture.[150] Just as Linda Colley's "Catholic Other" contributed to the formation of "Britishness" in the eighteenth century, Knoppers and Landes maintain that the "borders of the known and the acceptable" were constructed by the "monstrous Other" during the seventeenth century.[151] To many English writers of the Civil Wars, the seemingly bizarre and unnatural fashions of the early Caroline period transgressed what they believed were appropriate moral, social, and sexual boundaries.

The monstrous within the discourse of dress was particularly evident within an early ballad sheet, *The Phantastick Age*, which was anonymously published in 1634, a year after Charles I's reissue of his father's *Book of Sports*. The author claimed that English noblemen and women donned "transmutative" foreign fashions, including French, Italian, Spanish, Dutch, German, Danish, Persian, Polonian, and Ethiopian styles, much to the detriment of the nation. Employing the refrain, "O monsters, Neutrall monsters, leave these foolish toyes," the broadside described how strange, extravagant apparel transformed courtiers into chameleon-like creatures and thus allowed them to "change to any colour seene."[152] Such clothing, perceived as unnatural to the Isles, led to idle foppery, vanity, and vice.

---

[149] Laura Lunger Knoppers and Joan B. Landes, eds., *Monstrous Bodies/Political Monstrosities in Early Modern Europe* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2004), 7. For more on early modern monsters, see Merry E. Wiesner-Hanks, *The Marvelous Hairy Girls: The Gonzales Sisters and Their Worlds* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009); and Wes Williams, *Monsters and their Meanings in Early Modern Culture: Mighty Magic* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011).

[150] See Michel Foucault, *Les Anormaux: Cours au Collège de France (1974–1975)*, ed. François Ewald et al. (Paris: Seuil/Gallimand, 1999).

[151] Knoppers, 8. See Linda Colley, *Britons: Forging the Nation, 1707–1837* (1992; repr., New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2009).

[152] Anon., *The phantastick age: or, The anatomy of Englands vanity in wearing the fashions of severall nations* (London, 1634), 11.

Bulwer's *Anthropometamorphosis* (1650) presents another excellent example of how monstrous clothing was utilized to engage in significant political conversations regarding the English state during the mid-seventeenth century. It is perhaps difficult to understand how and why an ardent Royalist like Bulwer would directly condemn the opulent fashions characteristic of Charles I's court. Yet, a deeper examination of Bulwer's work reveals an underlying political message in defense of the monarchy. Traditionally, historians have viewed this lengthy treatise as simply an apolitical anthropological or ethnographical study of the early modern body throughout the world. Recent scholarship by William Burns, as well as Dominic Montserrat, however, has offered a reinterpretation of *Anthropometamorphosis* as a valuable piece of political theory during the turbulent mid-century.[153]

Educated at Oxford, Bulwer was a medical practitioner with a special interest in bodily communication, specifically in regards to how deafness influenced gesture. His literary dedications indicate that he was a member of a social circle that was concentrated at Gray's Inn in London and identified with the Church of England-Royalist party of Archbishop William Laud.[154] Bulwer supported the King throughout the 1640s and, as Burns argues, penned *Anthropometamorphosis* in direct response to the Royalist defeat and Charles's execution in January 1649. Within this work, Bulwer detailed many of the early modern world's fashions, hygiene rituals and practices regarding modifications of the human body. Yet, the body represented not just the monarch's physical form but also the English body politic. Playing on the medieval theory of the King's two bodies, Bulwer employed the language of monstrosity to challenge the authority of the artificially constructed post-regicidal state.[155] After the regicide of

[153] Burns, 187.
[154] Graham Richards, "Bulwer, John (bap. 1606, d. 1656), medical practitioner and writer on deafness and on gesture," *ODNB*.
[155] See Kantorowicz.

Charles I, the state of England was disfigured, since monarchy was the "natural" form of government. For Bulwer, the new "disguises of apparell," or strangely-shaped vestments, similarly distorted the body politic, and thus the state, as well as subverted one's natural form as God created it.[156] These fashions were an attack on both the English state and Church, as evident within Bulwer's criticism of high-heeled shoes, which were donned by both men and women during the seventeenth-century. While heeled shoes were greatly popularized by Louis XIV during the later half of the century, the style actually rose to fashion during the preceding sixteenth century and was prevalent throughout the Continent and Isles. In England, high-heeled shoes were primarily worn within the theater for dramatic effect, although literary evidence suggests that contemporaries believed these heels to be more common along the streets of London. One style in particular, the chopine, became the subject of much scorn and satire by English writers, including Bulwer.

The chopine, variously known as the choppine, chopin or chapiney, was an over-shoe female fashion popular during the late sixteenth and early to mid-seventeenth centuries that consisted of a toe-cap affixed to a rather high sole of wood or, usually, cork, which could be very elaborately decorated.[157] Within his travel journal *Crudities* (1611), Thomas Coryate comments that the wood heel was often covered in white, red, or yellow leather, while others were "curiously painted" or "fairely gilt."[158] The origins of these platform heels lay within the Catholic powers of the Continent, with versions in France ["*chapins* or "*chappins*"], Portugal ["*chapim*"*]*, Spain ["*chapin*"], and Italy. The chopine was apparently so popular throughout the Iberian peninsula that Bulwer writes that "this false and lying appearance" of chopines "is a fault

[156] Bulwer, *Anthropometamorphosis*, 551.
[157] Cumming, *Dictionary of Fashion History*, 61.
[158] Thomas Coryate, *Coryats crudities* (London, 1611), 262.

very ordinary in Spaines, where women for the most part (if not all)" don such fantastical footwear. Spanish ladies appeared much taller than their English counterparts, yet this proved no act of nature but of vain artifice. Indeed, Bulwer further comments that most Spanish women prove to be no more than "halfe wives," for upon a woman's wedding night when her shoes are removed in the marriage bed, "it may be perceived that halfe the Bride was made of guilded Corke."[159]

Yet, while Bulwer marvels at the popularity of the Spanish *chapin,* the style was most strongly associated with Italy, particularly Venice. Early seventeenth-century English authors firmly believed that their Anglicized term had originally derived from the Italian language, and often referred to these shoes as "cioppini" [the plural form of "*cioppino*"]. Moreover, Coryate notes that the chopine was so common throughout Venice, "that no woman whatsoever goeth without it, either in her house or abroad."[160] Venetian chopines were reportedly "monstrously exaggerated" to quite extraordinary heights.[161] Coryate observed that in Venice "there are many of these chapineys of a great height, even half a yard high, which maketh many of their women that are very short, seeme much taller then the tallest women we have in England."[162] A June 1645 entry from John Evelyn's diary includes a similar observation of this Venetian style during his travels to Italy, noting that the ladies, or "proude dames," wore "Choppines about 10 foote high from the ground." Furthermore, Evelyn relays the suggestion that these shoes were perhaps first invented to keep the women who wore them at home, owing to the great difficulty of walking in such a high heel. Indeed, Evelyn further remarked on the ridiculousness and hilarity

[159] Bulwer, *Anthropometamorphosis,* 550.
[160] Coryate, *Coryats crudities,* 262.
[161] "chopine | chopin, n." *OED Online*. October 2017. Oxford University Press. http://www.oed.com.ezproxy.lib.purdue.edu/view/Entry/32260?redirectedFrom=choppine#eid (accessed October 15, 2017).
[162] Coryate, *Coryats crudities,* 262.

of watching these ladies "crawl in and out of their gondolas, by reason of their choppines; and what dwarfs they appear, when taken down from their wooden scaffolds."[163] The chopine was indeed an unnecessary hindrance to woman's natural gait, as Coryate remarked upon one rather grave, albeit comical, stumble by a Venetian woman:

> I saw a woman fall a very dangerous fall, as she was going downe the staires of one of the little stony bridges with her high Chapineys alone by her selfe: but I did nothing pitty her, because shee wore such frivolous and (as I may trulely terme them) ridiculous instruments, which were the occasions of her fall. For both I myselfe, and many other strangers (as I have observed in Venice) have often laughed at them for their vaine Chapineys.

Indeed, Coryate further stated that he believed the style to be "so uncomely a thing in my opinion that it is pitty this custom is not cleane banished and exterminated out of the citie [of Venice]."[164]

Contemporary writers made sure to expressly emphasize the chopine as a foreign, and by extension, Catholic invention that sought to deform the feet of Englishwomen through artifice. However, the chopine was attacked within printed works not simply because it was a foreign fashion but also due to the apparent danger this style posed to Stuart England's social and political status quo, as both Englishmen and women attempted to make themselves more prominent in both a physical and figurative sense. Cross-class dressing was certainly a constant concern throughout early modern England, and many authors clearly acknowledged the connection between exaggerated clothing and social standing. Long garments and sweeping trains were criticized for purposely attempting to make the wearer seem "greater" than they actually were, while Coryate scathingly comments that, "by how much the nobler a woman is, by so much the higher are her Chapineys."[165] Similarly, in *Anthropometamorphosis,* Bulwer likens

[163] Evelyn, *Diary*, 2: 227, 297.
[164] Coryate, *Coryats crudities*, 262.
[165] Coryate, *Coryats crudities*, 262.

the trend of platform heels to another fashionable "affectation of creating height" at the opposite end of the human form: that of elaborate headdresses and hairstyles, being "strong inventions of Tiara's."[166]

Bulwer condemned those who "set themselves against the word of our Saviour, that it is not in us to add anything to the measure or height that God hath given to us." Such lifts deformed the feet and gave these individuals "a delusive apparition of stature, beyond the naturall procerity."[167] English ladies and even the gallants who donned such attire attempted to raise their physical stature higher than God and nature had designed, similar to the manner in which unworthy, common men rose to an unnatural position as head of the state. Furthermore, Bulwer claimed that those who strutted around in chopines and other high-heeled shoes were placed in "so tottering a condition, that when they have spun a while in the streets, usually come hobbling down, and in this fashion are emblematically presented to be unstable in all their waies," just as the artificially-constructed Commonwealth represented an unreliable and insecure form of English government.[168]

3.2 Black Patches: A Pox Upon the Head [of Government]

Other writers during the English Revolution (1642–51) drew upon the idea of the monstrous political body for their own particular purposes. Indeed, either Royalist or Parliamentarian could appropriate the deformed body in order to promote their own cause and condemn their opponent's. David Cressy has revealed that Cavaliers, Roundheads, Catholics, Levellers, and regicides were all similarly labeled as "monstrous" within various radical pamphlets of the English Revolution. Cressy advocates that printed reports of headless births in

[166] Bulwer, *Anthropometamorphosis*, 550–551.
[167] Bulwer, *Anthropometamorphosis*, 550, 555.
[168] Bulwer, *Anthropometamorphosis*, 550.

the 1640s often blamed particular "delinquents," such as Papists or sectarians, for these abnormalities. In such cases, the authors emphasized that the mother's heretical opinions and defiance of both clerical and patriarchal authority led to disastrous consequences, specifically her unviable offspring. The head, a symbol of reason and authority, is an appropriate metaphor for the state and thus, as Cressy comments, a headless monster demonstrated how the government had "lost its way and lost its mind."[169]

Bulwer was particularly interested in bodily modifications to the head and face, and their catastrophic effects upon the state. Indeed, the primary focus of *Anthropometamorphosis* was the cosmetic, as Bulwer described, in detail, beautifying rituals from around the globe, including the dyeing and curling of long hair as well as face painting. As another unnatural fashion, patches were also the subject of much criticism by English authors at both ends of the political spectrum. Rising to fashion in the 1590s, these patches were small pieces of black fabric, usually velvet or silk, which were applied with an adhesive mastic or "mouth-glue" (saliva) to the face in order to conceal blemishes and enhance the whiteness of one's visage.[170] Such embellishments were not always spots, however, as their shape, as well as size for that matter, ranged from the fanciful, such as hearts, stars, crescent moons and lozenges, to the more elaborate, including birds and trees.[171] Patches originated in France, arguably, the cultural center of the early modern world, where they were referred to as *mouches*, or "flies," as evident within Pierre Betrand's engraving

---

[169] David Cressy, "Lamentable, Strange, and Wonderful: Headless Monsters in the English Revolution," in *Monstrous Bodies/Political Monstrosities in Early Modern Europe* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2004), 62–3.

[170] Valerie Cumming, C.W. Cunnington and P.E. Cunnington, *The Dictionary of Fashion History* (New York: Berg, 2010), 150.

[171] Morag Martin, *Selling Beauty: Cosmetics, Commerce, and French Society, 1750–1830* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 2009), 15. See also, Aileen Ribeiro, *Facing Beauty: Painted Women & Cosmetic Art* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2011), 131–4. Vickery notes that one perfumer ordered a variety of sizes, ranging from those the size of pea to those of a half dollar. See Amanda Vickery, "Women and the World of Goods: A Lancashire Consumer and her Possessions, 1751–81," in John Brewer and Roy Porter, *Consumption and the World of Goods* (New York: Routledge, 1994), 280–81.

of the same name from the 1650s. In this image, two sumptuously dressed women sport so many insect-shaped patches that the flesh of their faces and décolletage is barely visible.[172] Although patches were a predominantly female cosmetic trend, many fashionable elite men also began to don these beauty spots by the turn of the eighteenth century. Furthermore, by the mid-eighteenth century, the position of these patches was utilized to communicate party affiliation.[173]

While black patches did not reflect such an overt political meaning in the mid-seventeenth century, the donning of these spots did hold particular significance to English writers of the 1640s. According to Bulwer, the Englishwomen who adopted the vain customs of face painting and black patches were "seldome known to be contented with a Face of God's making; for they are either adding, detracting, or altering continually." If a woman believed she had too much color, she would make herself fairer with "her bold stigmatizing hand." Alternatively, pale ladies would constantly apply rouge like "Spanish paper" or "Red Leather" to their visages, thus persisting in a continual cycle of bodily mutilation. Although he is less critical of the "ancient English," referring to the Scottish Picts who painted their faces with blue Woad, Bulwer argued that "Painter-stainers" usurped the divine role of God by imposing unnatural hues upon their faces.[174] Similarly, the use of patches was also condemned as a deformity of God's creation. These foul black patches, far from their intended purpose of augmentation, actually diminished one's natural beauty. In this way, spotting was "as odious, and as senselesse an affectation as ever was used by any barbarous Nation in the World." Indeed, Bulwer comments that only the French could so cunningly transform ugly blotches into beauty-spots. Yet, this nation may be

[172] Ribeiro, *Fashion and Fiction,* 209–10.
[173] Cumming, *Dictionary of Fashion History*, 150. The use of black patches to signal Whig and Tory party affiliations are discussed in the Conclusion.
[174] Bulwer's nostalgic sentiments regarding the Picts and their Woad may have been attributed to the fact that the Stuart monarchs were essentially Scottish, as James I of England was the grandson of James V of Scotland. Bulwer, *Anthropometamorphosis*, 260–261, 1.

excused for their "phantsticalnesse," as they have taken up the fashion for necessity rather than novelty since "those French Pimples have need of a French Plaister."[175]

While he did credit black patches as a thoroughly French invention, Bulwer acknowledged that the practice derived from the primitive peoples of India. *Anthropometamorphosis* even contained an image of indigenous face painting with intricate designs, such as lions, fish, deer, birds, and flowers, alongside contemporary European depictions of "artificially-altered humans" in order to stress the barbaric nature of this practice. Another woodcut depicted the decorated heads of a European and an African woman. Here, their faces were inverted; the European woman sported numerous black patches, including a large, elaborate carriage design upon her forehead, while her black counterpart wore simpler, light-colored shapes upon her dark visage.[176] The racial and ethnic implications of these two figures are obvious, as Bulwer likened this cosmetic trend popular throughout Stuart England to the uncivilized customs of non-whites as well as other Europeans, as in the case of the Catholic French.

Black patches, among other fashionable trimmings, also adorned the frontispiece and text of Laurence Price's satirical pamphlet, *Here's Jack in a Box, That Will Conjure the Fox* (1657), which was written in October 1656 and vividly depicted the newest fashions popular throughout London. Unlike Bulwer, Price lacked strong ideological affiliations during the Civil Wars, although evidence from contemporaries indicates that he occasionally sided with the Parliamentarian army during the periods of conflict. Nevertheless, his bibliography reveals a seemingly pragmatic writer who penned what he knew would sell. Indeed, Roy Palmer states that

[175] Bulwer, *Anthropometamorphosis*, 2, 272–73.
[176] Bulwer, *Anthropometamorphosis*, 534, 558.

Price supported Charles I during the early 1640s, then, at the very least, sympathized with the Commonwealth by 1656 before ultimately welcoming the Restoration.[177]

Within *Here's Jack in a Box*, Price described how a swindling tradesman, or a "jack-in-a-box," advertised his many fashionable wares, including beauty spots and periwigs in an assortment of colors like yellow, black, brown, auburn, red, and even blue, to the wide expanse of London society.[178] As a part of his marketing ploy, the jack was sure to emphasize the modish and exotic nature of his goods to the great expanse of London society. In particular, Price identified and addressed a particular troupe of wanton Englishwomen who spoke French fluently (although they had never traveled beyond the Isles) and were treated at least five times for *Morbur Gallicus,* the "French Disease." If they had the coin, the narrator offered to outfit these "wag-tailes"[179] with:

> a new Silken gowne of the new Fashion, with Petticoats laced with Silver and Gold lace most gallantly, with sumptuous trimming, for before and behind, with costly rich Gorgets[180]; and Dressings, the like whereof are not to be seen.[181]

---

[177] Roy Palmer, "Price, Laurence (fl. 1628–1675), ballad and chapbook writer," *ODNB*.

[178] Per OED, a "jack in a box" was a charlatan or cheat, "a thief who deceived tradesmen by substituting empty boxes for others full of money." See "Jack-in-a-box | Jack-in-a-box, n." *OED Online*. November 2014. Oxford University Press. http://www.oed.com.ezproxy.lib.purdue.edu/view/Entry/100519?redirectedFrom=jack+in+the+box#eid (accessed November 10, 2014).

[179] According to OED, the term "wagtail" was commonly used during the seventeenth century to describe "a profligate or inconstant woman," a harlot or courtesan. See "wagtail, n." *OED Online*. November 2014. Oxford University Press. http://www.oed.com.ezproxy.lib.purdue.edu/view/Entry/225074?rskey=KszGEj&result=1#eid (accessed November 10, 2014).

[180] A "gorget" was a rather large umbrella term during the medieval and early modern periods, used to refer to a number of different articles of dress or ornaments specifically for the neck, such as necklaces, embellished collars, and wimples. See "gorget, n.1." *OED Online*. November 2014. Oxford University Press. http://www.oed.com.ezproxy.lib.purdue.edu/view/Entry/80122?rskey=ItxdWH&result=1#eid (accessed November 10, 2014). Furthermore, according to Randolph Holme's *The Academy of Armory* (1688), "whisks," broad falling bands or collars that were usually trimmed with lace and fell about the shoulders, were also commonly known as gorgets; See Cumming, *Dictionary of Fashion History*, 293.

[181] Laurence Price, *Heres Jack in a box, that will coniure the fox. Or, A new list of the new fashions now used in London* (London, 1657), 9–10.

Already corrupted physiologically with syphilis, the jack-in-a-box proposed to further pollute, in a more cultural sense, the bodies of "Frenchified" *English*women with these opulent trappings of the Continent. Indeed, perhaps the black patches advertised within Price's pamphlet would be applied in an attempt to conceal the physical effects, or facial scarring, of the French Disease upon these English bodies.

The frontispiece also marketed the seller's goods. In this print entitled, "Here be your new Fashions Mistres," the fashionable woman dangled a laced mask in one hand and clutched a luxurious feathered fan in the other while her face sported numerous black patches cut into fantastical shapes, including a star, cross and crescent.[182] Such a bizarre appearance was further emphasized by the presence of a rather interesting accessory, a fox. In this context, the fox can be interpreted as an animal familiar, functioning as the "mistress" of these modish new fashions as well as a reservoir for the woman's supernatural abilities. Familiars were frequently featured within Roundhead propaganda during the Revolution, as evident in Mark Stoyle's recent study of Prince Rupert's faithful canine companion. Stoyle argues that the Parliamentarian press exploited occult motifs in order to fashion a powerful witch myth concerning Charles I's half-German nephew and his white Poodle, Boye. Boye was believed to be the familiar of the always opulently-dressed Prince Rupert and thereby contained a number of magical powers, including shape shifting and the ability to deflect gunfire. This political ploy proved so successful that Royalists later attempted to reverse the rhetoric in support of their own cause.[183]

Throughout the mid-century, English writers frequently utilized the presence of toads, cats, monkeys, and dogs in both picture and print to emphasize the abnormal character of an

---

[182] See Price, *Here's Jack in a Box*.
[183] Mark Stoyle, *The Black Legend of Prince Rupert's Dog: Witchcraft and Propaganda during the English Civil War* (Exeter: University of Exeter Press, 2011).

individual. Yet, the supernatural and monstrous manifested in other forms within Price's pamphlet besides the fox familiar. The work also satirized how fashionable women about London applied grisly cosmetics to their face like "puppy dog water," which was made from a young pup's urine, or as other contemporaries claimed, the macabre distilled liquid from dead dogs.[184] Indeed, Evelyn's *Mundus muliebris* (1690) also included a recipe for "puppidog water for the face," ordering one to take:

> a Fat Puppidog, of nine days old, and kill it, order it as to Roast; save the Blood, and fling away take the Blood, and Pig, or the Puppidog, and break the Legs and Head, with all the Liver and the rest of the Inwards, of either of them, put all into the Still if it will hold it, to that, take two Quarts of old Canary, a pound of unwash'd Butter not salted; a Quart of Snails-Shells, and also two Lemmons, only the outside pared away; Still all these together in a Rose Water Still, either at once or twice; Let it drop slowly into a Glass-Bottle, in which let there be a lump of Loaf-Sugar, and a little Leaf-gold.[185]

Additionally, Price listed the ingredients for another monstrous cosmetic concoction, a popular hair powder that required a witch's brew of the eyes of a cockatrice (or basilisk), the blood of a bat, and the brains of a woodcock.[186] In the midst of the Protectorate, Price drew upon the common political devices of witchcraft, demonology, and monstrosity in order to mock the unnatural fashions, especially cosmetics, characteristic of the royal court. However, although Price condemned the same garments and accessories as Bulwer did, and in a similar manner, his intent appears to be very different from his counterpart's pro-Royalist stance.

