

# Contents

<i>Acknowledgements</i>	ix
<i>Abbreviations</i>	xi
<i>Introduction</i>	xii
<b>1 Royalisms? Constructing and disrupting Royalist identity</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2 ‘... but the Picture, but the signe of a King’: the legal space of self and nation</b>	<b>20</b>
The space of the subject and the voice of law	20
Defining allegiance and authority: proclamations	25
Institutional Royalism	33
The body imprisoned and violated	44
Inscribing textual loyalty: Royalist censorship	46
<b>3 The Royalist reader</b>	<b>54</b>
Royal language	54
Royalist readings	61
‘not altogether publique’: print, manuscript, and the ownership of the text	66
<i>The King’s Cabinet Opened</i>	71
Inclusion and exclusion: the letter as genre, dedications, and the intended reader	76
<i>Areopagitica</i> and the Banquet of Mice: consumption and the marketplace	82
<b>4 ‘The late strangeness between us’: invasion, excrement and recognition</b>	<b>90</b>
Cavalier v. Roundhead	90
Riddles, language, allegiance	96
Clothes, hair, beards	101
Preachers, artisans, class warriors	108
<b>5 Gorgeous Gorgons: Royalist women</b>	<b>117</b>
Roundhead women: transgression and drunkenness	117
Royalist women: fetishization and anxiety	127
The homosocial turn	135

<b>6 Fragmentation of the body and the end of identity</b>	<b>141</b>
Traumatic occlusion	141
Elegy: loyalty and subjectification through example	148
The Royalist sublime: fracturing, rupturing, or business as usual?	164
<i>Notes</i>	176
<i>Bibliography</i>	196
<i>Index</i>	220

# 1

## Royalisms? Constructing and disrupting Royalist identity

Is it reasonable to talk of 'Royalist' identity or identities? The word itself was coined by the definitely anti-monarchist William Prynne: 'his Majesty and all Royalists must necessarily yeeld'.<sup>1</sup> Apart from the odd usage as a term of abuse by polemicists such as Prynne, the term is used very rarely throughout the civil conflict. 'Royalism' was an amorphous collection of attitudes, complex and indistinct – in much the same way that 'puritan', 'Parliamentary' or 'rebel' all meant vague and complicated things. As a phrase, then, 'Royalism' is often ahistorically used in the context of critical investigation into the Civil War period. Contemporaneously, the equally unclear and equally rigid term 'loyal' was applied by both sides to discuss the partisan identity associated with those that supported the King. Historiographically, Royalism is part of a Royalist/Roundhead binary that is inscribed into the representation of the conflict in the 1640s and increasingly during the 1650s. Our use of the word indicates an investment in a historical approach that privileges those binaries constructed during the war, a positivist teleological version of the conflict.

What this book discusses, then, is the interplay of a variety of discourses which accrue into a form I am crudely terming 'Royalism' and which appear at the nexus of definitions of social, cultural, political and sexual identity. It is clear that some kind of dogmatic loyalist collective existed – people fought for the King, irrespective of their specific loyal, personal, familial, religious or sexual identities, and this puts them into a particularized behavioural matrix.<sup>2</sup> As Robert Wilcher argues, 'the term "royalist", in fact, was not needed until the governing class polarized into parties engaged in an ideological and military contest over the locus of supreme power in the state.'<sup>3</sup> There were texts that defended the King, and those that attacked him. There was a delineated loyal

court, removed from London to Oxford.<sup>4</sup> There was a ruling junta of monarchists who were fighting a common enemy – yet still these definitions of identity and models of behaviour owe much more to our contemporary need to think of dialectic and individualized historical phenomena rather than the actual normative complexities of early modern political and social discourse. Religious difference, political difference, social and cultural differences – all these issues are at once in play in defining Royalist identity and also ignored in the face of the Parliamentary or Army challenge.