Indeed, patches also received substantial attention within the discourse of dress from those on the political left. At the end of his pamphlet, *Comarum Akosmia, or The Loathsomnesse*

---

[184] "puppy dog, n." *OED Online*. November 2014. Oxford University Press. http://www.oed.com.ezproxy.lib.purdue.edu/view/Entry/154806 (accessed November 5, 2014).
[185] Evelyn, *Mundus muliebris*, 23.
[186] Price, *Here's Jack in a Box*, 8.

of Long Haire (1654), the republican writer Thomas Hall included an essay entitled, "Seven Arguments against Spots, and Black-patches (worn for pride) on the Face."[187] Hall, the son of a clothier, remained a firm advocate of the Cromwellian government after the Lord Protector dissolved the Rump Parliament in 1653. Upon Cromwell's death five years later, Hall feared that England would transform into another Canaan and thus, although a Presbyterian, he fervently advocated against the Restoration of the monarchy. Following the Act of Uniformity in 1662, he was ejected from his living. Hall objected to more than simply the new King's religious settlement. He also opposed courtly fashions and entertainment more generally.[188] Such sentiments had indeed also been present during the Interregnum, for rich apparel and luxury consumption proved difficult to completely eradicate from the Isles even under strict Parliamentarian rule.[189]

Like Bulwer and Price, Hall utilized similar monstrous language to denounce black patches, referring to these "foul things" as "Beastly-spots." Moreover, he also referred to them variously as "Leprosie-spots" and "Plague-spots" throughout the pamphlet, thereby likening black patches to a disease on the English body politic. Patches marred, defiled, and debased the visage of the Englishman, and consequently the state at large, not due to any ailment of the flesh but rather due to the lingering cancer of the Cavalier cause. The wearing of these spots was understood by Hall to be both a revolt against the Parliamentarian state as well as nature, and thus God. He claimed that "these are not spots of Infirmity, but spots of Malignity and Rebellion; they are proud, and they will be so" as long as heretics persisted to adorn themselves with such profane markings. Good Christians were required by Scripture to shun not simply evil, but the

[187] Thomas Hall, *Comarum Akosmia, or The Loathsomnesse of Long Haire* (London, 1654).
[188] C.D. Gilbert, "Hall, Thomas (1610–1665), clergyman and ejected minister," *ODNB*.
[189] For more, see Peck, *Consuming Splendor*.

appearance of evil, and excessively unnatural fashions definitely looked ungodly. Instead, Hall proposed that the English should be as "Primitive Christians" and live by the virtues of innocence, patience, unity, and purity in all things, especially dress.[190] Englishmen and women would be better off with stink rather than sweet perfumes, with tatters over costly clothes, and baldness as opposed to curled, frizzed, and dyed hair.[191] To Hall, black spots were the vain markers of the Cavaliers and symbolized the dregs of monarchial authority within Interregnum England. In fact, the very purpose of these patches, to conceal blemishes and thus beautify through artifice, contradicted Cromwell's own plain and seemingly honest "warts and all" style that was characteristic of his personality and administration.[192]

3.3 The Farthingale

The concept of artifice was also integrally tied to another fashionable style that received much censure during the seventeenth century, the farthingale. This garment was a hooped petticoat made from wood, rushes, wicker, or, more rarely, whalebone, which expanded the skirt worn over it and gave the wearer a unique round shape.[193] The extent of the farthingale's wild popularity throughout sixteenth-century Europe is evident in the numerous different versions of this hoopskirt: English, French, Italian, Scotch, and Spanish, as well as the roll, pocket, and semi-circular farthingale.[194] The style was particularly popular in London and Paris, wherein the French style was known as the *verdugale* or *vertugalle*. In England, the farthingale was

[190] Hall, *Comarum Akosmia*, 118, 116, 122.
[191] Hall, *Comarum Akosmia*, 118–122.
[192] See Laura Lunger Knoppers, "The Politics of Portraiture: Oliver Cromwell and the Plain Style," *Renaissance Quarterly* 51, no. 4 (Winter 1998): 1287.
[193] Valerie Cumming, *A Visual History of Costume: The Seventeenth Century* (New York: Batsford, 1984), 143. Furthermore, Amanda Wunder states that the hooped construction of the farthingale could also be made from iron. See Amanda Wunder, "Women's Fashions and Politics in Seventeenth-Century Spain: The Rise and Fall of the Guardainfante," *Renaissance Quarterly* 68, no. 1 (Spring 2015), 135.
[194] Cumming, *Dictionary of Fashion History*, 103.

iconically donned by Elizabeth I and Anne of Denmark, as well as their respective ladies, and furthermore remained *the* formal costume for the English court until the end of James I's reign. This version worn by the English elite was referred to by various names, including the "great," "drum," and, most commonly, the "wheel" or "Catherine wheel" farthingale. Synonymous with the French variant, the wheel farthingale became fashionable in England first in the 1580s and differed considerably, in terms of shape, from other styles. The wheel farthingale was worn around the waist and slightly tilted upward from behind. The skirt was laid over the frame horizontally and then fell down over the edge of the frame, thereby creating a distinctive "tub-like" or boxy appearance with the illusion of extremely wide hips.[195]

Bulwer comments upon these "great and stately Verdingales" several times within *Anthropometamorphosis*. As another "foolish affectation" of fashion, Bulwer's critique of the farthingale, like the choppine and black patch, is firmly centered on its artificial and visually deceptive nature. Indeed, Bulwer reveals that the women who donned this garment intentionally self-fashioned an illusion of their bodily form, and, the farthingale's ridiculously odd shape being apparently so delusive, thereby encouraged observers to believe it to be their true, natural figure. Bulwer states that "some maides and women now adaies" wear this article of clothing to purposefully fashion a more attractive physical figure, believing that men desired them to have "great and fat thighs" and thus they "labour to ground this perswasion in men by their spacious, huge, and round-circling Verdingals."[196] Furthermore, Bulwer cites a similar, albeit embarrassing, diplomatic episode during the early reign of Charles I, wherein the farthingale projected a misleading idea of the Englishwoman's body to foreigners. Sir Peter Wyche served as the English ambassador to the Ottoman Empire from 1628–41. Charged with protecting

[195] Cumming, *Dictionary of Fashion History*, 293.
[196] Bulwer, *Anthropometamorphosis*, 541, 546.

English merchants' commercial interests in the Mediterranean, he arrived in Constantinople in November 1628 while his wife Lady Jane Wyche (née Meredith) arrived shortly thereafter.[197] According to Bulwer, while at the court of Sultan Murad IV (r. 1623–40), the Sultana requested an audience with Lady Wyche:

> whereupon my Lady Wych (accompanied with her waiting-women, all neatly dressed in their great Verdingals, which was the Court Fashion then) attended her Highnesse. The Sultanesse entertained her respectfully, but withall wondring at her great and spacious Hips, she asked her whether all English women were so made and shaped about those parts: To which my Lady Wych answered, that they were made as other women were, withall shewing the fallacy of her apparell in the device of the Verdingall, untill which demonstration was made, the Sultannesse verily believed it had been her naturall and reall shape.[198]

3.4 Bare Breasts and 'Bruitish Adamitisme:' The Politics of Nudity

Fantastical fashions certainly occupied a significant place within the political culture of seventeenth-century London. Yet, while writers often criticized the concept of too much superfluous clothing upon English bodies, they also protested against too little. Near or complete nudity remains another thematic thread that was popular within cheap print throughout the seventeenth century, and particularly heightened during the politico-religious chaos of the Civil Wars and subsequent Interregnum. Both Royalist and Parliamentarian writers criticized fashions that they believed exposed too much skin, including lightweight fabrics, revealing necklines, and partially or fully bared breasts. For example, Richard Brathwaite inherently associated these styles with nakedness, believing such fashions to be emblematic of the royal court and its sinful corruption and foreign decadence. Additionally, Presbyterian heresiographers as well as Church of England authors, including Bulwer, preached against the idea of naked and

[197] Liane Saunders, "Wyche, Sir Peter (d. 1643), diplomat," *ODNB*.
[198] Bulwer, *Anthropometamorphosis*, 547.

exposed flesh, as it was perceived within the theologies of sectarians like the Anabaptists and Adamites. Ultimately, the absence of clothing and baring of skin was another literary and pictorial theme employed by authors to demonstrate how such revealing styles, as well as nudity more generally, on the English body politic threatened the natural order of Stuart England.

The corresponding conduct books, *The English Gentleman* (1630) and *The English Gentlewoman* (1631) by Richard Brathwaite both addressed the issue of too little clothing during the preceding years of civil war.[199] In the earliest years of James I's reign, Brathwaite was educated at the Royalist stronghold of Oxford before training at Gray's Inn in London, much like Bulwer. Although he maintained strong Cavalier leanings, Brathwaite was not opposed to satirizing the royal court and his writings certainly reflected his aversion to the proliferation of foreign fashions within early Caroline England.[200] Nevertheless, he dedicated *The English Gentleman* to Thomas Wentworth, the controversial Earl of Strafford, while the feminine version was bestowed upon his second wife, Arabella Wentworth (née Holles). By Strafford's execution in 1641, Brathwaite appears to have, at least temporarily, shifted his support to Parliament, the prevailing political power. A later edition published that same year, which combined both these works into one large compilation, featured a dedication to the Parliamentarian Philip Herbert, first earl of Montgomery and fourth earl of Pembroke.[201]

The English Gentlewoman focuses on eight subjects considered fundamental to the Englishwoman's character: apparel, behavior, complement, decency, estimation, fancy, gentility

---

[199] Richard Brathwaite, *The English gentleman: containing sundry excellent rules or exquisite observations, tending to direction of every of selecter ranke and qualitie, how to demeane or accommodate himselfe in the manage of publike or affaires* (London, 1630); and *The English gentlevvoman, drawne out to the full body expressing, what habilliments doe best attire her, what ornaments doe best adorne her, what complements doe best accomplish her* (London, 1631). [henceforth, cited as *English Gentlewoman*].

[200] Julie Sanders, "Brathwaite, Richard (1587/8–1673), poet and writer," *ODNB.*

[201] David L. Smith, "Herbert, Philip, first earl of Montgomery and fourth earl of Pembroke," ODNB.

and honor. Brathwaite begins his discussion of female dress with a lengthy commentary on the origins and purposes of apparel. According to Brathwaite, who relies heavily on Scripture within his analysis, clothing maintained a two-fold purpose: to cover one's shameful nude form and to ensure the body's warmth by keeping in the natural heat of the body and keeping out the accidental cold from the air. Clothing was thus a human necessity born of practicality, not vanity. Brathwaite asks his fellow Englishmen and women: "How is it then, that these rages of sinne, these robes of shame, should make you idolize selves? How is it, that yee convert that which was ordained for necessity, to feed the light-flaming fuell of licentious liberty?" Brathwaite further argued that "the Divine Providence" first commanded Adam "to cover his nakednesse; not for State or Curiosity, but necessity and convenience." Clothing must ever be sensible and never frivolous since "the true servant of God is not to weare garments for beauty or delight."[202] A further examination of the book's first section on apparel reveals that the physical substantiality of fabrics was intricately tied to Brathwaite's ideas concerning nudity and exposed skin; the more lightweight or thin the garment, the more naked Brathwaite perceived the human form.

Brathwaite charts the development of apparel after man's fall from grace stating that the first clothes were made from the "Skinnes of dead beasts," before the progression to pure wool, which was born slightly out of human vanity as well as utility since this fabric was somewhat lighter than fur or hide. After wool, came the "rindes of trees, or flax, and then "the dung and ordure of Wormes" (silk), before richly embellishments, namely gold, silver and jewels, which "preciousnesse of attire highly displeaseth God."[203] In another essay included within *Comarum Akosmia*, entitled "Arguments against naked Backs and Breasts," Thomas Hall argued that, "God hath given us clothes wherewith to cover our bodyes in a decent, modest, frugall manner," and

[202] Brathwaite, *English Gentlewoman*, 3, 14.
[203] Brathwaite, *English Gentlewoman*, 13.

quoted Scripture in which God specifically commanded wool to cover man's nakedness.[204] Similarly, Brathwaite continues his discussion of apparel by noting that even John the Baptist, "who was sanctified in his mothers wombe," wrapped himself in "sharpe and rough garments."[205] Tough, heavy fabrics were thus not only the most practical but also the most godly material for attire, ordained by God to cloth the human form.

Opulence and adornment in dress as well as lightweight fabrics, especially silk, did not perform apparel's primary functions, for embellishments were superfluous while lighter textiles inadequately covered the body and thus failed to provide warmth. Brathwaite states that such flimsy fabrics "were not made to keepe cold out, but to bring cold in. No necessity, but meere vanity, introduced these Pye-coloured fopperies amongst vs." Indeed, "thinne Cobweb attires" and "Butterfly-habits" do not "preserue heat, nor repell cold."[206] These organic descriptions (particularly the previous "dung of worms" phrase) suggest silky fabrics to be rather disgusting, bizarre, and, despite the references to nature and insects, slightly unnatural when worn upon the human body. The use of such language by Brathwaite to describe silks emphasizes not simply the inadequacy of such textiles to meet clothing's primary purposes by also maintains greater political connotations within the context of mid-seventeenth century England.

During the Stuart era, silk was considered a doubly exotic commodity within England, being a raw good imported raw from China as well as a textile primarily worked by immigrants, specifically French Huguenots who migrated to the Isles in several waves throughout the seventeenth century.[207] In England, silks were thus one of the most expensive textiles as well as

---

[204] Hall, *Comarum Akosmia*, 109.
[205] Brathwaite, *English Gentlewoman*, 14.
[206] Brathwaite, *English Gentlewoman*, 4.
[207] Clare Backhouse, *Fashion and Popular Print in Early Modern England: Depicting Dress in Black-Letter Ballads* (New York: I.B. Tauris, 2017), 12.

highly fashionable, yet decidedly foreign luxury goods worn by the English elite even before the turn of the seventeenth century. Manufactured from silkworm cocoons, silk was bright, light, and lustrous, giving this striking textile a rather effervescent quality. Silk was perhaps deserving of the descriptors Brathwaite gave it; it was a textile indeed fabricated from organic matter, specifically insects, and was certainly not known for its heavyweight substantiality, although the threading allowed the fabric to be quite strong once produced. Conversely, wool was considered *the* staple good of England during the early modern period, as sheep farming and wool working were vital to the English economy and provided a great source of employment. Wool, therefore, embodied "the very essence of English identity," in contrast to expensive foreign fabrics, namely silk and cotton.[208] The dichotomy between wool and silk employed by Brathwaite here speaks to a greater political discourse throughout the seventeenth century concerning England's trade policies as well as national dress and identity, or "Englishness." In a very tangible sense, wool represented English industry and stability, while silk symbolized Stuart England's dependence on foreign trade as well as the pervasiveness of exotic culture.

Yet, Brathwaite's aversion to light fabrics and silks extends beyond their vain, impractical, and foreign nature, but also lies in the danger he believed they posed to England's sexual order. Indeed, the dichotomy between light and tough fabrics also maintained highly gendered connotations within this vestmentary discourse of the mid-seventeenth century. Brathwaite identified rich, lightweight fabrics as "soft" and "delicate," claiming that "Soft Cloathes" led to "soft minds" and begot "an effeminacy in the heart." He further argued that apparel had been corrupted by superfluity and delicacy, "which weakens and effeminates the

[208] Backhouse, *Fashion and Popular Print,* 11. Chapter III, "Dress for Success: The Politics of Display in the Royal Court," analyzes the role of cottons and, more specifically, calicoes within Britain's early imperial expansion as well as Catherine of Braganza's self-fashioning at the Restoration court.

spirit."[209] Thus, the dichotomy between silk and wool was politicized even further with such gendered language, added deeper dimensions to their inherent opposition; silk was superfluous, decadent, foreign, and effeminate, whereas wool was practical, frugal, "English" (being native to the Isles) and masculine. Brathwaite's discussion of light fabrics was not simply a criticism of elite dress and foreign influence within the royal court but also a commentary that touched other issues of a greater political significance, including national identity and gender politics.

Not just the perception of nudity, as exemplified with these lightweight textiles, but actual exposed flesh was another topic that received much comment, if not altogether critique, within vestimentary literature. Breast-baring was both an image and practice that received a great amount of attention from English writers including Brathwaite, Bulwer, and Hall. Naked breasts were negotiated within cheap print in both positive and negative terms, for images of cleavage and exposed décolletage were often associated with a wide array of literary and pictorial themes including sober spirituality, virginity, and queenship, as well as luxury, foreign vice, prostitution and female sexual agency more generally.[210] Since most prints (and later mezzotints during the later half of the seventeenth century) of women with bared breasts were general or stock images, they were thus used to communicate a variety of different meanings within printed works. Ideas concerning exposed breasts were far more nuanced and complex within mid seventeenth-century England, and therefore did not always represent the more obvious themes of sexual depravity.

That being said, English writers, like Brathwaite and Hall, most commonly utilized the theme and image of exposed breasts within their works to represent rampant sexual licentiousness and promiscuity within mid seventeenth-century London. Brathwaite identifies the baring of breasts as a shameful and sinful act leading unsuspecting male eyes to adultery: "Eye

[209] Brathwaite, *English Gentlewoman*, 14, 13.
[210] Backhouse, *Fashion and Popular Print*, 179.

those rising mounts, your displayed breasts, with what shamelesse art they wooe the shamefaste passenger."[211] Hall argues that "nakednesse is a curse with a witnesse, even monstrous pride; and therefore great is the folly of those, who have their garments made on such a fashion, that their necks and breasts are in great part left naked; a sinfull and abominable practise!" Furthermore, Hall claims that "that if it were possible, and necessity would permit it, the whole body, both face and hands, should all be covered: hence God hath made garments to cover our naked bodies."[212] It is often unclear whether the frequent criticism of naked necks and breasts in these printed works, as seen here with Hall, refers to low necklines and exposed décolletage or to the full, complete baring of breasts. Nevertheless, both sartorial practices appear to garner equal condemnation and were both understood to be crude symbols of a corrupt royal court.

Fully bared breasts as a motif of visual iconography remains a neglected subject within the field of art history.[213] When early modern scholars have treated the subject, the central focus has largely been placed upon court portraiture, with a more recent particular interest in the titillating portraits of Charles II's mistresses Barbara Palmer, Nell Gwynn, Louise de Kéroualle, and Hortense Mancini.[214] In seventeenth-century court portraiture, bared breasts were typically a vital component of allegorical compositions, especially those with biblical allusions to the Virgin Mary. Yet, as Clare Bachouse notes, allegorical depictions of fully bared breasts were also "widely available in contemporary English printed images," as these court portraits were often copied and disseminated within cheap print. In her recent study, Backhouse examines the image of bared breasts within seventeenth-century black-letter ballads, wherein this motif was

[211] Brathwaite, *English Gentlewoman*, 8.
[212] Hall, *Comarum Akosmia*, 109–10.
[213] Backhouse, *Fashion and Popular Print*, 162.
[214] See Catharine MacLeod and Julia Marciari Alexander, "The 'Windsor Beauties' and the Beauties Series in Restoration England," in *Politics, Transgression, and Representation at the Court of Charles II*, Catharine MacLeod and Julia Marciari Alexander, eds. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2007): 81–120.

"ubiquitous" in comparison to its presence in engravings and painted portraits. Backhouse states that the fully exposed breasts depicted within these ballads were often "perceived as symbols of the social elite."[215] As Backhouse notes, it is quite difficult to determine the exact circumstances concerning the baring of breasts within seventeenth-century England. However, both literary and anecdotal evidence indicates that it was not simply a sexy and trendy topic employed within cheap print to better attract readers, but rather a recognizable sartorial practice throughout London that was "unlikely to have been seen in public spaces outside court culture or the stage."[216]

Bared breasts' strong and popular association with the royal court is evident not simply within the printed works that condemned exposed flesh, but within accompanying images. Several stock images of courtly women in revealing dress are included within *Anthropometamorphosis.* The first depicts an English noblewoman dressed in a very Elizabethan style, with her signature hairstyle and high back collar, her wheel farthingale, and heeled shoes.[217] While her artificial attire is certainly noteworthy, and probably the primary reason for the image's inclusion within Bulwer's work, her chest and neck command particular attention. At first glance the article upon the woman's neck may appear to be a large open ruff, only covering the back and sides of the her neck while exposing the décolletage and cleavage. Yet, the article was most likely a "butterfly-veil," Elizabeth I's signature style that was constructed from "two to four circular wings that framed the back of the head" and were often filled with a translucent material or sheer gauze and decorated along the edges with rich jewels.[218] Indeed, the woman's style, save for her fully exposed breasts, is quite similar to Elizabeth I's appearance and

[215] Backhouse, *Fashion and Popular Print*, 171, 158, 163.
[216] Backhouse, *Fashion and Popular Print*, 167.
[217] Bulwer, *Anthropometamorphosis*, 546.
[218] Lydia Edwards, *How to Read a Dress* (New York: Bloomsbury, 2017), 27.

dress within several of her portraits by Marcus Gheeraerts the Younger, especially the Ditchley Portrait (c. 1592), which even includes the same fan.[219] Another woodcut portrays another female courtier dressed in more Caroline garb, sporting numerous black patches upon her face, a more updated hairstyle, a strand of jewels around her neck, and bared breasts clearly visibly over her extremely low laced neckline.[220]

Elizabeth's fashion for very low décolletage has been vividly captured not simply within her portraits but also her wardrobe records, and was further appropriated and worn by Anne of Denmark, much like the farthingale, well into the Jacobean era.[221] Backhouse notes that contemporary textual accounts suggest that this courtly fashion may have wholly revealed the breasts, while full breast-baring was a rather frank feature of Inigo Jones's female costumes for court masques during the 1630s and 1640s.[222] Such costumes were obviously designed for an elite clientele with a very limited, courtly audience, although it is indeed possible that these garments were disseminated onto the streets of London as a result of early modern England's thriving second-hand clothing trade.[223] Regardless of whether these courtly fashions were actually physically worn by elite women in public spaces, the sartorial practice of exposed breasts was certainly commonly and popularly associated with the royal court, and was therefore utilized within printed works to criticize its gross decadence and immorality.

Within *Anthropometamorphosis*, Bulwer also condemns exposed flesh, yet his criticism appears to be directed not at the men of women of the royal court but rather at the theologies of

[219] See *Queen Elizabeth I* by Marcus Gheeraerts the Younger, c. 1592. National Portrait Gallery, London.
[220] Bulwer, *Anthropometamorphosis*, 544.
[221] See Janet Arnold, *Queen Elizabeth's Wardrobe Unlock'd* (New York: Routledge, 2015).
[222] Backhouse, *Fashion and Popular Print*, 164.
[223] See Varholy, "'Rich like a Lady,'" 6–9.

radical sectarians, specifically the Adamites.[224] The English Adamites of the seventeenth century were reportedly active during the 1640s around London and shared the same core beliefs as their ancient and medieval antecedents regarding grace through the unfettering of earthly clothing. Many modern scholars believe these Adamites to be a "phantom sect," that existed only within popular English imagination during the Civil Wars, rather than actuality.[225] Consequently, they were often viewed as the archetypal radicals during the political and religious chaos of the mid-seventeenth century, as evident by their frequent presence within printed political propaganda and heresiography.[226]

Bulwer identified nudity to be intricately tied to heretical doctrine, being dangerous to both the spiritual and political health of the English state. Bulwer argues that the, "upstart impudence and innovation of naked breasts, and cutting or hallowing downe the neck of womens garments below their shoulders," worn by these "semi-Adamits, is another meere peece of refined Barbarisme." Furthermore, he contends that this "shrewd prospect of Heresie," dangerously approaches "a full Bruitish Adamitisme," being "so naturall it is for errour to beget errour, and to transmit it selfe from bad to worse, and of Phantasticall to become Dogmaticall."[227]

[224] Indeed, I find that the inclusion of the two woodcuts previously examined within Bulwer's *Anthropometamorphosis* was most likely primarily due to their depictions of "artificial" fashions (i.e. heeled shoes, farthingales, and black patches) rather than bared breasts.
[225] John Coffey, "The Last and Greatest Triumph of the European Radical Reformation?: Anabaptism, Spiritualism, and Anti-Trinitarianism in the English Revolution," in *Radicalism and Dissent in the World of Protestant Reform* (Göttingen & Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2017), 213.
[226] David Cressy, *Travesties and Transgressions in Tudor and Stuart England: Tales of Discord and Dissension* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 251–80.
[227] Bulwer, *Anthropometamorphosis*, 543–4.

3.5 Conclusion

This chapter demonstrated how English writers often utilized the theme of monstrous clothing as a political tool within seventeenth-century England. Through images and words, Cavaliers and Roundheads, Anglicans and Dissenters, emphasized how bizarre apparel upon English bodies was subversive to both God and the state. Such garments were both unnatural and supernatural, abnormal and paranormal. The men and women who donned black patches were variously described as heretics, monsters, and witches. However, although both Royalist and Parliamentarian utilized similar vocabularies to condemn these flamboyant (and foreign) fashions, their cause was very different. Bulwer, in particular, emphasizes how these facial accessories marred and tainted the head (of government). He associated cosmetic "mutilations" to the face with the beheading of Charles I in 1649 while Thomas Hall saw beauty spots and face painting as a very physical sign of rebellion against the Commonwealth. Furthermore, the farthingale, or *guardainfante,* was seen as monstrous article of clothing that transformed the queen consort's body into a foreign beast and threatened the future of the monarchy. Monstrosity, especially in dress, was utilized by the many political and religious groups of the mid-century and thus reveals insight into how different Englishmen and women viewed themselves in relation to their opponents. Fashion, thus, served as a universal medium for political expression during the seventeenth century.

CHAPTER 4. DRESS FOR SUCCESS: THE POLITICS OF DISPLAY IN THE RESTORATION COURT

On May 21, 1662, Charles II and the Portuguese princess Catherine of Braganza were officially wed in Portsmouth. The royal couple was publically married in the Church of England, as well as in a secret Roman Catholic service. While the king, his new bride and their intimate wedding party celebrated the nuptials, Barbara Palmer (née Villiers), Countess of Castlemaine, Duchess of Cleveland and Charles II's principal mistress for approximately twenty-five years, conducted her own ceremony of sorts, a sartorial power play, back in London within the Privy Garden of Whitehall. Born into the Royalist Villiers family, Barbara was married to fellow Royalist and lawyer Roger Palmer in April 1659 before she first met Charles II. The circumstances of their first meeting remains unclear, and it is unknown whether Barbara and Charles first met before the king's return to England in May 1660. Yet, the royal affair certainly began within two or three weeks of Charles's arrival in London, since he publically acknowledged her first daughter, Anne, who was born in February of 1661. Palmer was bestowed the title of Baron Limerick and first earl of Castlemaine in December 1661, thereby ennobling "Madam Palmer." By 1662, Lady Castlemaine reigned within the Restoration court as Charles's most beloved courtesan and mother to several of the king's illegitimate children. The Countess, who was then pregnant with her first son by the king in May 1662, resided with her husband on King Street, which was located directly across from the Privy Garden.[228]

Pepys observed that Charles II dined at Castlemaine's house every day the week before he travelled south to meet his bride. He further noted that, "the night that the bonfires were made

[228] Sonya M. Wynne, "Palmer [née Villiers], Barbara, countess of Castlemaine and suo jure duchess of Cleveland (bap. 1640, d. 1709), royal mistress," *ODNB.*

for joy of the Queenes arrivall, the King was there; but there was no fire at her door, though at all the rest of the doors almost in the street; which was much observed." Lady Castlemaine refused to celebrate the royal nuptials and remained "a most disconsolate creature, and comes not out of doors—since the King's going." Indeed, instead of celebrating the arrival of the new queen, she employed her dress to protest. On the day of the royal wedding, Pepys recorded how he enjoyed a leisurely stroll through the Privy Garden wherein he observed "the finest smocks and linnen petticoats of my Lady Castlemaynes, laced with rich lace at the bottom, that ever I saw; and did me good to look upon them."[229]

Lady Castlemaine had ordered her freshly laundered undergarments to be hung throughout the royal gardens for every courtier of note to witness. She used her clothing to convey a very deliberate and meaningful political message: that her relationship with the king and her position at court would not be diminished despite her royal lover's new marriage to the foreign, Catholic princess. Lady Castlemaine was literally "marking her territory" with a woman's most intimate and sexualized garments, thereby claiming ownership of the King himself and, by extension, the space of the royal court. In this sense, the spectacle of her undergarments in the palace garden was a calculated display of power.

This chapter analyzes several ways in which the women of the Restoration court employed their clothing and other material goods as a means of political agency within late seventeenth-century England. The donning of particular clothing and accessories served as another means of political expression within late Stuart England. While male royals and courtiers, including Charles II as we shall see in the next chapter, frequently used clothing as a political tool, this practice was particularly significant for elite woman. This chapter focuses

[229] Samuel Pepys, *The Diary of Samuel Pepys*, eds., Robert Latham and William Matthews, 11 vols. (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1971), 3: 87.

primarily on Catherine of Braganza, with minor attention to Charles II's favorite mistresses including Barbara Palmer and Louise de Kérouaille. The display of dress and objects, such as furniture, curiosities, and even carriages, allowed these women to communicate political and confessional loyalties within the space of the royal court, and thus engage in the dynamic world of Restoration court politics despite their exclusion from official governmental positions. Despite such exclusion, female courtiers consistently acted to promote their own personal or familial interests by establishing factional alliances within the court, granting patronage, and attempting to gain the king's favor.

Recent studies have proposed a reevaluation of early modern elite women by focusing upon their cultural, political, and religious agency. In particular, the royal consorts of English sovereigns, such as Catherine of Braganza and Mary of Modena, have only recently begun to receive any sort of serious scholarly attention within historical scholarship.[230] Clarissa Campbell Orr's anthology *Queenship in Britain, 1660–1837* (2002) acknowledges the manner in which queen consorts contributed to the court culture of their respective reigns. While these women have frequently been the subjects of popular biographies, serious historiography has either ignored them altogether as an extreme example of the incorporated wife or regarded them inaccurately based on the contemporary attitudes or the prejudices of the historian. While Jeremy Wood contends that the political and cultural significance of royal women should not be exaggerated, Orr argues that a survey of royal consorts reveals their profound significance as major players in the intricacies of court politics as well as the formation of each court's own unique culture.

---

[230] Clarissa Campbell Orr, ed., *Queenship in Britain 1660–1837: Royal Patronage, Court Culture and Dynastic Politics* (New York: Manchester University Press, 2009). See also Clarissa Campbell Orr, ed., *Queenship in Europe, 1660–1815: The Role of the Consort* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004).

Alternatively, other scholars contend that the royal mistress maintained far greater political power and capital within the space of the royal court. Traditionally, standard histories of the Stuart period have argued that Charles II's mistresses did not wield much political influence. However, Nancy Klein Maguire argues for the unparalleled real political and diplomatic power of royal mistresses, especially Louise de Kéroualle, Duchess of Portsmouth, over Charles II.[231] Other historians note that, rather than attempting to cultivate favor with Queen Catherine, courtiers often petitioned his noble mistresses, namely Lady Castlemaine and Lady Portsmouth. For these women, fashion and physical appearance served as a form of self-expression as well as an emblem of power. They often utilized their costume to illustrate and communicate political statements such as their factional or party affiliation and dominant position within the court. A women's material wealth, including her gowns, jewels, and apartments, were symbolic of her station within the royal court. Although Vincent emphasizes the importance of a garment's physical properties within the politics of display, she states that equally significant was "the manner in which these garments were borne, displayed and manipulated" by royal women and female courtiers, as evident in Lady Castlemaine's sartorial display within the Privy Garden.[232] Charles's vast and competitive array of mistresses utilized their material wealth to demonstrate their dominant position within the court and over one another.

Therefore, the spectacle of fine things within the court was not simply a demonstration of who owned more extravagant garments but an expression of personal power. Sonya Wynne describes how late Stuart courtiers measured a mistress's personal and political influence by the

---

[231] Nancy Klein Maguire, "The Duchess of Portsmouth, English Royal Consort and French Politician, 1670–85," in *The Stuart Court and Europe: Essays in Politics and Political Culture*, Malcolm Smuts, ed. (Cambridge University Press, 1996), 247–53. See also Eveline Cruickshanks, ed., *The Stuart Courts* (Thrupp, Gloucestershire: Sutton Publishing, 2000), 7.

[232] Susan Vincent, *Dressing the Elite: Clothes in Early Modern England* (New York: Berg, 2003), 9.

opulence of the gifts given to her by the king. She notes that, "when challenged by courtiers, the mistresses' best answer was to draw attention to Charles's esteem for them."[233] Such a visual display of good favor often included gem-encrusted gowns, luxurious apartments, modish equipages and, as French scholar Patricia Cholakian notes, "jewels, traditionally a woman's most sacrosanct property."[234] Both Castlemaine and Portsmouth received considerable annuities from the Crown and thus broadcasted their influence over the king through their extravagant clothes and possessions. The notorious rivalry between Portsmouth and Nell Gwyn escalated when the Frenchwoman continually rode past the English actress's comparatively humble abode in her ostentatious coach as a visual reminder of how much better the king kept his noble mistresses. Such displays of material wealth and power stimulated conversations within late Stuart print culture regarding the dominance and emasculation of King Charles II by women such as Portsmouth as well as Castlemaine.[235]

Scholars have traditionally overlooked Catherine of Braganza, or, merely viewed her as politically passive within Restoration England, a period marked by cultural renewal and extravagance as well as intense politico-religious tension. There is no modern biography of Catherine to date and, as Edward Corp notes, the best account of her life remains Lillias Campbell Davidson's 1908 monograph.[236] However, recent scholarship from both Corp and Adam Morton has begun to rethink Catherine's role at court and lasting influence upon English

---

[233] Sonya Wynne, "The Mistresses of Charles II and Restoration Court Politics," in *The Stuart Courts*, 173.
[234] Patricia Francis Cholakian, *Women and the Politics of Self-Representation in Seventeenth-Century France* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2000), 95.
[235] For more on how Charles II's mistresses were portrayed in early modern literature and cheap print, see the following satirical novellas: *The Life, Amours, and Secret History of Francelia, Late Duchess of Portsmouth, Favourite Mistress to King Charles II* (London, 1734); and Gabriel de Brémond, *Hattige: or The Amours of the King of Tamaran, A Novel* (Amsterdam, 1683).
[236] Edward Corp, "Catherine of Braganza and cultural politics," in *Queenship in Britain*, 67. See Lillias Campbell Davidson, *Catherine of Braganza, Infanta of Portugal and Queen-Consort of England* (London: John Murray, 1908).

(and "British" for that matter) culture.[237] Indeed, Corp demonstrates that Catherine's contribution to the development of the English court's cosmopolitan character was much more significant than previously supposed.[238] This chapter argues that Catherine shaped, in direct contrast to her rivals, her own "English" identity and position at court through her clothing and apartment furnishings. Initially abhorred by English courtiers for her seemingly odd hairstyle and attire, Catherine pioneered her own unique styles, and encouraged the patronage of Italian artists at court. Ultimately, such an examination contributes to this new historiographical view of Catherine of Braganza, and furthermore, reinforces the importance of queen consorts, as well as elite women more generally, as integral political players within early modern England.

4.1 Defining "Englishness" in Dress

Although David Kuchta notes, "clothing is nothing if not an obvious, all-too-apparent sign of class and gender," dress was, and still is, a representation of national character or sentiment, an intangible feeling of patriotism and state spirit.[239] Particular garments worn by certain individuals during the Restoration period illustrated not merely a portrait of how late seventeenth-century English society was structured but also a grander geographic landscape of late Stuart England. With the continual rise of international trade and consumption during the Restoration period, the selection of foreign goods, including clothing, ornaments, furniture, and other luxury items, increased within the London marketplace. Englishmen and women across the

[237] See Corp, "Catherine of Braganza and cultural politics," 53–73; and Adam Morton, "Sanctity and suspicion: Catholicism, conspiracy and the representation of Henrietta Maria of France and Catherine of Braganza, Queens of Britain," in *Queens Consort, Cultural Transfer and European Politics c.1500–1800,* Helen Watanabe-O'Kelly and Adam Morton, eds. (New York: Routledge, 2016), 172–201.
[238] Corp, "Catherine of Braganza and cultural politics," 67.
[239] David Kuchta, *The Three-Piece Suit and Modern Masculinity: England, 1550-1850* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002), 6.

social, political, and religious spectrums began to rethink conceptions of "Englishness," as late Stuart England experienced an influx of foreign commodities and varying cultural styles.

The concept of "Englishness" has been a pervasive problem for scholars within the studies of both dress and nationality. Scholars of the early modern history continue to debate the concept of an English national identity. In *Britons*, Linda Colley identifies characteristics of a shared British identity during the eighteenth century. Colley locates the roots of British nationalism in the decades following the Acts of the Union in 1707. Colley argues that, "notions of Britain and British identity in this period were constructs 'superimposed on much older allegiances.'" These allegiances between the English were based on Protestantism and the idea of free trade. Britain's geographic position as an island combined with its increasing economic stability after 1700 contributed to the development of a British national feeling. Colley also stresses the importance of religion, here the Protestant faith, as the dominant factor in the formation of this identity. Additionally, she argues that, "the economic peculiarities of the British aided their cohesion, then, but it was the coincidence of the island's pan-Protestantism and its successive wars with a Catholic state that did most to give it what Eugene Weber calls 'a true political personality.'"[240]

England's 130-year long period of warfare with France during the early modern period was another significant element in the invention of Britishness. Colley comments that, "Britishness was superimposed over an array of internal differences in response to contact with the Other, and above all in response to conflict with the Other." This concept of the "Other" figured most prominently with the "Catholic 'Other'" in contrast to English Protestantism.[241]

---

[240] Linda Colley, *Britons: Forging the Nation, 1707–1837* (1992; repr., New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2009), xv, 378, 1.
[241] Colley, 6, xxii.

Therefore, France doubly embodied the "Other" as both a foreign Continental and Catholic power. Although Colley's work identifies the development of a true British national identity at the beginning of the eighteenth century, the roots of Britishness were evident a century earlier as late Stuart England clashed with France and struggled with Catholicism.

However, the idea of "Englishness" certainly differed from the more united nature of "Britishness," which also encompassed the Scottish and the Welsh peoples. During the past century, scholarly studies have attempted to identify the historical characteristics of Englishness particularly in cultural modes such as art and architecture.[242] Nikolaus Pevsner, a German-born British art and architectural historian, identifies a "geography of art." He describes this concept as "what all works of art and architecture of one people have in common, at whatever time they may have been made." Therefore, the geography of art is "national character as it expresses itself in art."[243]

Aileen Ribeiro has further expanded the study of "Englishness" with her examination of national characteristics found within fashion and dress. Ribeiro maintains that the concept of an "English" dress is not based solely on modern nationalistic ideas or specific geographical factors. Rather, Ribeiro contends that Englishness in clothing is a state of mind or subjective force: the "notion of Englishness in dress is about perceptions and attitudes, rather than the facts of such conventional usage." These perceptions are subject to change over time because "dress, if it means anything at all, concerns itself with social norms, which, although they may be modified by individuals, reflect the customs and aesthetics of any given age."[244] Pevsner acknowledges the

---

[242] For more on "Englishness" and English national sentiment, see Paul Langford, *Englishness Identified: Manners and Character, 1650-1850* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), and David Rogers and John McLeod, ed., *The Revision of Englishness* (New York: Manchester University Press, 2004).

[243] Nikolaus Pevsner, *The Englishness of English Art* (New York: Praeger, 1956), 11.

[244] Aileen Ribeiro, "On Englishness in Dress," in *The Englishness of English Dress*, ed. Christopher Breward, Becky Conekin, and Caroline Cox (New York: Berg, 2002), 17; 25.

continuity of national identity with his statement that, "there does not exist anything like a national character consistent over centuries."[245] Indeed, to modern English minds, "things look English because they are beautiful, insular, charming, quirky even—all qualities which over the years we have come to think of as English, but which were not necessarily thought so at the time." Hence, this romanticized concept of an English national dress embodies a synchronous "idea of England rather than England itself."[246]

Thus, Ribeiro proposes that perceptions of "Englishness" in dress change over time and space depending upon the unique historical circumstances of a given period. Following Ribeiro's theory, I argue that profound xenophobic sentiment, which was, as we have seen, one of the defining characteristics of the Stuart era, shaped seventeenth-century ideas concerning "Englishness." The first and second chapters revealed how the English understood themselves in relation to others, particularly the French. Other scholars besides Colley have demonstrated how important binary oppositions were to the formation of self within early modern England. Peter Lake demonstrates that the popular seventeenth-century concept of anti-popery created negative characteristics of Catholicism that were countered by positive religious, cultural, and political values that were exclusively attributed to a Protestant England. As a "wholly irrational and unitary 'thing' which merely has to be identified rather than analysed or explained," Lake contends that anti-popery reveals just as much about how English Protestants perceived themselves as it does how they viewed Catholics.[247]

These English/French and Protestant/Catholic dichotomies were certainly manifested within the rhetoric of dress and fashion found in seventeenth-century political literature.

---

[245] Pevsner, *The Englishness of English Art*, 12.
[246] Ribeiro, "On Englishness in Dress," 18; 17.
[247] Peter Lake, "Anti-popery: the Structure of a Prejudice," in *Conflict in Early Stuart England: Studies in Religion and Politics, 1603–1642*, eds. Richard Cust and Ann Hughes (New York: Longman, 1989), 73.

Consequently, many Englishmen and women fashioned a perspective of "English" dress based solely on perceived negative characteristics of foreign clothing and toilette practices. In this sense, "Englishness" was not truly defined by specific geographic factors, such as where the garment was produced or the origin of a particular style, but rather upon complex and subjective ideas of what a Protestant England might have symbolized. Englishmen and women may not have known exactly what Englishness was but they knew what it was not, and it was not anything perceived as foreign. More specifically, I argue that English fashion at this time, denoted any dress or style that did not appear as if Continental Europe, primarily the French, Dutch, or Spanish, would wear it. As England's principal rivals for economic hegemony during the seventeenth century, France, the Dutch Republic, and Spain represented what Colley would refer to as the "Other." Furthermore, continuous warfare with the Dutch and French further strained their Anglo-relations while Spain and France's Catholicism contrasted sharply with late Stuart England's Protestant majority. Such conceptions of "Englishness" are evident in the manner in which Catherine of Braganza fashioned a new cultural identity for herself, transforming from Portuguese princess to English queen.