One of the purposes of this book is to analyse just how the fragmentation and complexity of war is placed within a narrative – legal, textual, generic, religious, emblematic, cultural, gender and sexual – and to highlight how these narratives are continually buckling. I am inscribing and discerning a loyalist discourse, and describing the intersecting nexus with a legally and institutionally defined R/Loyalism. Therefore, the book opens with a contextualization of ‘Royalist’ political, legal and social theory, before considering how this model of identity was challenged and interrogated, compromised and fragmented. While, in many ways, our understanding of Royalist *v.* Roundhead rests on oppositions that did exist during the war period, it also perpetuates a simplistic model of identity and behaviour that does not allow for the complexities and differences found during the period. Indeed, such an uninflected interpretation simply reinscribes the attempts of Civil War propagandists to present a clear distinction between right and wrong, either/or, black and white. As I argue throughout the book, this attempt to categorize is crucially compromised. It is important not to deploy the terms ‘Parliamentary’ and ‘Royalist’ unreflexively or unthinkingly; we must have a sense that these terms are historically and politically contingent. Yet they are terms that necessarily are used, albeit with silent quotation marks, because the war was fought by two opposing sides striving for dominance. The meanings of ‘Royalist’, in my construction of the term, are the loose affiliation of those who supported the King and who condemned his enemies. They were first and foremost monarchists, before any ambiguity of internal debate regarding the relationship with the parliament. ‘Royalism’ is not a monolithic structure, however, and it teemed with debate and faction. I trace a variety of discourses of loyalism in the first three chapters, before turning to spaces of dissidence and disruption.

What the ambiguity inherent in the phrase ‘Royalism’ demonstrates is the complexity and the shifting dynamic of identity formation. Loyalty during the period was demonstrably important, highly con-

tested, and clearly categorized. However, our understanding of the discourse is prey to problematic ambiguities. The years of the Civil War and Interregnum have produced some of the most exciting scholarship of recent years. Since 1989 alone David Norbrook, Thomas Corns, Nigel Smith, Lois Potter, James Loxley, Sharon Achinstein, Robert Wilcher, and Susan Wiseman have published challenging and groundbreaking monographs exploring the partisan literature and culture of this period, in addition to the collection edited by Thomas Healy and Jonathan Sawday plus that by Ted-Larry Pebworth and Claude J. Summers.<sup>5</sup> However, much of this work has concentrated upon Parliamentary literature, and there has been little sustained work on loyalism as a cultural or social phenomenon. We have no historical study or body of work considering the issue, and this absence has hampered an understanding of the Civil War in general. Those critics who have addressed Parliamentary languages of authority, disobedience and notions of the public during the period have defined them in opposition to a discourse we still know little about. Loyalist culture and thought is still a relatively unmapped area.

Other works in this field have asked the question 'what was Royalism?'<sup>6</sup> This book shifts the emphasis, asking 'What did Royalism want to be?' Rather than analysing the historical actualities of the period – as much recent work has shown, loyalty was an extremely elastic concept during the war – this book considers how the King and his party reacted to the challenge presented by war. I map the connections, contradictions and tensions between 'Royalism', which has sometimes been taken to mean a dogmatic system of ideals, and loyalism (or perhaps 'royalism'), a less defined set of principles and values. The representation of political identity during the war, as opposed to the physical experience of life on the ground, was far less concerned with the ambivalence of loyalty than with using polemically informed definitions of behaviour to exclude and attack perceived enemies.

This book therefore analyses the reaction of the mainstream to the subversive challenges of 'Parliament', illustrating how orthodoxy attempts to legitimate itself once it is under stress and perceived serious threat. In order to understand loyalist identity further it is crucial that we analyse the paradigms of identity and behaviour presented in contemporary texts. I examine several models of identity, from simplistic representational notions of 'difference' and otherness, through institutional and state-led constructions of legal subjectivity, toward more complex and normative notions of the relationship between self, text and state, concluding with an examination of dissident and different

identities within the loyalist party as a whole. Throughout I consider the ambivalence and anxiety inherent in constructions of identity during a period of civil war, with particular reference to the engagement with the Parliamentary other. The conclusion ends by considering Royalist responses to the death of the King and the refraction of loyalist ideology into a set of more contingent and problematic 'Royalisms'. The complicating and dissonant trajectory of these fractured models of identity mean that we leave the action in the aftermath of the death of the King; analysis of 'Royalisms' such as they are during the 1650s would fill another book, and, despite good work in this field, is still a neglected subject.<sup>7</sup>

The fundamental difference between rebellious identities and 'Cavalier' identities, it was claimed by Royalists, was attitude to the state:

Hee [an agitator] is an universall Enemy to all Order, and Government, both in Church and State. Hee will have, and acknowledge, no King, Parliament, Majestrate, or Superiour Power in the State but himselfe . . . and ere long will deny there is any God at all either in Heaven or Earth to controle or prescribe any Lawes or Rules unto them.<sup>8</sup>

This anatomization defines troublemaking and rebellion as anti-social, a mode of defying the power of the institutions of State to order society, define, and construct identity. 'Agitators' were those radicals who emerged from the New Model Army, particularly during the aftermath of the King's defeat and the Putney debates of 1647.<sup>9</sup> They represented, to loyalists, extremist politics and religious views (they had close links with the Leveller movement), and were demonstrative of an unchecked antisocial madness that attempted to deny the authority of the King. Furthermore, they presented the Army gone mad, revelling in its savage power (rioting in Parliament, marching on London), and undermining the order of the country.