4.2 Catherine of Braganza: From Portuguese "Fright" to "English" Queen

Catarina, or Catherine, was born on November 25, 1638, Saint Catherine's Day, as a subject of the Spanish Crown. She was the third child of the Duke of Braganza, the future John IV, King of Portugal (1640–56), and his wife Luiza de Guzmán, the daughter of the eighth duke of Medina Sidonia. Corp notes that Catherine descended from, "a parvenu dynasty, still trying to establish itself in a far-away and vulnerable country, which could provide her with little diplomatic support" during her tenure as queen years later. Much is still unknown about her childhood in Portugal, although we know that she spent several years in a nunnery before her

marriage to Charles II.[248] Her strict and formal upbringing certainly ill-prepared her for life in Restoration England. Indeed, as Lillias Campbell Davidson argues, she was ignorant of court intrigues and "knew nothing of men, or their hearts, or habits." Davidson, in particular, reproaches Queen Luiza for the inattention to her daughter's education, which "showed wild stupidity." Indeed, Davidson states that, "if any mother had planned her child's misery and failure, she could not have done it with more careful preparation than the Queen-mother gave to Catherine's future" for "the fatal folly of her training was to be the ruin of her daughter's life."[249]

By certain accounts, Catherine may not appear to have been all that successful as Queen of England. She did not ever produce an heir, which was admittedly her primary duty as queen consort. Catherine suffered several miscarriages throughout her marriage to Charles and, thus, produced no live children. Additionally, she did not possess the dynamic personality or the astounding beauty that characterized her English, French, and Italian rivals at the Restoration court. Catherine's appearance and dress, especially her farthingale (the hoopskirt analyzed in the previous chapter), would be the subject of much observation and conversation by courtiers and commoners alike upon her arrival in London in 1662.

On May 25, shortly after the wedding of Charles to Catherine, Samuel Pepys observed several of the Queen's "Portugall ladys" who had travelled ahead of the royal couple. He commented that these ladies "were not handsome, and their farthingales a strange dress … I find nothing in them that is pleasing; and I see they have learnt to kiss and look freely up and down already, and I do believe will soon forget the recluse practice of their own country."[250] Pepys's words reflect a greater conversation regarding the danger that this style posed to the early

[248] Corp, "Catherine of Braganza and cultural politics," 53.
[249] Davidson, *Catherine of Braganza*, 16–7.
[250] Pepys, *Diary*, 3: 92.

modern monarchy, a discourse that extended beyond the British Isles to the Iberian peninsula and other Continental powers.

While the English and French abandoned the farthingale by the beginning of the Caroline period, it remained the fashion within Iberia well into the 1630s and 1640s. This version was known as the *verdugado* and later developed into the *guardainfante*. Unlike the wheel farthingale, the *verdugado* was cone-shaped; the frame was constructed from a graduated series of circular hoops that were sewn into the skirt, creating a narrow waist and wide hem or base. The *guardainfante* evolved from this style but also incorporated more of the boxy silhouette from French or wheel farthingale, somewhat expanding the hip and subtly altering the traditionally tapered shape. Amanda Wunder notes that the differences between the *verdugado* and early *guardainfante* may appear minor to the modern eye. However, contemporaries certainly recognized the expansion of the skirt and inherently associated it with the French style. Consequently, the *guardainfante* was thus met with radical criticism and even legal condemnation by the Spanish Crown. Indeed, the term "*guardainfante*," which roughly translates to "baby keeper," hints at the hoopskirt's association with licentiousness and immorality. The style first emerged in order to conceal illicit pregnancies with the skirt's bulky frame, although scholars debate whether the farthingale was first fashioned by the notorious Joan of Portugal, the second wife of Henry IV of Castile, or by upper-class French women. Nevertheless, Wunder states that this controversial fashion remained "at the center of politics in the Spanish empire for much of the seventeenth century," even prompting King Philip IV of Spain to outlaw the outfit in 1639 to all except prostitutes.[251] Despite such legal censure, the farthingale would continue as *the* most stylish fashion within the Iberian peninsula throughout the 1640s.

[251] Amanda Wunder, "Women's Fashions and Politics in Seventeenth-Century Spain: The Rise and Fall of the *Guardainfante*," *Renaissance Quarterly* 68, no. 1 (Spring 2015), 136–9. According to Wunder, Carmen Bernis argues

The garment likewise became a topic of observation and debate within England, albeit to a lesser degree, as evident by Pepys' reaction to the "strange dress" worn Catherine and her ladies. A similar sighting occurred in France upon the occasion of Louis XIV's marriage to Maria Theresa of Spain in 1660. Madame de Montville, a lady-in-waiting to Anne of Austria, commented that, "it pained me to see the clothing and coiffure of the Spanish women … and their *Gard-Infante* was a machine half round and monstrous, because it seemed that it was several wooden hoops sewn into their skirts, except that hoops are round and their *Gard-Infante* was flattened a bit in the front and the back, and swelled out on the sides. When they walked, this machine moved up and down, and made for a very ugly appearance."[252]

Interestingly, English commentators also utilized this same monstrous language, much in the same manner as Bulwer did within *Anthropometamorphosis*, to describe the appearance of Catherine and her Portuguese retinue upon her arrival at Hampton Court on May 30. John Evelyn noted that "the Queene arrived, with a traine of Portugueze Ladys in their mo[n]strous fardingals or Guard-Infantas: Their complexions olivaster, and sufficiently unagreable: Her majestie in the same habit, her foretop long and turned aside very strangely."[253] The garb and hair that Evelyn found so "monstrous" can be observed within Dirk Stoop's 1661 portrait of Catherine, which depicts the princess in a richly laced black *guardainfante* with a traditional curled foretop hairstyle. Furthermore, another courtier Anthony Hamilton commentated that, "the new Queen gave but little additional brilliancy to the Court, either in her person or in her retinue, which was

---

that French actresses traveling in theater troops first brought the farthingale to Spain, as they wore the out-of-date style on stage (which, presumably, had been consigned by French noblewomen and then purchased in secondhand trade shops). See Carmen Bernis, "Velázquez y el guardainfante." *Velázquez y el arte de su tiempo. Jornadas de Arte* 5 (1991): 49–60.

[252] Quoted in Abby E. Zanger, *Scenes from the Marriage of Louis XIV: Nuptial Fictions and the Making of Absolute Power* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1997), 51. Originally from Madame de Motteville, *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire d'Anne d'Austriche Espouse de Louis XIII, Roi de France, par Madame de Motteville, Une de ses Favorites*, 5 vols. (Amsterdam, 1723), 5: 87–88.

[253] John Evelyn, *The Diary of John Evelyn*, eds., E.S. de Beer, 6 vols. (Oxford University Press, 1955), 3: 194.

then composed of the Countess de Panétra, who came over with her in quality of lady of the bedchamber; six frights, who called themselves maids of honour, and a duenna, another monster, who took the title of governess to those extraordinary beauties."[254]

As Edward Corp notes, young Catherine conformed to a "different ideal of femininity" that drastically differed from the women of Restoration England, "with her olive-tinted Portuguese skin and a hair style and formal court costume" that, while not fashionable in London, might still be considered the mode within Portugal and Spain, even despite its earlier legal censure.[255] However, Catherine of Braganza continued to be a victim of fashion within popular English culture during the early 1660s. Her clothing, as well as her general appearance, was decidedly "un-English," since she donned either French or Spanish (and regardless, Catholic) styles that deformed the English body politic. As a queen consort, Catherine's body held special political significance, and observers scrutinized the items that adorned her physical form.[256]

The queen consorts of the Stuart kings were European princesses selected for their political and dynastic value. Although they were often culturally "Anglicized" to varying degrees or became mothers to future *English* kings, these women, Anne of Denmark, Henrietta Maria of France, Catherine of Braganza, and Mary of Modena were still considered foreigners by the English population. Their perceived political influence over their husbands, children, and the royal court as a whole was always a constant concern for Protestant writers.[257] In a more tangible

---

[254] Anthony Hamilton, *Memoirs of the Court of Charles II by Count Grammont*; reprint (New York: P.F. Collier & Son, 1910), 104.
[255] Corp, "Catherine of Braganza and cultural politics," 54.
[256] See Dena Goodman, ed., *Marie Antoinette: Writings on the Body of a Queen* (New York: Routledge, 2003); and Kathleen Wellman, *Queens and Mistresses of Renaissance France* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2013).
[257] Additionally, foreign mistresses, such as Louise de Kérouaille, Duchess of Portsmouth and Hortense Mancini, Duchesse Mazarin and the favored niece of Cardinal Mazarin, were similarly criticized due to their close proximity to the king and position within the court. Consequently, their clothing was likewise examined in connection to the body politic.

sense, their bodies served as vessels for future Stuart sovereigns, thereby containing the future of the monarchy within their physical form. The sexually illicit implications of the foreign and oddly-shaped farthingale upon the English queen's body was certainly alarming to observers like Pepys and Evelyn, who continued to wait, in vain, for the birth of an heir.

The development of a more "Anglicized" wardrobe, and overall "look," was essential to Catherine's "success" at court, which was typically measured by the amount of power and influence one wielded, as well as her general image as Queen of England to the country at large. As demonstrated in the previous chapters, xenophobic and particularly anti-Catholic sentiment was rampant throughout the seventeenth century, but particularly intensified during the political turmoil and succession crisis of the 1670s and 1680s. Indeed, Corp remarks that, unfortunately for Catherine, her thirty years within England "coincided with an extraordinary and unparalleled outburst of anti-Catholic feeling."[258] Such feelings were evident within the "monstrous" descriptions of her dress from even Royalist men. Catherine, who was from one of the most Catholic nations in early modern Europe, could never compete on her own at Whitehall with the charms of the other more dynamic women of the Restoration court. She still stood, in terms of appearance as well as personality, in stark contrast to Charles's *English* mistresses, especially Barbara Palmer, Frances Stuart, and Nell Gwyn. The Countess of Castlemaine, as noted earlier, was a particular obstacle for Catherine, as she was both English and, at least originally, a Protestant (although her conversion to Roman Catholicism was made public in 1663).[259] Furthermore, unlike Charles's other early mistresses, the Countess had managed to capture the king's singular attention for quite a considerable length of time.[260] However, as Lady

[258] Corp, "Catherine of Braganza and cultural politics," 53.
[259] Wynne, *ODNB*.
[260] Corp, "Catherine of Braganza and cultural politics," 55–56.

Castlemaine's influence over the king began to decline in the late 1660s, Catherine's appearance and identity as Queen of England also began to transform.

On September 13, 1666, Evelyn recorded that "the Queene was now in her Cavaliers riding habite, hat and feather and horsemans Coate, going to take the aire."[261] This entry heralded the introduction of the term, "riding habit," within the history of English fashion.[262] Catherine pioneered this style within England, first donning a wide-brimmed hat with a plumed ostrich feather in the manner of a Cavalier, the Royalist supporters of her father-in-law King Charles I during the Civil War. Thus, such a garb was a visual representation of the Stuart monarchy. It is no coincidence that Catherine first wore this style in the wake of two large national disasters: the Great Plague and the Great Fire.

The Great Plague of 1665–66 was one of the final strains of the Black Death, which had ravaged most of Europe and Britain in the fourteenth century. This time the plague was confined to London and primarily afflicted commoners, as Charles II and his court fled to Salisbury. While the plague had been virtually eradicated by the end of summer, a large conflagration enveloped the poorer streets of London on September 2, 1666. The fire was extinguished three days later before it could reach the Palace of Whitehall. Rumors abounded within the city concerning the origin of the fire and many attributed its devastation to foreigners and Catholics, specifically the French and Dutch, since England was currently embroiled within the Second Anglo-Dutch War (1665–7).[263] Thus, the appearance of Catherine's riding habit coincided with a period of political turmoil and national crisis.

---

[261] Evelyn, *Diary*, 3: 305.
[262] Janet Arnold, "Dashing Amazons: The Development of Women's Riding Dress, c. 1500–1900," in *Defining Dress: Dress as Object, Meaning and Identity*, ed. Amy de la Haye and Elizabeth Wilson (New York: Manchester University Press, 1999), 16.
[263] See Roy Porter, *London: A Social History* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1994), 80–91; and A. Lloyd Moote and Dorothy C. Moote, *The Great Plague: The Story of London's Most Deadly Year* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2008), 54.

The donning of this riding habit, with its signature Cavalier hat, was a calculated move to improve Catherine's image within the court. Catherine's ladies-in-waiting, including the famed beauty Frances Stuart, soon adopted the riding habit and, as Anthony Wood observed, could be glimpsed wearing "plush caps…either full of ribbons or feathers, long periwigs which men used to weare, and riding coat of a red colour all bedaubed with lace which they call vests."[264] Commentators, including Pepys, did not find this fashion particularly pleasing at first, thinking it too masculine and thus the garment was often referred to as "Amazonian."[265] Nevertheless, this riding habit became wildly popular among elite women in the following years and would later develop into a quintessentially "British" style during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.[266]

By the 1670s, Catherine's attire and hairstyle had completely transformed, just as her position at court had also improved. Indeed, Catherine, like other women of the Restoration court, used portraiture in order to create her own "independent cultural identity." During the 1660s, Sir Peter Lely, a Protestant, was the sole artist to paint the Queen, but Catherine soon gave her patronage to the Catholic artist Jacob Huysmans, who "succeeded in giving her a magnificent new image."[267] She was no longer the youthful and pretty figure with the falling ringlet curls that had been captured by Lely on canvas. Instead, Huysmans depicted her as a mature beauty in *undresse* or "dishabille," the artful, sensual style characteristic of the late seventeenth-century English elite that featured rich, ravishing satin gowns with an exposed décolletage.[268] Her newfound confidence, which was evident in her more statuesque poses within portraiture. Catherine's transformation was not simply evident within the paintings she posed in,

---

[264] Anthony Wood, *The Life and Times of Anthony Wood, Antiquary of Oxford, 1632–95, described by himself*, collected by Andrew Clark, 21 vols. (Oxford: Oxford Historical Society, 1891), 1: 509.
[265] See Pepys, *Diary*, 7: 286.
[266] Arnold, "Dashing Amazons," 16.
[267] Corp, "Catherine of Braganza and cultural politics," 60.
[268] Clare Backhouse, *Fashion and Popular Print in Early Modern England: Depicting Dress in Black-Letter Ballads* (New York: I.B. Tauris, 2017), 171.

but with her patronage of Continental artists as well. Catherine became *the* patron of Italian culture at the Restoration court, fashioned in direct opposition to the French culture represented by Portsmouth. She appointed Italian composer Giovanni Sebenico to the position of Master of Italian music at her own personal chapel, while she also commissioned the Baroque artist Benedetto Gennari to paint numerous devotional works and court portraits.[269] Furthermore, along with her new sister-in-law Mary of Modena, Catherine made an artful maneuver to oust the French Louise by encouraging the amorous liaison between Charles and Hortense Mancini (Mary's aunt), all at a time when Castlemaine's profound influence over the king also began to diminish.[270]

4.3 Black and "Blue Bloods"

By the 1670s, the Countess of Castlemaine no longer shone as the only star in Charles's galaxy of women. Louise de Kéroualle, Duchess of Portsmouth joined the Queen's household in 1670 after the death of the king's beloved sister Henriette, whom she served at the French court. By 1680, Lady Portsmouth gained intense notoriety within London as a destructive agent of vice, fornication, and espionage against the Crown. Charges of treason were brought against her for promoting the papist and French interests by facilitating, as well as engaging in, clandestine meetings between the king and French ambassadors. One article cited her role as an intermediary of French culture as not simply treasonous, but murderous. Portsmouth was accused of planting a French confectioner within the royal household whom allegedly attempted to poison Charles II with sweetmeats.[271] Such an accusation was most likely proposed in reaction to the sordid Affair

[269] Corp, "Catherine of Braganza and cultural politics," 56; 59.
[270] Corp, "Catherine of Braganza and cultural politics," 60–61.
[271] *Articles of high-treason and other high crimes and misdemeanours against the Dutchess of Portsmouth* (London, 1680).

of the Poisons, a period of hysteria at Louis XIV's court between the late 1670s and early 1680s. Many prominent aristocrats, as well as a few medical professionals, were accused, condemned, and executed for using poisons to assassinate notable courtiers. Among those who died at this time was Charles II's own sister. Although Henriette's death was officially ruled as colic and no one was formally convicted of her murder, the prevailing theory throughout the French court was that she was poisoned by the chevalier de Lorraine, the lover of her husband the duke of Orléans, Louis XIV's brother.[272] Consequently, Portsmouth's relationship with the king as well as her very presence within the Restoration court was viewed as dangerous to the monarchy itself.

Lady Portsmouth faced similar challenges as Catherine for she was also both a foreigner (a Frenchwoman in this case) and a Catholic, although the two women never became allies, let alone friends. Indeed, contemporaries considered her quite beautiful while her fellow royal mistresses also found her witless and utterly exasperating. Like Lady Castlemaine and Queen Catherine, the Duchess of Portsmouth also utilized her clothing in order to engage within Restoration court politics, specifically as a means to publically communicate her own "Frenchness" and political affiliation as an intermediary between Louis XIV and Charles II. Portsmouth, whose own noble lineage and family's Breton title was often questioned by English courtiers, was notorious for donning black mourning dress whenever a notable French aristocrat died. Mourning dress was thus utilized as another display of power within the royal court, much in the same manner as Castlemaine's petticoats hung in the Privy Garden. In this case, the power was dynastic, donned in order to signal Louise's familial connections with the great houses of early modern Europe.

---

[272] John Miller, "Henriette Anne [formerly Henrietta], Princess, duchess of Orléans (1644–1670)," *ODNB.* See Anne Somerset, *The Affair of the Poisons: Murder, Infanticide, and Satanism at the Court of Louis XIV* (New York: St. Martin's, 2003).

Such a display was utterly frustrating to the women of the Restoration court, especially to Nell Gwyn, a former actress and orange seller who was also a mistress of Charles II. Indeed, Gwyn, who made no attempt to obscure her low birth, once remarked that Portsmouth "claims that everyone in France is her relation; the moment some great one dies she puts on mourning."[273] Upon the death of the chevalier de Rohan, Lady Portsmouth once again dressed herself in black and appeared at court in mourning. In reaction to this sartorial display, Gwyn, the self-proclaimed "Protestant Whore," also reportedly wore mourning dress for the cham of Tartary, for she claimed she was as intimately related to this Mongol prince as Portsmouth was to the French duke.[274]As a French noblewoman (perhaps) who still communicated with Louis XIV and his ministers, Portsmouth's mourning dress indicated her political inclinations towards France and thus incited rather sardonic responses from those with anti-French political interests, such as the English-born Gwyn.

Additionally, the color black was also politically significant within the royal court not simply in regards to dress and dynastic power, but also with the presence and ownership of black attendants.[275] Recent scholarship from Susan Amussen, Simon Gikandi, and Catherine Molineux has revealed that the presence of African men and women within the metropole during the late seventeenth century was more common than previously supposed, and thus their commodification served as a very fashionable marker of wealth, trade connections, and color for the elite. [276] The satirical pamphlet, *The Character of a Town Misse* listed all the required

[273] Quoted in John Harold Wilson, *Nell Gwyn, Royal Mistress* (New York: Pellegrini & Cudahy, 1952), 182.
[274] Wilson, *Nell Gwyn*, 154–5.
[275] For more on the color black during the seventeenth century, see Michel Pastoureau, *Black: The History of a Color* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2008), 134–149.
[276] See Susan Amussen, *Caribbean Exchanges: Slavery and the Transformation of English Society, 1640-1700* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina, Press, 2007); Simon Gikandi, *Slavery and the Culture of Taste* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2011); and Catherine Molineux, *Faces of Perfect Ebony: Encountering Atlantic Slavery in Imperial Britain* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2012).

members of the most stylish mistress's entourage: "She hath always two necessary Implements about her, a Blackmoor, and a little Dog; for without these, she would be neither Fair nor Sweet."[277]

Such a literary reference also connected to contemporary accounts from the Restoration court. Charles II, who was often regarded for his dark complexion that reflected the Medici blood on his mother's side, himself maintained African pages, as well as Catherine and ladies Castlemaine and Portsmouth.[278] Pepys's diary indicated on January 27, 1666 that Castlemaine retained a "little black boy" among her stylish retinue of servants.[279] Furthermore, four portraits of Portsmouth prominently featured African servants. In Pierre Mignard's 1682 portrait, Portsmouth is splendidly dressed in sumptuous dishabille depicted with a young black girl, who in turn meaningfully sports a jeweled choker and holds a conch shell brimming with a bounty of rich pearls.[280] This image, as well as numerous others from the period, "presents a sharply dichotomized view of skin color," intended to enhance the whiteness of sitter's physical form, in contrast to the servant's dark skin, and thereby their beauty and fashionableness.[281]

4.4 Strutting their 'Stuffes'

Fashion was not the only mode of political display at the Restoration court. Objects, particularly furniture, were also prominently displayed throughout Whitehall as a means of political expression. When Charles signed his marriage treaty to Catherine on June 23, 1661, England's role within the early modern global economy greatly transformed. Catherine's dowry granted England the rich trade ports of Tangier and Bombay as well as free trading rights within

[277] Anon., *The Character of a Town Misse* (London, 1675), 7.
[278] Antonia Fraser, *King Charles II* (London: Weidenfeld & Nicholson, 1979), 11.
[279] Pepys, *Diary*, 7: 264.
[280] See Pierre's Mignard's painting, *Louise de Kéroualle, Duchess of Portsmouth*, currently located in the National Portrait Gallery in London.
[281] Amussen, *Caribbean Exchanges*, 180.

the East Indies and Brazil. Thus, England gained a strategic foothold in Asia, stimulating a flow of Eastern goods into London.[282] In a very material sense, such exotic objects symbolized the queen's dowry, as these Eastern treasures represented and furthermore reminded everyone of what Catherine, as a princess of Portugal, brought into her marriage to Charles II.

A month after Catherine's arrival in London in 1662, Evelyn, who was often intrigued by exotic curiosities, wondered at the rich furnishings that adorned the Queen's apartments, stating that Catherine "brought over with her from Portugal, such Indian Cabinets and large trunks of Laccar, as had never before ben seene here."[283] One cabinet in particular, which was located in her bedchamber, was richly embellished with ebony, mother of pearl, ivory and silver.[284] Catherine's apartments also prominently featured cane chairs, porcelain, and brightly painted Indian cottons, known as calicoes, "which were used after the 1660s to make clothes, bedcovers and wall hangings."[285] Davidson remarks that the Duke of York's apartments also contained "white calico window-curtains."[286]

Indeed, these colorful "New Luxury" textiles sharply contrasted against the "Old" French tapestries that adorned Portsmouth's chambers. Evelyn observed the rich and luxurious splendor of Portsmouth's wall hangings: "Here I saw the new fabrique of French Tapissry, for designe, tendernesse of worke, and incomparable imitation of the best paintings; beyond anything, I had ever beheld: some pieces had Versailles, St. Germans and other Palaces of the French King with Huntings, figures, and Lanscips, Exotique fowle and all to the life rarely don."[287] Like her

---

[282] See Gertrude Z. Thomas, *Richer than Spices: How a Royal Bride's Dowry Introduced Cane, Lacquer, Cottons, Tea, and Porcelain to England, and So Revolutionized Taste, Manners, Craftsmanship, and History in Both England and America* (New York: Knopf, 1965).
[283] Evelyn, *Diary*, 3: 210.
[284] Davidson, *Catherine of Braganza*, 211.
[285] Corp, "Catherine of Braganza and cultural politics," 64. See also Thomas, *Richer than Spices*, 95.
[286] Davidson, *Catherine of Braganza*, 226.
[287] Evelyn, *Diary*, 3: 236.

mourning dress, Portsmouth's courtly apartments displayed the opulence of her native France to her rivals as well as the English noblemen and ministers whom frequently gathered there to confer with the Charles II about important matters of state.

The royal court and household at large certainly experienced a great deal of Portuguese influence under Charles's new queen, as evident by the prevalence of "Portugal mats." Portugal mats appear to have been made of sturdy palm or rattan construction and were utilized in the royal household as underlays for feather beds and chairs.[288] Although Davidson comments that, "these mats were not improbably introduced by Catherine," to my knowledge, there is no mention of them either within the household accounts or literature before her arrival in London.[289] It is unclear whether their designation as "Portuguese" derives from their physical construction and manufacture, or their role as a byproduct of Portugal's large trade empire in the Atlantic or Africa. Regardless, the mats were thoroughly associated with the queen's homeland and symbolized her cultural influence within the royal court.

Household records indicate that these mats were found throughout the royal palace, including the queen's withdrawing room, privy chamber, and great bedchamber, as well as the eating room shared between Catherine and Charles. Indeed, in December of 1676, Henry Bennett, first earl of Arlington and Lord Chamberlain of the Royal Household requested, "a Portugall matt for ye Queens Bedchamber." Six months later in July 1677, he sent another warrant for "Two Portugall Matts one for the Queens Majesty privy Chamber & One for ye Withdrawing roome" to Ralph Montagu, the Master of the Great Wardrobe. Furthermore, Portugal mats were even used to line His Majesty's throne in 1665: "Matlayers Employed in new

[288] "mat, n.1" OED Online. January 2017. Oxford University Press. http://www.oed.com.ezproxy.lib.purdue.edu/view/Entry/114853?rskey=dT3UhP&result=1#eid
[289] Davidson, *Catherine of Braganza*, 225.

matting the K's throne with Portugall matt, taking up the old matts at the Kings back stairs."[290] Additionally, Pepys makes note of "A very fine Affrican Matt (to lay upon the ground under a bed of state)," within his diary entry from June 1666.[291] The symbolism here is extremely pointed: a thoroughly foreign good, representative of England's rising global empire, lining the English throne, the king and the state's seat of political power. The foreign cultural influence, particularly that of Queen Catherine, was so profound in late Stuart England that it affected not simply the royal court but the monarchy as well.

4.5 Conclusion

Queen Catherine's overt opposition to the French interest at court as well as her role as a forerunner in the revolution in English taste during the late seventeenth century meant that she had more political agency within the royal court than previously supposed. Catherine's transformation into a more "English" queen was absolute through her dress as well as her contributions to both Restoration court culture and English culture in general. She also popularized the practice of tea as a recreational beverage, not simply a medicinal remedy, within late Stuart England.[292] Due to its lasting role in English culture, Catherine further shaped perceptions of Englishness by introducing an import, made both popular and accessible in England by her marriage to Charles II, which has come to be regarded as profoundly "English" far into modernity.

This chapter's analysis of fashion and the politics of display within the Restoration court does not simply offer an ornamented picture of the squabbles between queens, ladies, mistresses, and lovers, but rather reveals several ways in which elite women harnessed political power

[290] MS Folger X.d.679 f. 5, f. 21.
[291] Pepys, *Diary*, 7: 397.
[292] Corp, "Catherine of Braganza and cultural politics," 64.

through the objects available to them. Material culture served as an extension of identity and a mode for women to communicate this identity, be it social, political, religious, or national, within the Restoration court. Indeed, as Anthony Hamilton observes in his memoirs, "a woman does not dress herself with so much care for nothing."[293] The clothing worn and items displayed by women during the late seventeenth century, and men as we shall see in the following chapter, thus embodied complex meanings that represented deeper oppositional tensions of the period.

[293] Hamilton, *Memoirs*, 228–229.

CHAPTER 5. FASHIONING "ENGLISHNESS": THE FABRICATION OF ENGLISH DRESS AND MATERIAL OBJECTS

Richard Brathwaite's conduct book, *The English Gentlewoman* (1630), as we have seen in the second chapter, sharply criticized the light fabrics and precious silks donned by the royal court as symbols of its immorality and foreign decadence, which endangered (or rather exposed) the English body politic. Brathwaite, like other writers throughout the seventeenth century, abhorred the idea of foreign attire on English bodies, claiming that "nothing is held more contemptible … than apishly to imitate foraign fashions." Indeed, Brathwaite argued that, "Apparell is most comely, which conferres on the Wearer most native beauty, and most honour on her Countrey … There is nothing which confers more true glory on us, then in displaying our owne Countries garbe by that we weare upon us." Brathwaite notes all the different national styles that the early Caroline Englishwomen donned and specifically calling for a more "English" dress:

> We usually observe such a fashion to be French, such an one Spanish, another Italian, this Dutch, that Poland. Meane time where is the English? Surely, some precious Elixir extracted out of all these. She will neither relye on her own inve[n]tion, nor compose her selfe to the fashion of any one particular Nation, but make her selfe an Epitomized confection of all. Thus becomes she not only a stranger to others, but to her selfe. It were to be wished, that as our Countrey is jealous of her owne invention in contriving, so shee were no lesse cautelous in her choice of wearing.[294]

Braithwaite, like the other English writers discussed throughout this dissertation, penned these pro-"English" and xenophobic sentiments in direct response to the influx of foreign culture found at the Palace of Whitehall and on the streets of London. Such views took on even greater

[294] Richard Brathwaite, *The English gentlevvoman* (London, 1631), 22–3.

political significance during the Restoration period, when, as we shall see, the English government made several attempts to bolster economic development and national feeling with the restriction of foreign imports and fashioning of more "English" goods.

This chapter examines how certain articles of clothing and material objects were so politicized by their foreign nature in late Stuart London that they became a source of concern for those at the highest levels of state. As demonstrated in the previous chapters, the prevalence of foreign fashions at home facilitated controversy within cheap print and literature throughout the seventeenth century, as England attempted to differentiate itself within a more highly competitive global economy. This chapter analyzes how the rhetorical was made material during the Restoration period. Fashion and dress were not simply employed in a rhetorical sense to express anti-foreign sentiment within printed works. Rather, during the 1660s and 1670s, foreign material objects, specifically French and Dutch goods, were physically politicized to the degree that Charles II's administration attempted to limit, and even altogether eliminate, their presence within England for the betterment of the nation. Additionally, I demonstrate how menswear and painted earthenware underwent a process of "Anglicization," during the Restoration period in order to promote national sentiment as well as improve England's economy and fledgling trade empire.

5.1 The King's Fashion: The "English" Vest

As evident by Brathwaite's views, writers were already concerned with England's seeming lack of a national dress even before the restoration of the monarchy and the subsequent reigns of Charles II and James II. Yet, by the beginning of the Restoration period and the royal court's subsequent return to the French mode, the issue became even more relevant. Thirty-one years after the publication of Brathwaite's work, John Evelyn similarly condemned the foreign

fashions that still dominated the royal court and London at large within his small pamphlet, *Tyrannus, or: The mode* (1661). Like Brathwaite, Evelyn understood the damaging effects of French fashions upon Stuart England, commenting that, "I love the French well (and have many reasons for it) yet I would be glad to pay my respects in any thing rather then my Clothes because I conceive it so great diminution to our Native Country, and to the discretion of it." The French fashion was not simply detrimental to English character and morale, but to the country's economy and wool industry as well. Evelyn opposed imports from France and encouraged domestic textile production as evident by his exclamation, "we need no French inventions for the Stage, or for the Back; we have better Materials for Clothes."[295]

Evelyn even pens a rather scathing statement regarding the role of the king himself in the promotion of the French fashion within England, noting that "For though Lewis the XIIII. be the French King; CHARLES the II is King of France; and I shall not despair to see the day when he shall give his Vassals there the Edict for their Apparel, and not suffer his Subjects here to receive the Law from them." Evelyn ponders the possibilities for English national sentiment if the entire population, following the king's example, were to be freed from the tyranny of the French mode and united in a shared "English" dress, crafted domestically by Englishmen with English resources:

> How glorious to our Prince, when he should behold all his Subjects clad with the Production of his own Country, and the People Universally inrich'd, whilst the Species that we now consume in Lace or export for foreign Silks, and more unserviceable Stuffs would by this means be all fav'd, and the whole Nation knit as one to the heart of their Sovereign, as to a Provident and Indulgent Father?[296]

[295] John Evelyn, *Tyrannus, or, The mode in a discourse of sumptuary laws* (London, 1661), 2, 18.
[296] Evelyn, *Tyrannus*, 2, 22.

Evelyn's desire for the king to consign his French dress and fashion a new, more "English" attire would actually be fulfilled only five years later, when Charles requisitioned a new court fashion for men that would ultimately transform early modern ideas concerning masculinity, class, and national feeling.

On October 8, 1666, Pepys recorded that "the King hath yesterday in Council declared his resolution of setting a fashion for clothes, which he will never alter. It will be a vest, I know not well how; but it is to teach the nobility thrift, and will do good." A few days later, on Saturday, October 13th, Pepys observed Charles "dress himself, and try on his vest, which is the King's new fashion, and will be in it for good and all on Monday next, and the whole Court: it is a fashion, the King says he will never change." Indeed, on that following Monday, the king, "several persons of the House of Lords and Commons," as well as other "great courtiers" donned this new vestment, "a long cassocke close to the body, of black cloth, and pinked with white silke under it, and a coat over it, and the legs ruffled with black riband like a pigeon's leg."[297] The vest was, essentially, a knee-length undercoat with elbow sleeves that was generally confined at the waist by a sash or buckled girdle and worn underneath a tunic or surcoat.[298] Evelyn also described his first sighting of the vest, making particular note of its similarities to the Eastern style of dress:

> Star-Chamber: thence to Court, it being the first time of his Majesties putting himself solemnly into the Eastern fashion of Vest, changing doublet, stiff Collar, [bands] & Cloake &c: into a comely Vest, after the Persian mode with girdle or shash, & Shoe strings & Garters, into bouckles, of which some were set with precious stones.[299]

---

[297] Samuel Pepys, *The Diary of Samuel Pepys*, eds., Robert Latham and William Matthews, 11 vols. (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1971), 7: 313–4, 320–1, 324.
[298] Valerie Cumming, *Royal Dress: The Image and the Reality, 1580 to the present day* (New York: Holmes & Meier, 1989), 218.
[299] John Evelyn, *The Diary of John Evelyn*, eds., E.S. de Beer, 6 vols. (Oxford University Press, 1955), 3: 301.

Evelyn was familiar with the "Persian mode," having come across "a Persian walking about in a rich vest of cloth of tissue, and several other ornaments, according to the fashion of his country," during his travels to Italy in 1645. This style "much pleased" Evelyn, who thought the young man looked quite handsome and "of the most stately mien."[300] In 1662, Evelyn observed this Eastern style yet again at the Restoration court, when the Russian Ambassador and his retinue arrived, "being clad in their Vests, after the Eastern manner, rich furrs, Caps, & carrying Haukes, furrs, Teeth, Bows, &c:…"[301] Evelyn appears to be the only contemporary who specifically likened Charles's new vest to Eastern fashion, perhaps because he was more attentive to or familiar with these styles than his fellow courtiers. Nevertheless, the vest's style sharply contrasted with the established French mode, and despite Evelyn's association here with "Persian" dress, strongly embodied a sense of "Englishness" within Restoration England.

The style differed from the French fashion, the decadent doublet, not simply in terms of cut, shape, or length but due to the simplicity of the garment. Indeed, Charles's vest rejected flamboyant shades and rich fabrics for more somber tones and simple cloth. Pepys himself was thrilled to order a plain vest from his tailor, but found himself "out of countenance to be seen in the street" when it got dirty. Pepys also noted that, "the Court is all full of Vests; only, my Lord St. Albans not pinked, but plain black—and they say the King says the pinking upon white makes them look too much like magpyes, and therefore hath bespoke one of plain velvet."[302] Sources indicate that there were certainly special occasions wherein the vest was greatly embellished, including a month later, at a ball in honor of Queen Catherine's birthday: "the King in his rich vest of some rich silke trimming, as the Duke of York and all the dancers were, some

[300] Evelyn, *Diary*, 2: 281.
[301] Evelyn, *Diary*, 3: 180.
[302] Pepys, *Diary*, 7: 362, 366, 328.

of cloth of silver, and others of other sorts, exceedingly rich."[303] Evelyn's entry from February 18, 1667 includes a similar observation: "I saw a magnificent Ball or Masque in the Theater at Court, where their Majesties & all the greate Lords & Ladies daunced infinitely gallant: the Men in their richly imbrodred, most becoming Vests." Although the vest was occasionally elaborated for specific court functions, Charles stuck to his fashion resolution and never consigned the garment from his wardrobe. Indeed, many courtiers originally questioned Charles's resolve to the style, yet Evelyn remarked that the king vowed "never to alter it, & to leave the French mode, which had hitherto obtained to our greate expense & reproach: upon which divers Courtiers & Gent: gave his Ma[jesty] gold, by way of Wager, that he would not persist in this resolution."[304]

David Kuchta has convincingly demonstrated how the creation of Charles's vest ushered in a new masculine aesthetic as well as the modern three-piece suit that still remains today. As we have seen in the second chapter, ideas concerning luxury and effeminacy were integrally entangled during the early modern era, and were furthermore viewed as chief political vices that sought to corrupt the English body politic. Kuchta argues that the frugality and simplicity of Charles's vest thus drastically altered conceptions of masculinity and social status.[305] However, I argue that this new style maintained equal historical significance as a clever fashion and *political* statement that was decidedly anti-extravagance and anti-French.[306] Indeed, while luxury and effeminacy were firmly associated with one another, so were luxury and "Frenchness" often considered indistinguishable within late seventeenth-century England. Consequently, following these dichotomies, minimalism and thriftiness in dress was thoroughly associated with ideas

[303] Pepys, *Diary*, 7: 371–2. See also Edmond S. de Beer, "King Charles II's Own Fashion: An Episode in Anglo-French Relations 1660–1670," *Journal of the Warburg Institute* 2, no. 2 (October 1938), 110.
[304] Evelyn, *Diary*, 3: 322, 302.
[305] David Kuchta, *The Three-Piece Suit and Modern Masculinity: England, 1550–1850* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002), 10. See also Christopher Breward, *The Suit: Form, Function and Style* (London: Reaktion Books, 2016).
[306] See also Vincent, *Dressing the Elite*, 1.

concerning "Englishness." The fact that the garment could, and often was, constructed of England's native wool only made the garment more English within contemporary minds.[307] As demonstrated in the second chapter, luxury fabrics, such as silk, were understood as superfluous, effeminate, and foreign (usually French), whereas wool as well as other plain yet substantial textiles were practical, masculine, and decidedly more "English."[308]

When Charles retired his French menswear in October of 1666, contemporaries themselves at home and abroad understood this act as a political statement against French interests and proclamation for English national sentiment. Indeed, it is no coincidence that Charles's vest, much like his wife's riding habit discussed in the previous chapter, was first fashioned and publically displayed following the Great Fire of September 1666. This royal fashion, therefore, functioned as a vestimentary piece of political propaganda against French interests at a time of national crisis. Moreover, anecdotal evidence of the French reaction indicates that Louis XIV certainly interpreted this new fashion statement as a political act and sartorial affront to France. Pepys's entry from November 22, 1666 includes an interesting tale describing how Louis XIV supposedly retaliated to his cousin's new vest: "The King of France hath, in defiance to the King of England, caused all his footmen to be put into vests…which, if true, is the greatest indignity ever done by one Prince to another, and would incite a stone to be revenged."[309] The insult was pointed: within France, this "English" style was not fit for the *French* king, but only for his servants. Regardless of whether these words were actually spoken

[307] Cumming, *Royal Dress*, 33.
[308] See Chapter II, p. 25.
[309] Pepys, *Diary*, 7: 379.

by Louis XIV, Pepys's anecdote proves that political messages were often communicated, or at the very least interpreted, through one's dress during the seventeenth century.[310]

While the vest may have been received negatively abroad, Evelyn and other Englishmen and women delighted in this sartorial rejection of French fashion. Indeed, Charles's vest may well have responded to or been influenced by the vestimentary rhetoric against foreign fashions that dominated seventeenth-century cheap print. In his diary, Evelyn himself rather humbly acknowledges the probable role of *Tyrannus* in the creation of the Charles's vest, since he personally presented the king with a copy of his pamphlet years before the king first donned his new vestment:

> I had some time before indeede presented an Invectique against that unconstancy, & our so much affecting the French fashion, to his Majestie in which [I] tooke occasion to describe the Comelinesse & usefullnesse of the Persian clothing in the very same manner, his Majestie clad himself: The pamphlet I intituled Tyrannus or the mode, & gave it his Majestie to reade; I do not impute the change which soon happn'd to thus discourse, but it was an identite, that I could not but take notice of.[311]

5.2 Dueling Dishes: Dutch vs. English Delftware

Like Charles II's new vest, painted earthenware was another highly politicized material object, being a thoroughly foreign luxury commodity within late seventeenth-century England. Due to the success of the Dutch trade in Chinese porcelain, manufacturers in the Dutch Republic, and later England, began domestic production of imitation pieces known as delftware, tin-glazed earthenware specifically crafted to resemble the exquisite china of the East. Thus, in this way, Dutch delftware was considered doubly foreign within Stuart England, as a *Dutch* imitation of a

[310] de Beer and other scholars question the accuracy of this account, nothing that Pepys's entry is the only reference to such a claim. See de Beer, "King Charles II's Own Fashion," 111.
[311] Evelyn, *Diary*, 3: 301.

Eastern luxury good. By the mid-seventeenth century, delftware became a cultural phenomenon throughout early modern Europe and necessity for the advancement of the metropole. Delftware was so central to the Dutch Republic that one observer, a Frenchman named Pierre-Daniel Huet, acknowledged, "*Holland* produces nothing at all necessary, except Butter, Cheese, and Clay to make *Delft* Ware, or other Eastern Ware, and this is well worth the Observation of the Reader that is any ways versed in Politicks."[312]

While imperial competition between early modern European powers has been thoroughly studied, there remains a dearth of studies concerning the interrelationship between the Dutch and English empires and consumer culture. Indeed, most scholarly studies emphasize the role of rival trade companies and their expansive activities abroad, seldom concentrating on the importance of domestic commerce within the metropole. Furthermore, even fewer scholars focus on specific commodities and their role in expanding the English and Dutch trade empires. The political nature of delftware remains a seriously underdeveloped area of historical study and has failed to receive adequate recent scholarly attention. Such a historiographical gap is particularly surprising considering the vital role this pottery played within both the Dutch and English economies throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

Recent Atlantic histories have stressed that the rise of the British empire was due to its emulation of early modern Dutch imperialism during the seventeenth century. As Julia Adams notes, "the conventional picture of politics in eighteenth-century northern Europe is one of Dutch decline, English triumph, and French collapse." Adams argues that international competition between Dutch and English trading companies greatly contributed to the downfall of the Dutch trade empire. The Dutch ultimately failed because they were too successful; other European

[312] Pierre-Daniel Huet, *Memoirs of the Dutch trade in all the states, kingdoms, and empires in the world* (London, 1700), 18.

powers recognized their exemplar commercial system throughout the globe and implemented it themselves in order to nudge the Dutch Republic out of power.[313] Thus, within the early modern Atlantic world, the Dutch Republic was a successful world power to be emulated and eliminated. However, emulation was not simply practiced on a grand political scale among state officials but also by merchants and entrepreneurs on a more localized level with the production of imitation goods. States also recognized that the trade and manufacture of extra-European commodities remained the key for economic power over their imperial rivals. The majority of the conflict between European powers, primarily the Dutch Republic and England, during the seventeenth century concerned control of the world's rich trade networks.[314]

Material objects were so vital for the economic and imperial development of early modern European powers that delftware, in both its Dutch and English forms, became the subject of intense political dispute, like Charles's vest, albeit to a much greater degree, by the end of the seventeenth century.[315] This section examines both Dutch and English delftware within Restoration England in order to reveal how the imperial competition between the two European powers was projected onto the material world. The Dutch served as both an imperial model and

---

[313] Julia Adams, *The Familial State: Ruling Families and Merchant Capitalism in Early Modern Europe* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2005), 6. Adams's book investigates how the Netherlands' unique form of governance, patrimonialism, played a key role in their rise as the hegemonic merchant empire during the seventeenth century. Adams describes how the Dutch Republic was ruled by an alliance of trading families based in the bustling metropolis of Amsterdam who were focused on extending Dutch trade networks in both hemispheres with the VOC and WIC. Ultimately, Adams argues that the British adopted this effective paradigm to aid in their triumph over the Dutch within the Atlantic. Also, see Nuala Zahedieh's *The Capital and the Colonies: London and the Atlantic Economy, 1660–1700* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010), which further analyzes the British attempts to eliminate the Dutch Republic as a commercial rival.