To an 'Agitator' the ultimate guarantor of meaning and signification, of identity construction, is not King, Parliament, Magistrate, or God, but 'himselfe'. This self-definition leads to a challenging of state apparatuses and controls, a disruption or interrogation of society that is distressing and transgressive and refuses the power of God to 'controle or prescribe any Lawes or Rules'. It is an interrogation that might expose the logocentric, phallogocentric nature of the nation and lead to any number of excesses. This desire for self-definition, the individuation of society into units of identity rather than masses to be controlled, figures

a crisis in the traditional discourse of power. It is a humanistic movement toward individualized capitalist modernity away from the collective consciousness of state. There is a shift in the discourse of subjectivity from repressive constructionism towards some sense of self-fashioning.

In contrast to this fragmenting of 'Order', Charles and his loyal cohorts stand as a thin red line preserving the physical fabric of nation from destruction by the forces of disorder who question harmony and encourage transgression. Charles is the guarantee of stability, the validation of security. He becomes the central definition of order, the guarantor of security, the centre. In his essay 'Structure, Sign and Play in the Discourse of the Human Sciences' Jacques Derrida begins to account for what he sees as the formation of a structure of meaning and being in Western philosophy and society. He considers the artificial imposition of a centre to the 'structure', a centre which legitimates, mediates and guarantees meaning, but is not part of or within the structure: 'The concept of centred structure is in fact the concept of a play based on a fundamental ground, a play constituted on the basis of a fundamental immobility and a reassuring certitude, which itself is beyond the reach of play'.<sup>10</sup> Derrida's point is that what he calls 'certitude' is artificially imposed or constructed in order to put off anxiety, distress, or instability: 'on the basis of this certitude anxiety can be mastered, for anxiety is invariably the result of a certain mode of being implicated in the game, of being caught by the game' (Derrida, *Writing and Difference*, p. 279):

The function of this centre was not only to orient, balance, and organise the structure – one cannot in fact conceive of an unorganised structure – but above all to make sure that the organising principle of the structure would limit what we might call the *play* of the structure. By orienting and organising the coherence of the system, the centre of a structure permits the play of its elements inside the total form. And even today the notion of a structure lacking any centre represents the unthinkable itself. (Ibid., p. 352)

The Parliamentary denial of the fundamental authority of the King led to an unmeaning, a decentring. This challenge to the structured models of language was mapped onto all facets of society: sexual identity, religious practice, education, gender organization. Parliament challenged the King's role as legislator of social hierarchy. Their interrogation of social roles and political identities led to a conservative

backlash, as texts and writers attempted to reinvest social models and paradigms with power, to reimpose structures of identity and behaviour. Royalism was desperately trying to confirm the centrality of a divine or royal presence. It is clear that anxiety was directly linked to the loss of authority or the challenge to the King. The monarch was the guarantee of meaning; his loss was represented as the disruption of normality, the rupturing of order.

Despite the apparent trauma of the war, many high-profile Royalists were reported by Parliamentary newsbooks to be having a wonderful time:

Prince *Rupert* accompanied with some Lords and other Cavaliers, danced through the streetes openly with musick before them, to one of the Colledges, where they had stayed about halfe a houre, they returned back againe dancing with the same musick before them.<sup>11</sup>

The entire court had moved to Oxford after the first few months of the war, and had occupied the city. This report of hedonistic life at the new court needs to be understood in the context of the London construction of Royalism as a foppish, unauthentic masquerade whose main proponents were licentious and hedonistic foreigners imposing their alien identities onto England's traditional hierarchies and institutions. However, the secondary effect of this passage is to emphasize how dissimilar the proceedings are to the Whitehall masques and entertainments. The structure echoes that of the 'running' masques, seemingly highlighting progressive continuity but in this instance emphasizing a curtailed and limited circular movement. Rupert and his companions newly map the masquing process onto a strange and relatively unknown college-based town. A town, moreover, with its own distinct hierarchies and traditions, which highlight the differences in location and situation. In the same month another Parliamentary newsletter, *Mercurius Rusticus*, crowed that 'the Queen will not have so many Masks this Christmas and Shrovetide this yeare as she was wont to have other yeeres heretofore; because *Inigo Jones* cannot conveniently make such Heavens and Paradises at *Oxford* as he did at WhiteHall'.<sup>12</sup> The change in physical situation enforces a profound conceptual change in the understanding of form, trope and structure. The circumstances of the war and the necessitated movement of the court to Oxford force a reassessment and a reconstruction of cultural loyalism mediated by the changed ideological battle and the new location. This is a notion that underlines the literal dislocation of the Royalist court and party from