[314] See Simon Schama, *The Embarrassment of Riches: An Interpretation of Dutch Culture in the Golden Age* (New York: Vintage Books, 1987); and Timothy Brook, *Vermeer's Hat: The Seventeenth Century and the Dawn of the Global World* (New York: Bloomsbury Press, 2008).

[315] Traditionally, the term "delftware" is utilized to denote the *Dutch* industry of oriental-style earthenware while "English delftware" signifies the Anglicized counterpart, only applying to the version made in England in direct imitation and competition with the Dutch. Since this chapter looks at both versions often in comparative fashion, I refer to each respectively as "Dutch delftware" and "English delftware" to avoid confusion. Furthermore, here "delftware" collectively represents both Dutch and English forms.

irritant to domestic industry within late Stuart England. Consequently, English artisans imitated the successful delftware of the United Provinces in order to break the Dutch hold on this rather lucrative market. The fashioning of a more "English" design aesthetic as well as the Stuart administration's regulations against foreign manufacture and trade ultimately contributed to the success of English delftware.

Pottery was not a foreign art to the Dutch during the early modern era. During the early years of the Eighty Years' War (1568–1648), a community of immigrant potters had settled in the province of Holland and began producing majolica, a form of painted tin-glazed earthenware fashioned in the Italian style. This earthenware, however, was initially viewed as unsophisticated and crude in comparison to the exotic porcelain of the East.[316] By the seventeenth century, porcelain emerged as a historically significant commodity within early modern Europe. It would be these white dishes that would spark an obsession throughout the Continent, ignite the flames of imperial rivalry between the Dutch Republic and England, and ultimately lead to the creation of imitation pieces known as delftware.

Early modern Europe's taste for chinaware originated when Chinese porcelain became a staple commodity of the Dutch trade empire during the early seventeenth century. At this time, the Dutch Republic maintained two commercial enterprises that spanned the globe: the Dutch West India Company (the WIC), which was granted a monopoly on all Atlantic trade in 1621, and the United East India Company, or the VOC, a corporation that established a lucrative direct shipping route to Asia. In the year of its founding in 1602, the VOC captured a Portuguese ship heavily laden with prized Chinese porcelain and thereby auctioned thousands of vases, dishes,

[316] Jan Daniël van Dam, *Delffse porceleyne: Dutch delftware, 1620–1850* (Amsterdam: Rijksmuseum, 2004), 9–11.

ewers, and tea wares to eager buyers back home in the Republic.[317] Consequently, the Dutch ignited a demand for porcelain throughout the rest of Europe, as Chinese porcelain began to adorn only the most fashionable tables.[318]

Yet, such merchandise was still rare and expensive enough during the early seventeenth century that not everyone could possess such a treasure. A cult of porcelain emerged during this period that transformed this valuable commodity into a cultural sign of social and economic status among the European elite. Seventeenth-century Europe's fascination with china was largely attributed to its exclusivity and exoticism, yet another factor played a significant role in its high value in early modern Europe: it was exceedingly difficult to make. The English term, "porcelain," in all its varied forms as the French *pourcelaine,* Italian *porcellana,* Spanish *porcelana,* and Dutch *porselein* referred to "a kind of univalve mollusc with a nacreous shell," or the cowry shell itself.[319] Porcelain was produced from a certain clay that, upon being baked, transformed it into a shiny, translucent, and hard form of ceramic pottery. The difficulty in reproducing oriental porcelain arose when European potters attempted to replicate the paste, or clay substance that forms the body of the object. This paste may be either hard, meaning that it was made from a natural clay as seen with the Chinese porcelain, or soft and thereby produced with artificial clays.[320] Ultimately, European potters were unable to exactly replicate the hard paste found within china, and thus their reproductions lacked the shine and thickness of the coveted oriental porcelain.

---

[317] See Robert Finlay, *The Pilgrim Art Cultures of Porcelain in World History* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2010); and Stacey Pierson, "The Movement of Chinese Ceramics: Appropriation in Global History," *Journal of World History* 23, no. 1 (March 2012): 9–39.
[318] See Corrigan, Karina H., Jan van Campen, and Femke Diercks, eds., *Asia in Amsterdam: The Culture of Luxury in the Golden Age* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2015).
[319] "porcelain, n. and adj.," *OED Online*. December 2017. Oxford University Press. http://www.oed.com.ezproxy.lib.purdue.edu/view/Entry/147941?redirectedFrom=porcelain#eid (accessed December 5, 2017).
[320] N.H. Moore, *The Old China Book* (New York: Frederick A. Stokes Company, 1903), 7.

By the mid-seventeenth century, the first delftware factories were founded in the city of Delft, a cultural and artistic center with close ties to the House of Orange and located near The Hague.[321] Many of the delftware potters set up shop in the city's abandoned breweries, which had closed down as another result of the industrious revolution when the working-class tastes changed from beer to gin.[322] Fourteen workshops operated within Delft by 1650 while another thirty larger enterprises began a mere twenty years later.[323] Production became so concentrated within Delft that these earthenwares were hereto branded as "delftware" by the late eighteenth century. However, contemporaries referred to delftware by many varied designations. Due to its resemblance as porcelain, it was often denoted through several derivative forms including "porselyn," "pursselyn," and "purslaine." In England, delftware was often known as "painted earthenware" while the Dutch also used variations of delft like "delph" or "delf."[324]

In an attempt to copy the popular oriental aesthetic embodied within Chinese porcelain, Dutch delftware initially adopted a very similar style that gradually developed into something quite unique. From an exterior view, delftware was painted in the iconic *chinoiserie* style with a white background offset by vivid cobalt blue details.[325] This blue coloring was such an integral component of delftware pieces that they were often referred to as "Delft blue," a title that would later contribute to its distinctiveness among European consumers. Early forms of delftware included the traditional oriental imagery characteristic of Chinese porcelain, with depictions of pagodas, exotic animals, and exquisite gardens filled with beautiful water lilies. However, while

---

[321] John Michael Montias, *Artists and Artisans in Delft: A Socio-Economic Study of the Seventeenth Century* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1982), 12.
[322] Brook, *Vermeer's Hat*, 78.
[323] Jan de Vries, *The Industrious Revolution: Consumer Demand and the Household Economy, 1650 to the Present* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 131.
[324] Moore, *Old China*, 4.
[325] David Beevers, *Chinese Whispers: Chinoiserie in Britain, 1650–1930* (Brighton, England: Royal Pavilion & Museums, 2008), 45.

Dutch delftware did attempt to emulate the china imported from the East, these portrayals were not authentically "Asiatic" in nature, since artisans were also willing to alter such designs in order to appeal the most to the European customer.[326] Experiment with design developed further into the second half of the seventeenth century, as pieces gradually become less Asian and more "Dutch" in nature. Biblical scenes certainly appealed to all Christians, be they Catholic or Protestant, but windmills, pastoral scenes, and tulips were specifically targeted for the Dutch consumer.

However, this demand for Dutch delftware was not simply confined to consumer households within the United Provinces, but rather extended to the Continent as well as the isles. The English interest in foreign pottery began during the reign of Elizabeth I, with the import of small shipments of Chinese porcelain as well as imports of Italian faïence and German Bellarmines, stoneware jugs, which all had superseded English-made drinking vessels in terms of quality and taste.[327] During the 1560s, Dutch potters migrated to England and set up shop originally in Norwich. These artisans produced an early form of tin-glazed earthenware very similar to what would later become Dutch delftware at the Aldgate pothouse in London, where the queen herself enjoyed them as well as the entire royal court.[328] As the Delft industry flourished in Holland, more Dutch potters soon travelled to England to further capitalize on the craze for delftware. Exact dates for the first Dutch delftware factory within England remain unknown, however, the earliest artifacts have been traced to the 1630s. Established workshops of immigrant potters, like that of Christian Wilhelm, provided a community that allowed Dutch

[326] van Dam, *Delffse porceleyne*, 23.
[327] Moore, *Old China*, 2.
[328] Kieron Tyler, Ian Betts and Roy Stephenson, *London's Delftware Industry: The Tin-glazed Pottery Industries of Southwark and Lambeth* (London: Museum of London Archaeology Service, 2008), 8. See also, Lorna Weatherill, *The Growth of the Pottery Industry in England, 1660–1815* (New York: Garland, 1986).

delftware to flourish to the point that such pottery was "found all over this [English] country, in every shade of blue and every degree of workmanship."[329]

Yet, the potters who created and marketed these popular goods within England were not English, and the Dutch monopoly on tin-glaze pottery continued until the mid-seventeenth century, when English potters would begin to fashion their own version.[330] Although English artisans had produced fine earthenware for decades before, it was not until the 1660s that they began to construct imitations specifically modeled after Delft china in order to break into this rather lucrative market. This English delftware was largely concentrated in Staffordshire with numerous other pothouses located in London and Lambeth as well as the port cities of Bristol and Liverpool. English delftware thrived throughout the isles not simply due to its competitive price, but also because of its initial adoption of the Delft blue aesthetic, boasting both oriental as well as Dutch imagery.[331]

English manufacturers directly imitated the popular designs that characterized Dutch delftware. Yet, these artisans also "Anglicized" their delftware pieces in a more aesthetic sense with prominent depictions of English monarchs. Commemorative pottery had been a popular trend within seventeenth-century England beginning with the reign of Charles I. As English artisans tried their hand at delft imitations at the outset of the Restoration, they also employed this commemorative style in order to appeal more to the English consumer and differentiate their wares from their Dutch competitors. One example celebrates the marriage of Charles II to Catherine of Braganza in 1661 (see Figure 1).[332] This tin-glazed dish, believed to have been made during the early years of the Restoration at the Brislington pottery, details the king and his

[329] Moore, *Old China*, 10.
[330] Moore, *Old China*, 2.
[331] de Vries, *The Industrious Revolution*, 131.
[332] This dish, c. 1662–85, currently resides at the Victoria & Albert Museum, London.

new queen in the traditional Delft blue. Charles dons armor and proudly brandishes the orb and scepter. Queen Catherine wears an ornate crucifix and sports a very low décolletage, admittedly an uncharacteristic style for her at this time as demonstrated in the previous chapter. A tulip stands in between the royal couple, as mythological creatures, including a dragon, adorn the rim of the dish. While this piece contains both Dutch and oriental elements, the overall look is decidedly English. The traditional symbols and trappings of the monarchy, the orb, scepter, and crown, dominate the central image of King Charles and Queen Catherine. The eye is immediately drawn to the large crowns that sit atop the sovereigns' heads. Indeed, the English monarchy appears to be central theme of the design, rather than Charles and Catherine themselves.

There was certainly a popular demand for English delftware pieces in such a commemorative style. English delftware continued to depict the royal couple as well as the king and queen individually well into the 1680s. Succeeding Stuart sovereigns were also featured in this commemorative style as James II, William III, Mary II, and Queen Anne were also immortalized in clay. An avid delftware collector, Queen Anne was posthumously named in honor of a new form of earthenware developed after 1730 known as "creamware" or "tortoise-shell ware." Even the early Hanoverians, who were descended from a German-born line, were also portrayed in English ceramic portraits.[333]

Such commemorative pieces became, as Caiger-Smith notes, "an expression of popular loyalty at the Restoration." Indeed, the depictions of Charles II and Catherine of Braganza found within English delftware during the Restoration period served as a political statement of support for the returning monarchy. These pieces also represented thoroughly "English" products in a

[333] J.H. Plumb, "The Royal Porcelain Craze," in *In the Light of History* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1973), 9.

luxury market dominated by foreign-made goods. English delftware served as an excellent mode to express "English" sentiment, for earthenware was already a deeply politicized luxury commodity within late Stuart England. According to Alan Caiger-Smith, the "Englishness" of English delftware did not "lie in any style or in any particular technique, but rather in a mood, ingenuous, direct, sometimes eccentric, that can be discerned in most of the various types of tin-glaze pottery made in England as they responded to the changes of taste and fashion of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries." Like Ribeiro, Caiger-Smith contends that ideas concerning the "Englishness" of material objects were formulated based on the unique political and cultural context of late Stuart London. As we have seen in the previous chapters, notions of "English" sentiment and anti-foreign sentiment were deeply entwined, as "Englishness" was fashioned in opposition to "foreignness" throughout the seventeenth century. Thus, Caiger-Smith argues that seventeenth-century consumers usually recognized English delftware "as English and nothing else."[334] This delftware was undoubtedly viewed as "English" to contemporaries, being made by English hands for English consumers and proudly sporting images of the English monarchy.

5.3 Forbidden Goods and the Politics of Pottery

English delftware was certainly popular and thriving during the late seventeenth century, in great part due to its more "English" aesthetic. Yet, the English state also contributed to this thriving industry with legal regulations aimed to eliminate the Dutch manufacture and sale of delftware within the isles and promote their English competitors. The influx of foreign commodities, including delftware, remained a central concern for the English state during the

[334] Alan Caiger-Smith, *Tin-Glaze Pottery in Europe and the Islamic World: The Tradition of 1000 Years in Majolica, Faience & Delftware* (London: Faber, 1973), 161–8.

late seventeenth century. Both French and Dutch goods were highly politicized during the 1660s and 1670s, much in the same manner as tea and stamps were in Boston on the eve of the American Revolution.[335] State prohibitions of imports were thus a common administrative practice during periods of warfare and other devolved relations with the French and Dutch. Indeed, the Stuart state prohibited a myriad of imported items from apples to saltpeter to pottery at significant historical moments.

For example, on November 10, 1666, less than a month after the introduction of his vest, Charles II prohibited "the Importation of all sorts of Manufactures and Commodities whatsoever, of the Growth, Production, or Manufacture of France, and of all places in the Possession of the French King … upon pain of Our high Displeasure."[336] This declaration against French fashions and commodities maintained a significant role within the sartorial narrative of the Charles's vest. Its issue, so recently after Charles first introduced his garment to the royal court, did not simply reflect the current state of affairs in relation to France. It also represented Charles's firm resolution to consign French fashions in favor of domestic-made clothes. Similarly, the state's series of declarations against Dutch commodities, specifically delftware, maintained a significant place within the narrative of Anglo-Dutch commercial competition. An examination of royal proclamations against Dutch delftware during the Second (1665–7) and Third (1672–4) Anglo-Dutch Wars demonstrates how foreign goods were further even politicized and figured at the center of early modern imperial competition.

The Anglo-Dutch Wars, which occurred in four episodes from 1652–1784, characterized relations between England, the Dutch Republic and France throughout the seventeenth and

[335] See Breen, "Baubles of Britain," 73–104.
[336] *A proclamation prohibiting the importation of all sorts of manufactures and commodities whatsoever, of the growth, production, or, manufacture of France, and of all places in the possession of the French King* (London, 1666).

eighteenth centuries. England and the Dutch Republic's combative relationship during the seventeenth century can be traced to the first issue of the Navigation Acts in 1651 and the subsequent the outbreak of the First Anglo-Dutch War (1652–54). The Navigation Acts, which were reissued by Charles II to once again curb the Dutch trading hegemony, restricted the use of foreign shipping between the English metropole and its colonies in order to stop direct colonial commerce with the Dutch Republic. The first war ended with the Battle of Scheveningen in August 1653, although the official peace treaty was signed in 1654. However, the principal issues that initially sparked this conflict were never resolved at this time, which led to additional outbreaks of war in the decades following.[337]

By the beginning of the Restoration era in 1660, imperial trade expansion and the growth of domestic industry remained significant issues to the English state. Within a year of his ascension to the throne, Charles II attempted to curb the activities of foreign merchants operating in the isles. On November 20, 1661, Charles ordered that no native citizen or foreigner "shall bring, send or convey from beyond the Sea…any Laces, Ribbonds, Fringes, Imbroidery, Laces of Silver or of Gold, Hats, Knives, Scissers, Painted Ware, Caskets, Poynts, Gloves, Locks, or Brushes to be uttered and sold within our said Realm of England, or Dominion of Wales, by way of Merchandize." The government believed that the trade and sale of these prohibited goods, which included Dutch delftware or "Painted Ware," within England posed a significant threat to domestic production. The order further explained that Dutch delftware:

> have of late been brought from beyond the Seas in great abundance, and sold within this Our Realm of *England* and Dominion of *Wales,* whereby the said Artificers and their Families are not only utterly impoverished, the youth not trained up in the said Sciences, and thereby the said Faculties, and the exquisite Knowledge thereof, like in short time, within this Our Realm to decay, but divers of Our Cities and Towns

[337] Jeremy Black, *A System of Ambition?: British Foreign Policy, 1660-1793* (Stroud: Sutton, 2000), 4.

> are thereby much impaired, the whole Realm greatly endamaged, and Foreign Countries much enriched.[338]

Charles's administration argued that the trade of foreign goods was detrimental to England's economy and commercial enterprises. English "Artificers" of Dutch delftware were also ruined, while the craft itself suffered as well. The skills needed for the production of these fashionable goods would soon "decay" and diminish if Dutch merchants, as well as other foreign tradesmen, continued to dominate the retail of delftware within the isles.

When the Second-Anglo Dutch War broke out in 1665, mercantile competition between these two early modern empires was again a central catalyst. Despite their familial connections to the House of Orange, Charles II and the Duke of York had financial motivations for war with the United Provinces.[339] In 1660, Charles established the Royal African Company, a mercantile corporation aiming to gain commercial interests on the western coast of Africa, with his brother at the head. Charles's administration hoped that this enterprise would infiltrate the trade of WIC and gain control of the prized gold along the Gambia River. The imperial tensions between the English and Dutch regarding West Africa were further strained when Charles II reissued the Navigation Acts in 1662 and 1663 to once again curb the Dutch trading hegemony. Zahedieh argues that these significant Acts were specifically directed at the Dutch in order "to create a sealed, self-contained, English Atlantic world which would allow Englishmen rather than the Dutch middlemen to benefit from their large investments in empire."[340] These attempts to oust

---

[338] *A proclamation prohibiting the importation of divers foreign wares and merchandizes into this realm of England and the dominion of Wales* (London, 1661).
[339] Charles II's oldest sister Mary, formerly the Princess Royal, was married to William II, Prince of Orange. Consequently, she was the mother of the future William III, who married her niece Mary, the daughter of James II and his first wife Anne Hyde.
[340] Zahedieh, *The Capital and the Colonies*, 5.

the Dutch from their commercial ventures abroad quickly led to the deterioration of Anglo-Dutch relations. By the beginning of 1665, both countries were posed for war, again.

Three days before war was declared between England and the Dutch Republic, the English state instituted another proclamation in preparation for the coming conflict. The bill restricted any English ship from venturing beyond his Majesty's waters.[341] This isolationism was echoed on March 15, 1665 with yet another statue in reference to the Second Anglo-Dutch War, already in progress. This document indicated that the ban on the importation of Dutch goods into England was a direct result of the combative relationship between Charles II and William of Orange. The proclamation states that "having duly considered and weighed the present state of affairs between Him [Charles II] and the states of the United Provinces, and finding the differences on their parts daily multiplied and heightened," a ban on all Dutch imports was thereby instituted. Consequently, it was thereby ordered that "that no goods, merchandizes or commodities whatsoever of the growth or manufacture of the dominions of the said states of the United Provinces, or of any of their plantations or factories" be imported into the dominions of His Majesty.[342] The Treaty of Breda in 1667 ended this second war. England gained the territory of New Netherland, which was renamed New York in honor of James. However, the seeds of yet another war were sown with the end of this particular conflict. Dutch imports would continue to plague Restoration England during periods of peace as well as war. By the time of the next Anglo-Dutch War in the 1670s, delftware took center stage within the imperial competition between the two European powers.

---

[341] *A proclamation forbidding foreign trade and commerce* (London, 1665).
[342] *A proclamation for prohibiting the importation or retailing of any commodities of the growth or manufacture of the states of the United Provinces* (London, 1665).

The origins of the Third Anglo-Dutch War derived from the failing relationship between the Dutch Republic and France. Despite their alliance during the previous Anglo-Dutch war, France and the United Provinces clashed when Louis XIV of France invaded the Spanish Netherlands during the War of Devolution (1667–8). Due to the diplomatic talents of Charles's favorite sister Henriette, the wife of the Louis's brother, the duc d'Orléans, Charles signed the clandestine Treaty of Dover with France in 1670. The agreement stipulated that England was to aid the French in their war of conquest against the Dutch Republic. In exchange, Louis would help England reach an rapprochement with Rome. Consequently, the English were once again embroiled in another Anglo-Dutch war. Although the motivations for this war were not directly related to imperial competition, as they were with the previous military conflicts, foreign trade in the isles remained a constant concern.