London; for a King to whom the physicality of a court was important (witness the plans for the Whitehall Court, the Banqueting House), the nomadic nature of the early months of the war figure both a physical dislocation and conceptual movement that became expressed generically and institutionally. This displacement is part of the dissonance found in the loyalist social and cultural discourse of the period, a physical disruption of normality leading to a desire for stability.

The anxiety inherent in loyalist work of the period due to the challenges of the war is demonstrated in the loyalist Jasper Mayne's reaction to the Queen's leaving for France in 1644:

Having lost the Harmonye,  
Which combined us in one knot,  
Concord, Rule, and Lawes forgot  
Every Thing did loose its Name,  
A People a wild Rout became.<sup>13</sup>

The exile of the Queen and the sundering of the family unit allows the entirety of the nation to be reduced to chaos. The loss of language and the destruction of the bodily stability of the nation are foregrounded by the poem as the most destructive consequences of this exile, far more important than civic peace or legal clarity. Linguistic confusion follows the loss of national harmony, and this leads to civil unrest and the debasing of the country. There a terrible confusion involved in the loss of nomenclature; Adam named the world for God in Eden, and this divinely ordered linguistic system has been undone. Naming is also the first step in ruling – Adam's status as outside of named language allows him to be the ruler and lawgiver. There is fear of the instability of language which is revealed by the transgressive and fragmenting challenge of the Parliament – the pun of 'loose' may be a mere quirk of spelling, but it presents us with a pleasing motif of the anxiety underpinning Royalist texts of this period. Naming fixes meaning and defines language as stable and categorizing. The war has loosened the defining hold of language, leading to legal, civic and identity confusion, an unravelling of the knot of nation into thousands of dissonant strands. The breaking of bodily, property and gender boundaries presented loyalists with the horror of complexity and unmeaning – the central paradox of the war being that it was at once a binary of them/us and at the same time an amorphous mass of you/me/them/us/other, a 'wild Rout'. Civil war defied boundarization and categorization, destroying the fragile 'Harmony' which binds the nation together. Nascent nationalism in

Wales, Scotland and Ireland and the increasing independence of the English cities and counties in political and administrative terms combined with the innate fragmentation and confusion of war to diffuse the identity of the subject and the country. Royalist discourse attempted to put the country together again, but it becomes clear that definitions of loyalty and identity deployed and disseminated by loyalists quickly become compromised. Mayne's anxiety illustrates the inherent paradox faced by loyalist writers. They had to construct an identity as loyalists, rejecting the transgressions of the Parliament. Yet this loyalty was based on unstable ground, as the space of nation and subject was continually fragmented and broken apart.

Parliamentary writers articulated positions of resistance predicated on an ascending theory of society. The populace held the power, which they delegated upwards: as Henry Parker argued, 'Power is originally inherent in the people.'<sup>14</sup> This discursive and dialogic model of commonwealth is at odds with the clean lines of loyalist political thought which strove for definition and boundarization. Parliamentary writers argued that the authority of Kings and magistrates is ceded by the people, their representatives elected or contracted through a covenant:

and it [power] is nothing else but that might and vigour [of the people] which such or such a societe of men contains in it selfe, and when by such or such a Law of common consent and agreement it is derived into such and such hands, God confirms that Law: and so man is the free and voluntary Author, the Law is the Instrument, and God is the establisher of both. And we see, not that Prince which is the most potent over his subjects, but that Prince which is most Potent in his subject. (Parker, *Observations*, pp. 1–2)