Upon England's declaration of war against the Dutch on April 6, 1672, Charles's administration began to specifically target the Dutch delftware industry in England. The first proclamation of this series appeared months after the outbreak of war on July 22, 1672. The document begins with a prelude that emphasizes the need to increase domestic delftware production for the well being of the nation. The decree acknowledges England's very recent entrance into the delftware industry and further laments English artisans' lesser degree of knowledge concerning the craft:

> Whereas the art of making all sorts of painted earthen wares is a mystery but lately found out in England … whereby great benefit and advantage will accue to this Our Kingdom in general, and to very many private Families, who already make their chief livelihood and sustenance thereupon: Notwithstanding which, divers Merchants and others, have lately imported into England great quantities of the like painted earthenwares, from parts beyond the seas, and do sell the same at an undervalue, to the great discouragement of so useful a manufacture.

Cheaper Dutch imports of delftware hindered the industrious labors of English manufacturers, who were impoverished not simply by their own inexperience but also by the meddling commercial activities of Dutch competitors. The English state thus banned "any kind or sort of Painted Earthen Ware" except, of course, the priceless Chinese porcelain, "by way of merchandise to be sold, bartered, or exchanged."[343] Furthermore, the order demanded that no merchants were permitted to engage in the sale of imported painted earthenware, again, except Chinese porcelain, within the realm of England.[344] Charles's administration hoped that English delftware industry would flourish with the enforcement of these regulations.

Although the Third Anglo-Dutch War ended on February 19, 1674 with the Treaty of Westminster, the English state continued its assault on the Dutch delftware industry within Restoration England. Another edict targeted both the manufacturers and merchants of Dutch delftware in December 1676. Despite the earlier proclamations that forbade the imports of "Painted Wares," Charles II comments that these foreigners "have presumed to Import, and daily do bring several great quantities of Painted Earthen Wares privately into the Port of London." As a result, the document reiterated the embargo on foreign painted earthenware, pointedly addressing Dutch delftware with the emphasis on its blue coloring. Indeed, the order specifically cites "Painted Earthen Wares, be the same Painted with White, Blew, or any other Colours." Furthermore, Charles's administration concludes that, "English Manufacture [of such goods] being made to as great perfection by His Majesties said Subjects, as by any Foreigners, and that for the most part with Materials of *English* growth."[345] Indeed, the proclamation declares that the

[343] *A proclamation prohibiting the importation of painted earthen wares* (London, 1672).
[344] This proclamation was reissued exactly a year later on July 22, 1675, which demonstrates that Dutch delftware even posed a significant threat to English industry even during times of peace.
[345] *A proclamation prohibiting the importation of earthen ware* (London, 1676).

art of painted earthenware had now been perfected by native artisans, and further emphasizes the profound "Englishness" of English delftware.

5.4 Conclusion

Dutch delftware emerged by the mid-seventeenth century due to the rising consumer demand for Chinese porcelain among, predominantly northern, Europeans and quickly became a profitable international commodity for the Dutch Republic. Eager to mimic this success, English artisans developed their own tin-glazed earthenware directly modeled after the Dutch. Just as the English state copied the most successful aspects of the Dutch trade empire, English delftware initially adopted the deep blue coloring, exotic imagery, as well as the more Westernized or European designs. Yet, English delftware was not able to dominate the earthenware industry in England by simply copying the oriental and Dutch aesthetic. English artisans differentiated themselves from their foreign competitors with commemorative pottery, just as the state attempted to promote the consumption of English delftware.

Acknowledging the threat to domestic industry and patriotic feeling at a time of warfare, the Stuart state became actively involved in the fashioning of more "English" goods. As we have seen with Charles's vest, the king sought to fabricate a new fashion for Englishmen that rejected the French style. This simple, frugal, and more "masculine" garment was often made from wool, a textile considered native to the isles. Thus, the matter of a national dress became intricately tied to England's wool industry. Similarly, the English state attempted to bolster the domestic delftware industry through a barrage of royal proclamations directly aimed at Dutch competitors. An examination of these decrees within the narrative of the Anglo-Dutch Wars reveals that the Stuart administration believed that Dutch delftware, both produced in England by Dutch artisans as well as imported from the Dutch Republic itself, was a significant concern worthy of state

action. Ultimately, fashion and material objects were not simply politicized in a rhetorical sense within printed works, but also became figured at the center of imperial competition.

CHAPTER 6. CONCLUSION

In *The Spector* edition from Saturday, 2 June 1711, the essayist and politician Joseph Addison notes an interesting sighting at the theater in Hay-Market during the previous winter of 1710.[346] According to Addison, two "Parties of very fine Women" situated themselves in opposing boxes, drawing up "a kind of Battle-Array one against another." Upon further observation, Addison, himself a Whig, noticed that the women had patched their faces differently:

> The Faces on one Hand, being spotted on the right Side of the Forehead, and those upon the other on the Left. I quickly perceived that they cast hostile Glances upon one another and that their Patches were placed in those different Situations, as Party-Signals to distinguish Friends from Foes. In the Middle-Boxes, between these two opposite bodies, were several Ladies who Patched indifferently on both Sides of their Faces, and seem'd to sit there with no other Intention but to see the Opera. Upon Inquiry I found, that the Body of Amazons on my Right Hand, were Whigs, and those on my Left, Tories: And that those who had placed themselves in the Middle Boxes were a Neutral Party, whose Faces had not yet declared themselves. These last, however, as I afterwards found, diminished daily, and took their Party with one Side or the other; insomuch that I observed in several of them, the Patches, which were before dispersed equally, are now all gone over to the Whig or Tory Side of the Face.[347]

These noble and genteel ladies had strategically positioned their black patches upon their faces in order to communicate their party affiliation. Patching for one's party soon became the prevailing fashion, thereby forcing the non-compliant women to follow suit or ultimately choose their side in this "Party Rage."[348] Yet, Addison comments that this practice was not without its problems, specifically when one already had a "natural patch" in a rather unfortunate location:

> I must here take notice that Rosalinda, a famous Whig Partizan, has

[346] Pat Rogers, "Addison, Joseph (1672–1719), writer and politician," *ODNB*.
[347] Joseph Addison, *The Spectator*, no. 81 (London, 1711), 1.
[348] Addison, *The Spectator*, 4.

> most unfortunately a very beautiful Mole on the Tory Part of her Forehead; which being very conspicuous, has occasioned many Mistakes, and given an Handle to her Enemies to misrepresent her Face, as tho' it had Revolted from the Whig Interest.[349]

However, upon further conversation with her, it became "well known that her Notions of Government are still the same." The Tory location of this "unlucky Mole" had "mis-led several Coxcombs; and like the hanging out of false Colours, made some of them converse with Rosalinda in what they thought the Spirit of her Party, when on a sudden she has given them an unexpected Fire, that has sunk them all at once."[350] A similar situation emerged with "Nigranilla" (another clear alias), who, although a proud Tory, was forced to use a black patch to cover a pimple that had emerged on the Whig side of the face.

Addison's anecdote concerning Rosalinda and Nigranilla demonstrates the power of the language of fashion during the early modern period. There was certainly a vernacular associated with these fashionable patches, one that was culturally constructed and informed by specific political and social circumstances. In eighteenth-century France, elites similarly donned patches in varying positions in order communicate a form of flirtation; a patch on either cheek was known as the "gallant," another near the lips was called the "coquette," and one on the forehead was referred to as the "assassin."[351] English contemporaries also attached their own meanings to patches worn on specific locations of the face, regardless of the wearer's actual intent. These women did not intend to communicate a particular party affiliation, yet observers inherently misinterpreted Rosalinda's mole and Nigranilla's blemish as a public display of political loyalty.

---

[349] Addison, *The Spectator*, 2.
[350] Addison, *The Spectator*, 2.
[351] Morag Martin, *Selling Beauty: Cosmetics, Commerce, and French Society, 1750–1830* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 2009), 15.

Therefore, the donning of these patches still remains politically significant even if they were worn devoid of any overt political intent because many interpreted it as such.

As we have seen within the previous chapters, the wearer or owner's intent is often irrelevant as others attach their own particular meanings to objects. Such interpretations are based on an item's origins, manufacture, and other material characteristics such as construction, color, and shape. However, equally important factors include the environment (i.e. geographical location) as well as the political, religious, and social context in which these objects were made, worn, displayed or consumed. For example, Catherine of Braganza almost certainly did not don the farthingale in order to conceal an illicit pregnancy, which was, after all, considered by many to be the primary purpose of this "monstrous" skirt. Yet, observers could not help but view this foreign garment, when worn upon the English queen's body, as threatening to the state's natural order as well as the monarchy at large. We may not always be able to identify the exact reasons why Englishmen and women donned or displayed specific items. However, we may discover how others interpreted or understood these objects within the unique political context of Stuart England.

Addison continues on with his tale and further notes that upon first glimpse at the theater, he counted about twenty more Tory patches than Whigs. However, by the next morning, "the whole Puppet-Show filled with Faces spotted after the Whiggish Manner." Such reinforcement of patched women continued the next evening when Tory ladies "came in so great a Body to the Opera, that they out-number'd the Enemy." Addison concludes his sartorial observations with the following remarks:

> This Account of Party Patches, will, I am afraid, appear improbable to those who live at a Distance from the fashionable World: but as it is a Distinction of a very singular Nature, and what perhaps may never meet with a Parallel, I think I should not have discharged the

Office of a faithful Spectator, had I not recorded it.[352]

This trend was certainly noteworthy within the London of Queen Anne (1702–14), as fashion continued to play a central role within English political culture well into the eighteenth century.

Fashion had always made a [political] statement during the early modern period, whether purposefully intended or not. Within the Tudor court, female hoods or headdresses were thoroughly politicized. The gable hoods worn by Katherine of Aragon, her Spanish ladies, and later Jane Seymour sharply contrasted against the French version sported by Anne Boleyn and in turn her cousin Katherine Howard.[353] Furthermore, Anne Boleyn's monogrammed "B" pearl necklace, captured in her famed portrait currently residing at the National Portrait Gallery, maintained particular significance. The donning of this bauble within the portrait could serve no other purpose than to reinforce her political alliances and dynastic connections as the daughter of Thomas Boleyn, and therefore a member of the powerful Howard family.[354] Elizabeth I drew upon the imagery of the sacred as a means of self-fashioning. She employed virginal symbols, such as the rose and the pearl, and also claimed black and white, representing purity, as "her colors." By dressing herself in this manner, Elizabeth reinforced her image as the "Virgin Queen," being wed only to her country, and thus was able to justify her political decision not to marry.[355]

However, as this dissertation has demonstrated, the Stuart era represents a rather exceptional period for the study of the intersection of fashion and political culture. Indeed, it was a period that witnessed the unique convergence of intense politico-religious crisis, successive

---

[352] Addison, *The Spectator*, 3–4.
[353] Maria Hayward, *Dress at the Court of King Henry VIII* (New York: Routledge, 2007), 171–3.
[354] See *Anne Boleyn*, unknown English artist, late sixteenth century, NPG 668.
[355] Carole Levin, *The Heart and Stomach of a King: Elizabeth I and the Politics of Sex and Power* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1994), 39.

warfare, profound xenophobia, as well as the rise in luxury consumption and international trade. Seventeenth-century England certainly experienced many internal crises. In a political sense, the period began with an assassination plot, followed by civil war, the execution of one king, the formation of a republic, the restoration of another king, and, ultimately, revolution and the overthrow of a third king. Religious conflict between the Church of England and Puritans continued on from the sixteenth century, while Catholicism remained a constant threat. Socially, the rising political voice of the country gentry challenged the hegemony of the aristocracy. All these factors combined together led to a "crisis of political legitimacy" that historians have designated the "general crisis" of the seventeenth century. As David Kuchta argues, this period also witnessed a "fashion crisis," which was informed by political, religious, and social events, and in turn also helped to shape them. This "fashion crisis" was a moment of profound sartorial criticism against the courtly display of the Stuart monarchy. Kuchta contends that the Stuart court's "public image was a focal point of criticism precisely because it was a focal point of contemporaries' understanding of the political, social, economic, and moral order." Furthermore, the monarchy's crisis in public image "helped precipitate its fall in the English Civil War, helped redefine its meaning during the Restoration, and helped expel James II in the Glorious Revolution."[356]

This dissertation has revealed how contemporaries viewed the conspicuous consumption and foreign cultural influence found in the royal court as a threat to the political, economic, and moral well being of the nation. Foreign fashions and material objects, especially those from Catholic nations such as France, Spain or the Italian states, were politicized in both a rhetorical and a material sense. Clothing such as hooped-petticoats and heeled shoes, cosmetics including

[356] David Kuchta, *The Three-Piece Suit and Modern Masculinity: England, 1550–1850* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002), 51–2.

black patches, and accessories like dildos were the subject of much criticism not simply because they were foreign fashions, but because they were foreign fashions worn by the political elite of the court. The men and women of the royal court were visual representations of the English government. Therefore, the very presence of foreign styles throughout the court threatened to corrupt the monarchy and the state at large. The dissemination of these goods onto the streets of London only further compounded the threat they posed to seventeenth-century England. Additionally, the manufacture and trade of foreign goods, particularly the Dutch delftware discussed in the last chapter, threatened domestic industry as well as the English economy at large. Such profound xenophobia in fashion and dress greatly contributed to the formations of "English" national sentiment throughout the seventeenth century. As we have seen, dichotomies were crucial to how these conceptions of "Englishness" were fashioned. Contemporaries identified "English" dress as what they perceived as the polar opposite of foreign garb: sensible, frugal, simple, and masculine.

Fashion and material objects thus maintained great significance within Stuart England in several ways. Firstly, as we have seen throughout this dissertation, certain garments and commodities were deeply politicized during the seventeenth century, symbolizing a wide range of political issues. As evident in the previous chapters, fashion and material culture was at the center of ongoing political debates and of great interest to those at the center of government. Fashion was not a trifling matter but rather maintained important political connotations. Secondly, fashion also served as an universal form of political expression. Dress was certainly a popular and accessible topic to the vast majority of the English populace. Indeed, all Englishmen and women wore (at or least were supposed to wear) clothing. As we have seen, writers across the politico-religious and social spectrums employed the theme of fashion as rhetorical device

within literature in order to express their opinions regarding the current political status quo. Furthermore, the third and fourth chapters have demonstrated how the men and women of the royal court physically used clothing and other material objects to convey certain messages or images of themselves (or others) for political purposes. Even the king himself drew upon this mode of political expression, as Charles II's vest transmitted a powerful message to the French king as well as the royal court at large. Yet, fashion also allowed those on the political fringes an opportunity to engage in the dynamic world of Stuart politics. Anonymity allowed English writers from all social orders to pen their political opinions without fear of reprisal, while the women of the royal court were able to communicate their status and allegiances through the display of their dress and apartment furnishings.

Fashion certainly provided a new avenue for political expression and agency for early modern women despite their exclusion from formal governance. Yet, this sartorial phenomenon is not limited to those women who did not hold formal positions within the government. Modern women at the center of government also utilized their dress for political purposes. Margaret Thatcher's iconic "pussy-bow" blouse, a tie-neckline popular during the Victorian era, projected her conservative values, while former United States Secretary of State Madeleine Albright was renown for using her jeweled brooches to send political messages. As United States Ambassador to the United Nations, Albright diplomatically donned a snake pin in response to a poem published by the government-controlled Iraqi press, wherein she was denounced as an "unparalleled serpent." Albright reminisces her first meeting with Iraqi officials after the appearance of the poem:

> While preparing to meet the Iraqis, I remembered the pin and decided to wear it. I didn't consider the gesture a big deal and doubted that the Iraqis even made the connection. However, upon leaving the meeting, I encountered a member of the UN

> press corps who was familiar with the poem; she asked why I had chosen to wear that particular pin. As the television cameras zoomed in on the brooch, I smiled and said that it was just my way of sending a message.[357]

Fashion remains deeply entwined with politics, and no more so than today within this very material world and contentious political climate. As a multi-trillion dollar global industry, fashion remains an undeniable platform for political expression, particularly in regards to socio-political movements such as Black Lives Matter and, most recently, the Time's Up (#MeToo) movement. Ultimately, additional studies of the intersection of politics and material culture throughout the early modern and modern worlds would further demonstrate how clothing does not simply "make the man," or woman, but history.

[357] See Madeleine Albright, *Read My Pins: Stories from a Diplomat's Jewel Box* (New York: Melcher Media, 2009), 17.

REFERENCES

Archival Sources

Folger Shakespeare Library

Warrants and orders from Lord Chamberlain of the Royal Household to Master of the Great Wardrobe (1669, 1676–77).

The Huntington Library

Egerton Family Papers (1150–1803).

Hastings Family Papers (1100–1892).

The National Archives

The Stuart Papers.

The Wardrobe Accounts.

The Newberry Library

Edme Pirot Papers (1606–79).

Francis Gregor Manuscripts.

Printed Sources

Addison, Joseph. *The Spectator*, no. 81. London, 1711.

Albright, Madeleine. *Read My Pins: Stories from a Diplomat's Jewel Box*. New York: Melcher Media, 2009.

Articles of high-treason and other high crimes and misdemeanours against the Dutchess of Portsmouth. London, 1680.

Brathwaite, Richard. *The English gentleman: containing sundry excellent rules or exquisite*

observations, tending to direction of every of selecter ranke and qualitie, how to demeane or accommodate himselfe in the manage of publike or affaires. London, 1630.

_____. *The English gentlewoman, drawne out to the full body expressing, what habiliments doe best attire her, what ornaments doe best adorne her, what complements doe best accomplish her*. London, 1631.

de Brémond, Gabriel. *Hattige: or The Amours of the King of Tamaran, A Novel*. Amsterdam, 1683.

Breton, Nicholas. *The court and country, or A briefe discourse dialogue-wise set downe betweene a courtier and a country-man contayning the manner and condition of their lives, with many delectable and pithy sayings worthy obseruation*. London, 1618.

Bulwer, John. *Anthropometamorphosis: Man Transform'd or, the Artificiall Changling*. London, 1653.

Butler, Samuel. *Dildoides, A burlesque poem.* London, 1706.

The Character of a town-gallant exposing the extravagant fopperies of some vain self conceited pretenders to gentility and good breeding. London, 1675.

The Character of a Town Misse. London, 1675.

Coles, Elisha. *An English dictionary explaining the difficult terms that are used in divinity, husbandry, physick, phylosophy, law, navigation, mathematicks, and other arts and sciences.* London, 1677.

Coryate, Thomas. *Coryats crudities.* London, 1611.

Dunton, John. *The parable of the top-knots*. London, 1691.

Evelyn, John. *The Diary of John Evelyn*. Edited by E.S. de Beer. 6 vols. New York: Oxford University Press, 1955.

_____. *Tyrannus, or, The mode in a discourse of sumptuary laws*. London, 1661.

Evelyn, Mary. *Mundus muliebris: or, The ladies dressing-room unlock'd, and her toilette spread in burlesque*. London, 1690.

Florio. *A Worlde of Words*. London, 1598.

Hall, Thomas. *Comarum akosmia, the loathsomnesse of long haire*. London, 1654.

Hamilton, Anthony. *Memoirs of the Court of Charles II by Count Grammont*. Reprint; New York: P.F. Collier & Son, 1910.

Heath, James. *The glories and magnificent triumphs of the blessed restitution of His Sacred Majesty K. Charles II from his arrival in Holland 1659/60 till this present*. London, 1662.

Huet, Pierre-Daniel. *Memoirs of the Dutch trade in all the states, kingdoms, and empires in the world.* London, 1700.

The Ladies Mercury 1, no. 3. London, 1693.

The Life, Amours, and Secret History of Francelia, Late Duchess of Portsmouth, Favourite Mistress to King Charles II. London, 1734.

Monsieur Thing's origin. London, 1722.

de Motteville, Madame. *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire d'Anne d'Austriche Espouse de Louis XIII, Roi de France, par Madame de Motteville, Une de ses Favorites,* 5 vols. Amsterdam, 1723.

Mundus foppensis: or, the fop display'd Being the ladies vindication, in answer to a late pamphlet, entitled, Mundus muliebris: or, the ladies dressing-room unlock'd. London, 1691.

N.H. *The compleat tradesman, or, The exact dealers daily companion*. London, 1684.

_____. *The Ladies Dictionary: Being a General Entertainment of the Fair-Sex*. London, 1694.

The parable of the puppies, or, The top-knots vindicated. London, 1691.

Pepys, Samuel. *The Diary of Samuel Pepys*. Edited by Robert Latham and William Matthews. 11 vols. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1971.

The phantastick age: or, The anatomy of Englands vanity in wearing the fashions of severall nations, with good exhortations, against transmutations. London, 1634.

The Practical Part of Love. London, 1660.

Price, Laurence. *Heres Jack in a box, that will coniure the fox. Or, A new list of the new fashions now used in London*. London, 1657.

A proclamation forbidding foreign trade and commerce. London, 1665.

A proclamation for prohibiting the importation or retailing of any commodities of the growth or manufacture of the states of the United Provinces. London, 1665.

A proclamation prohibiting the importation of all sorts of manufactures and commodities whatsoever, of the growth, production, or, manufacture of France, and of all places in the possession of the French King. London, 1666.

A proclamation prohibiting the importation of divers foreign wares and merchandizes into this realm of England and the dominion of Wales, and sale thereof and to repress the excess gilding of coaches and chariots. London, 1661.

Selden, John. *Table-talk being the discourses of John Selden, Esq., or his sence of various matters of weight and high consequence relating especially to religion and state*. London, 1689.

Shadwell, Thomas. *The Miser: a comedy acted by His Majesties servants at the Theater Royal*. London, 1672.

Skinner, Stephen. *Gazophylacium Anglicanum*. London, 1689.

Stubbes, Phillip. *The Anatomie of Abuses*. London, 1583.

Taylor, John. *The Diseases of the Times, or, the cistempers of the common-wealth succinctly describing each particular disease wherin the Kingdome is Troubled*. London, 1642.

_____. *Mad fashions, od fashions, all out fashions, or, The emblems of these distracted times*. London, 1642.

The Town-misses declaration and apology, or, An answer to the character of a town-misse. London, 1675.

Wilmot, John. "Seigneur Dildoe [Version A]" and "Additions to Seigneur Dildoe." In *The Works of John Wilmot Earl of Rochester*. Edited by Harold Love. New York: Oxford University Press, 1999).

Wood, Anthony. *The Life and Times of Anthony Wood, Antiquary of Oxford, 1632–95, described by himself*. Collected by Andrew Clark. 21 vols. Oxford: Oxford Historical Society, 1891.

Secondary Sources

Adams, Julia. *The Familial State: Ruling Families and Merchant Capitalism in Early Modern Europe*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2005.

Adlard, John, ed., *The Debt to Pleasure: John Wilmot, Earl of Rochester: In the Eyes of His Contemporaries and in His Own Poetry and Prose*. New York: Routledge, 1984.

Amussen, Susan. *Caribbean Exchanges: Slavery and the Transformation of English Society, 1640-1700*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina, Press, 2007.

Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. New York: Verso, 1983.

Arnold, Janet. "Dashing Amazons: The Development of Women's Riding Dress, c. 1500–1900." In *Defining Dress: Dress as Object, Meaning and Identity*. Edited by Amy de la Haye and Elizabeth Wilson. New York: Manchester University Press, 1999.

_____. *Queen Elizabeth's Wardrobe Unlock'd*. New York: Routledge, 2015.

Asch, Ronald G. "Introduction: Court and Household from the Fifteenth to the Seventeenth Centuries." *In Princes, Patronage, and the Nobility: The Court at the Beginning of the Modern Age, c.1450–1650*. Edited by Ronald G. Asch and Adolf M. Birke. New York: Oxford University Press, 1991.

Ashelford, Jane. *The Art of Dress: Clothes and Society, 1500–1914*. New York: Harry N. Abrams, 1996.

Backhouse, Clare. *Fashion and Popular Print in Early Modern England: Depicting Dress in Black-Letter Ballads.* New York: I.B. Tauris, 2017.

Barroll, Leeds. *Anna of Denmark, Queen of England: A Cultural Biography*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2000.

Barthes, Roland. *The Language of Fashion*. Oxford: Berg, 2006.

de Beer, Edmond S. "King Charles II's Own Fashion: An Episode in Anglo-French Relations 1660–1670." *Journal of the Warburg Institute* 2, no. 2 (October 1938).

Beevers, David. *Chinese Whispers: Chinoiserie in Britain, 1650–1930*. Brighton: Royal Pavilion & Museums, 2008.

Bernis, Carmen. "Velázquez y el guardainfante." *Velázquez y el arte de su tiempo. Jornadas de Arte* 5 (1991): 49–60.

Berry, Helen. *Gender, Society and Print Culture in Late-Stuart England: The Cultural World of the Athenian Mercury.* Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003.

Black, Jeremy. *A System of Ambition?: British Foreign Policy, 1660-1793*. Stroud: Sutton, 2000.

Blake, Liza. "Dildos and Accessories: The Functions of Early Modern Strap-Ons." In *Ornamentalism: The Art of Renaissance Accessories*. Edited by Bella Mirabella. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 2011.

Boucher, Francois. *20,000 Years of Fashion: The History of Costume and Personal Adornment*. New York: Harry N. Abrams, 1987.

Breen, T.H. "'Baubles of Britain:' The American and Consumer Revolutions of the Eighteenth Century." *Past & Present*, no. 119 (May 1988): 73–104.

Breward, Christopher. *The Culture of Fashion: A New History of Fashionable Dress*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1995.

_____. *The Suit: Form, Function and Style*. London: Reaktion Books, 2016.

Brook, Timothy. *Vermeer's Hat: The Seventeenth Century and the Dawn of the Global World*. New York: Bloomsbury Press, 2008.

Brooke, Iris. *Dress and Undress: Restoration and Eighteenth Century*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1973.

Bryant, Arthur. *King Charles II*. New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1931.

Bucholz, Robert and Newton Key. *Early Modern England 1485-1714: A Narrative History.* Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2008.

Burns, William E. "The King's Two Monstrous Bodies: John Bulwer and the English Revolution," In *Wonders, Marvels, and Monsters in Early Modern Culture*. Edited by Peter G. Platt. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1999.

_____. *An Age of Wonders: Prodigies, politics and providence in England, 1657–1727*. New York: Manchester University Press, 2002.

Caiger-Smith, Alan. *Tin-Glaze Pottery in Europe and the Islamic World: The Tradition of 1000 Years in Majolica, Faience & Delftware*. London: Faber, 1973.

Campbell Orr, Clarissa, ed. *Queenship in Britain, 1660–1837: Royal Patronage, Court Culture and Dynastic Politics.* New York: Manchester University Press, 2002.

Chalus, Elaine. *Elite Women in English Political Life c.1754-1790.* New York: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Cholakian, Patricia Francis. *Women and the Politics of Self-Representation in Seventeenth-Century France*. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2000.

Chrisman-Campbell, Kimberly. "French Connections: Georgiana, Duchess of Devonshire, and the Anglo-French Fashion Exchange," *Dress* 31 (2004): 3–14.

Clark, Anna. *Scandal: The Sexual Politics of the British Constitution*. New Haven: Princeton University Press, 2003.

Coffey, John. "The Last and Greatest Triumph of the European Radical Reformation?: Anabaptism, Spiritualism, and Anti-Trinitarianism in the English Revolution." In *Radicalism and Dissent in the World of Protestant Reform.* Göttingen & Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2017.

Colley, Linda. *Britons: Forging the Nation, 1707–1837*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2009. First published 1992.

Corrigan, Karina H., Jan van Campen, and Femke Diercks, eds. *Asia in Amsterdam: The Culture of Luxury in the Golden Age*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2015.

Crane, Susan. *The Performance of Self: Ritual, Clothing, and Identity During the Hundred Years War*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2002.

Cressy, David. *Travesties and Transgressions in Tudor and Stuart England: Tales of Discord*

and Dissension. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Crowston, Clare Haru. "The Queen and her 'Minister of Fashion': Gender, Credit and Politics in Pre-Revolutionary France." *Gender & History* 14, no. 1 (April 2002): 92–116.

Cruickshanks, Eveline ed. *The Stuart Courts*. Thrupp, Gloucestershire: Sutton Publishing, 2000.

Cumming, Valerie. *Royal Dress: The Image and the Reality, 1580 to the present day*. New York: Holmes & Meier, 1989.

_____. *A Visual History of Costume: The Seventeenth Century*. New York: Batsford, 1984.

Cumming, Valerie, C.W. Cunnington and P.E. Cunnington. *The Dictionary of Fashion History*. New York: Berg, 2010.

Davidson, Lillias Campbell. *Catherine of Braganza, Infanta of Portugal and Queen-Consort of England*. London: John Murray, 1908.

Doran, Alice. "An adorned print: Print culture, female leisure and the dissemination of fashion in France and England, around 1660-1779." *V&A Online Journal* 3 (Spring 2011).

Edwards, Lydia. *How to Read a Dress*. New York: Bloomsbury, 2017.

Eicher, Joanne, ed., *Berg Encyclopedia of World Dress and Fashion: Global Perspectives, vol. 10*. Oxford: Berg Publishers, 2010.

Finlay, Robert. *The Pilgrim Art Cultures of Porcelain in World History.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 2010.

Fissell, Mary E. *Vernacular Bodies: The Politics of Reproduction in Early Modern England*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2004.

Foucault, Michel. *Les Anormaux: Cours au Collège de France (1974–1975).* Edited by François Ewald et al. Paris: Seuil/Gallimand, 1999.

Fraser, Antonia. *King Charles II*. London: Weidenfeld & Nicholson, 1979.

Gikandi, Simon. *Slavery and the Culture of Taste*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2011.

Godart, Frederic. *Unveiling Fashion: Business, Culture, and Identity in the Most Glamorous Industry*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012.

Goodman, Dena, ed. *Marie Antoinette: Writings on the Body of a Queen*. New York: Routledge, 2003.

Greenfeld, Liah. *The Spirit of Capitalism: Nationalism and Economic Growth*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2001.

Greer, Germaine, ed. *Kissing the Rod: An Anthology of Seventeenth-Century Women's Verse*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1989.

Griffey, Erin. *Henrietta Maria: Piety, Politics and Patronage*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2008.

_____. *On Display: Henrietta Maria and the Materials of Magnificence at the Stuart Court*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2015.

Harris, Carolyn. *Queenship and Revolution in Early Modern Europe: Henrietta Maria and Marie Antoinette*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016.

Harte, Negley. "Silk and Sumptuary Legislation in England." In *La Seta in Europa Sec. XII-XX*. Edited by Simonetta Cavaciocchi. Florence, 1993.

Hastings, Adrian. *The Construction of Nationhood: Ethnicity, Religion and Nationalism*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Haulman, Kate. *The Politics of Fashion in Eighteenth-Century America*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2014.

Hayward, Maria. *Dress at the Court of King Henry VIII*. New York: Routledge, 2007.

Hosford, Desmond. "The Queen's Hair: Marie-Antoinette, Politics, and DNA," *Eighteenth Century Studies* 38, no. 1, Hair (Fall, 2004): 183–200.

Hutchinson, John, Susan Reynolds, Anthony D. Smith, Robert Colls, and Krishan Kumar. "Debate on Krishan Kumar's *The Making of English National Identity*." *Nations and Nationalism* 13, no. 2 (2007).

Hunt, Lynn. *The Family Romance of the French Revolution*. Berkeley: University of California, 1992.

_____. *Politics, Culture, and Class in the French Revolution*. Berkeley: University of California, 1984.

Jardine, Lisa. *Going Dutch: How England Plundered Holland's Glory.* London: Harper Collins, 2008.

Jones, Ann Rosalind and Peter Stallybrass. *Renaissance Clothing and the Materials of Memory*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Kaiser, Susan. *The Social Psychology of Clothing: Symbolic Appearances in Context, 2nd rev. edition*. New York: Fairchild Publications, 1998.

Kantorowicz, Ernst. *The King's Two Bodies: A Study in Medieval Political Theology.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1957.

Knoppers, Laura Lunger and Joan B. Landes, eds. *Monstrous Bodies/Political Monstrosities in Early Modern Europe*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2004.

Knoppers, Laura Lunger. "The Politics of Portraiture: Oliver Cromwell and the Plain Style." *Renaissance Quarterly* 51, no. 4 (Winter 1998).

Kuchta, David. *The Three-Piece Suit and Modern Masculinity: England, 1550–1850*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002.

Kumar, Krishan. *The Making of English National Identity.* New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Kyle, Chris R. *Theater of State: Parliament and Political Culture in Early Stuart England.* Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2012.

Lake, Peter. "Anti-popery: the Structure of a Prejudice." In *Conflict in Early Stuart England: Studies in Religion and Politics, 1603–1642*. Edited by Richard Cust and Ann Hughes. New York: Longman, 1989.

Langford, Paul. *Englishness Identified: Manners and Character, 1650-1850*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Lefkowitz, Mary R. and Maureen B. Fant, eds. *Women's Life in Greece and Rome*. New York: Bloomsbury, 2016.

Lemire, Beverly. "Consumerism in Preindustrial and Early Industrial England: The Trade in Secondhand Clothes," *Journal of British Studies* 27, no. 1 (January 1988): 1–24.

Levin, Carole. *The Heart and Stomach of a King: Elizabeth I and the Politics of Sex and Power*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1994.

Love, Harold. "A Restoration Lampoon in Transmission and Revision: Rochester's(?) 'Signior Dildo.'" *Studies in Bibliography* 46 (1993).

Lublin, Robert I. *Costuming the Shakespearean Stage: Visual Codes of Representation in Early Modern Theatre and Culture*. Farnham, Surrey: Ashgate, 2011.

Lynn, Eleri. *Tudor Fashion: Dress at Court*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2017.

MacLeod, Catharine and Julia Marciari Alexander. "The 'Windsor Beauties' and the Beauties Series in Restoration England." In *Politics, Transgression, and Representation at the Court of Charles II*. Edited by Catharine MacLeod and Julia Marciari Alexander. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2007.

Maguire, Nancy Klein. "The Duchess of Portsmouth, English Royal Consort and French

Politician, 1670–85." In *The Stuart Court and Europe: Essays in Politics and Political Culture*, Malcolm Smuts, ed. Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Martin, Morag. *Selling Beauty: Cosmetics, Commerce, and French Society, 1750–1830*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2009.

Marzel, Shoshana-Rose and Guy D. Stiebel, eds. *Dress and Ideology: Fashioning Identity from Antiquity to the Present*. New York: Bloomsbury, 2015.

McElligott, Jason. *The Perils of Print Culture: Book, Print and Publishing History in Theory and Practice*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014.

McRobbie, Angela. *British Fashion Design: Rag Trade or Image Industry?*. New York: Routledge, 1998.

McShane, Angela and Clare Backhouse. "Top-Knots and Lower Sorts: Print and Promiscuous Consumption in the 1690s." In *Printed Images in Early Modern Britain: Essays in Interpretation*. Edited by Michael Hunter. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2010.

Molineux, Catherine. *Faces of Perfect Ebony: Encountering Atlantic Slavery in Imperial Britain*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2012.

Montserrat, Dominic, ed. *Changing Bodies, Changing Meanings: Studies on the Human Body in Antiquity*. New York: Routledge, 1998.

Montias, John Michael. *Artists and Artisans in Delft: A Socio-Economic Study of the Seventeenth Century*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1982.

Moore, N.H. *The Old China Book, including Staffordshire, Wedgwood, lustre, and other English Pottery and Porcelain*. New York: Frederick A. Stokes Company, 1903.

Moote, A. Lloyd and Dorothy C. Moote. *The Great Plague: The Story of London's Most Deadly Year*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2008.

Moulton, Ian Frederick. *Before Pornography: Erotic Writing in Early Modern England*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Nevitt, Marcus. *Women and the Pamphlet Culture of Revolutionary England, 1640–1660*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2006.

Newman, Karen. *Cultural Capitals: Early Modern London and Paris*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2007.

Niklas, Charlotte and Annebella Pollen, eds. *Dress History: New Directions in Theory and Practice*. New York: Bloomsbury, 2015.

Pastoureau, Michel. *Black: The History of a Color*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2008.

Peacey, Jason. *Politicians and Pamphleteers: Propaganda during the English Civil Wars and Interregnum*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004.

Peck, Linda Levy. *Consuming Splendor: Society and Culture in Seventeenth-Century England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Pestana, Carla Gardina. *The English Conquest of Jamaica: Oliver Cromwell's Bid for Empire*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2017.

Pevsner, Nikolaus. *The Englishness of English Art.* New York: Praeger, 1956.

Phillippy, Patricia. *Painting Women: Cosmetics, Canvases, and Early Modern Culture*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2005.

Pierson, Stacey. "The Movement of Chinese Ceramics: Appropriation in Global History." *Journal of World History* 23, no. 1 (March 2012): 9–39.

Pincus, Steven. *1688: The First Modern Revolution*. New Haven: Yale University, 2009.

_____. "The Making of a Great Power? Universal Monarchy, Political Economy, and the Transformation of English Political Culture," *The European Legacy* 5, no. 4 (2000).

_____. "'To protect English liberties': The English Nationalist Revolution of 1688–1689." In *Protestantism and National Identity: Britain and Ireland, c.1650–c.1850*. Edited by Tony Claydon and Ian McBride. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Plumb, J.H. "The Royal Porcelain Craze." In *In the Light of History*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1973.

Porter, Roy. *London: A Social History*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1994.

Raymond, Joad. *Pamphlets and Pamphleteering in Early Modern Britain*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

Reynolds, Susan. *Kingdoms and Communities in Western Europe, 900–1300.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1997.

Ribeiro, Aileen. "On Englishness in Dress." In *The Englishness of English Dress*, edited by Christopher Breward, Becky Conekin, and Caroline Cox. New York: Berg, 2002.

_____. *Facing Beauty: Painted Women and Cosmetic Art*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2011.

_____. *Fashion and Fiction: Dress in Art and Literature in Stuart England*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2005.

Rogers, David and John McLeod, eds. *The Revision of Englishness*. New York: Manchester University Press, 2004.

Rublak, Ulinka. *Dressing Up: Cultural Identity in Renaissance Europe.* New York: Oxford University Press, 2010.

Rublack, Ulinka, Maria Hayward, and Jenny Tiramani, eds. *The First Book of Fashion: The Book of Clothes of Matthaeus and Veit Konrad Schwarz of Augsburg.* New York: Bloomsbury, 2015.

Schama, Simon. *The Embarrassment of Riches: An Interpretation of Dutch Culture in the Golden Age*. New York: Vintage Books, 1987.

Scott, Alison V. *Literature and the Idea of Luxury in Early Modern England*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2015.

Sharpe, Kevin. *Remapping Early Modern England: The Culture of Seventeenth-Century Politics.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

_____. *Selling the Tudor Monarchy: Authority and Image in Sixteenth-Century England*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009.

_____. *Image Wars: Promoting Kings and Commonwealths in England, 1603–1660*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2010.

_____. *Rebranding Rule: The Restoration and Revolution Monarchy, 1660–1714*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2013.

Shenk, Linda. *Learned Queen: The Image of Elizabeth I in Politics and Poetry*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.

Stedman, Gesa. *Cultural Exchange in Seventeenth-Century France and England*. Burlington: Ashgate, 2013.

Stoyle, Mark. *The Black Legend of Prince Rupert's Dog: Witchcraft and Propaganda during the English Civil War*. Exeter: University of Exeter Press, 2011.

Styles, John. *The Dress of the People: Everyday Fashion in Eighteenth-Century England*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2007.

Taylor, Lou. *Establishing Dress History*. New York: Manchester University Press, 2004.

_____. *The Study of Dress History*. New York: Manchester University Press, 2002.

Thirsk, Joan. "Popular Consumption and the Mass Market in the Sixteenth to Eighteenth

Centuries," *Material History Bulletin* 31 (1990): 51–8.

Thomas, Gertrude Z. *Richer than Spices: How a Royal Bride's Dowry Introduced Cane, Lacquer, Cottons, Tea, and Porcelain to England, and So Revolutionized Taste, Manners, Craftsmanship, and History in Both England and America*. New York: Knopf, 1965.

Tyler, Kieron, Ian Betts and Roy Stephenson. *London's Delftware Industry: The Tin-glazed Pottery Industries of Southwark and Lambeth*. London: Museum of London Archaeology Service, 2008.

Underdown, David. "Yellow Ruffs and Poisoned Possets: Placing Women in Early Stuart Political Debate." In *Attending to Early Modern Women.* Edited by Susan D. Amussen and Adele Seeff. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1998.

Van Dam, Jan Daniël. *Delffse porceleyne: Dutch delftware, 1620–1850*. Amsterdam: Rijksmuseum, 2004.

Varholy, Cristine M. "'Rich like a Lady': Cross-Class Dressing in the Brothels and Theaters of Early Modern London." *Journal for Early Modern Cultural Studies* 8, no. 1 (Spring-Summer 2008): 4–34.

Vickery, Amanda. "Women and the World of Goods: A Lancashire Consumer and her Possessions, 1751–81." In *Consumption and the World of Goods*. Edited by John Brewer and Roy Porter. New York: Routledge, 1994.

Vincent, Susan. *Dressing the Elite: Clothes in Early Modern England*. Oxford: Berg, 2003.

de Vries, Jan. *The Industrious Revolution: Consumer Demand and the Household Economy, 1650 to the Present*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2008.

Watanabe-O'Kelly, Helen and Adam Morton. *Queens Consort, Cultural Transfer and European Politics c.1500–1800*. New York: Routledge, 2017.

Weatherill, Lorna. *The Growth of the Pottery Industry in England, 1660–1815*. New York: Garland, 1986.

Wellman, Kathleen. *Queens and Mistresses of Renaissance France*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2013.

Wiesner-Hanks, Merry E. *The Marvelous Hairy Girls: The Gonzales Sisters and Their Worlds*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009.

Williams, Hugh Noel. *Rival Sultanas: Nell Gwyn, Louise de Kéroualle, and Hortense Mancini.* New York: Dodd, Mead & Company, 1915.

Williams, Gordon. *A Dictionary of Sexual Language and Imagery in Shakespearean and Stuart Literature*. Atlantic Highlands, NJ: The Athlone Press, 1994.

Williams, Wes. *Monsters and their Meanings in Early Modern Culture: Mighty Magic*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Wilson, John Harold. *Nell Gwyn, Royal Mistress*. New York: Pellegrini & Cudahy, 1952.

Wunder, Amanda. "Women's Fashions and Politics in Seventeenth-Century Spain: The Rise and Fall of the *Guardainfante*." *Renaissance Quarterly* 68, no. 1 (Spring 2015): 133–186.

Zahedieh, Nuala. *The Capital and the Colonies: London and the Atlantic Economy, 1660–1700.* New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010.

Zanger, Abby E. *Scenes from the Marriage of Louis XIV: Nuptial Fictions and the Making of Absolute Power*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1997.

Zook, Melinda S. *Protestantism, Politics, and Women in Britain, 1660–1714*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013.