This version of constitutional relations was expressed institutionally in the Grand Remonstrance of late 1641 which made Parliament's position explicit. Princes were only 'intrusted with their Kingdoms'.<sup>15</sup> Parker argued that members of Parliament mediated the people's power and advised the King: 'Two things especially are aymed at in Parliaments, not to be attayned to by other meanes. First that the interest of the people might be satisfied; secondly that Kings might be better counsaild' (ibid., p. 5). The 'interest' of the people was not served by anyone other than the Parliament, and, subsidiary to them, the King: 'The King may safely leave his highest rights to Parliament, for none knowes better, or affects more the sweetnesse of this so well-ballanced a Monar-

chy than they do' (ibid., p. 20). The Court's attempt to replace these elected representatives as primary advisors to Charles has brought the country only trouble: 'wee have had almost forty yeeres experience, that the Court way of preferment has beene by doing publike ill Offices, and we can nominate what Dukes, what Earles, what Lords, what Knights, have been made great and rich by base disservices to the State' (ibid., p. 11). Prynne attacked 'illiterate flattering Court-Doctors, Theologasters, Lawyers, Statists', who 'without any shadow of Truth or Reason' argue against the sovereignty of Parliament 'not so much to flatter or seduce their Princes, as to advance themselves.'<sup>16</sup> Parker argued that Kings were entrusted with power, and their primary duty was to the subject: 'The word Trust is frequent in the Kings Papers, and therefore I conceive the King does admit that his interest in the Crowne is not absolute, or by a meere donation of the people, but in part conditionate and fiduciary.'<sup>17</sup> The 'ascending' model allowed Parliamentary writers to justify their theories of resistance as loyal and defensive: 'For him [Charles], say we; for we will never yeeld, that wee resist the King: we will maintaine a lawfull resistance, which god blesseth: and abhor the contrary, which God curseth'.<sup>18</sup> Parliament was fighting a defensive war against a misguided and unfortunately tyrannical monarch who, through the agency of self-serving courtiers and prelates, pretended to an absolute power independent of the people.

Royalist political theories scorned claims that Parliament was fighting a reluctant war in the interests of the people: 'for His Majesty had not granted one commission to raise a man, when they began their *defensive warre*'.<sup>19</sup> Instead, they saw the King as the aggrieved party. His concessions during the early 1640s were proof of his lack of aggression. Charles was God's anointed, and not dependent on the whim of the people's support. Tracts concentrated upon defence of the established institutional and constitutional life of the nation by deploying theories of Order. Polemicists such as Ussher and Bramhall emphasized that hegemonic or hierarchical monarchical order was the only true model endowed by God. Royalist tract writers and theorists interpreted the fifth commandment in a general way, arguing that the King was political father to the nation and therefore any challenge to his authority was blasphemous. The use of a traditional familial model predicated upon patriarchal infallibility is a common trope for royalist theories of society, and, as we will see, particularly important in royalist constructions of gender roles. A manuscript poem 'Anagrames of ye PARLIAMENT 1642' emphasized the familial transgressions of the House: 'Am il Parent/ I part al men.'<sup>20</sup>

Dudley Digges recognized the populist appeal of Parliamentary theories of accountability and the innate authority of the people:

He that will endeavour to make the yoke of government more easie, by setting a people loose from the restraints of positive lawes, upon pretence, they may justly use their native liberty, and resume their originall power, if civill constitutions, which were agreed upon for their good, be not effectual to that end, but prove disadvantageous to them, Shall be sure to meet with many favourable readers. (Digges, 1643, p. 1)

Digges understood the temptation of specious freedom. Civilized society depends upon the structure of laws and institutional restraint of the individual and collective will. Digges' formulation polemically categorizes the readership of a text. Yet there is a space of dissidence here. In the rush to define an either/or, a model of identity based on difference, Royalism compromised itself. War is a dialogue, a crucial intermingling and interaction of body, concept and identity. Materially it involves actual meetings and destructive fragmentation in order to provide an outcome, or an ending. Even the construction of identity through difference involves a notion of dynamic and tension, of dialectic. Yet throughout the 1640s writers strove to present war as a clean narrative with clear sides and no ambiguities of allegiance or identity. This inflexible model was under increasing strain, until the execution of the King presented Royalists with a clear sundering of their narrative models of history and warfare. The anxiety inherent in such attempts at presenting a clear view of war – particularly of civil war – is what underpins Colin Powell's words, and what leads loyalist writers to deploy uncertain and conflicting metaphors of invasion, sickness and disease. Roundheads were somehow simultaneously an internal virus and excrement to be purged. The binary of loyalist identity is not something that can be imposed easily; models of behaviour are more discursive and dynamic than that. This problematizes Royalist writing, leaving it crucially compromised.

Charles I, it seems, recognized the demand for a more discursive, dialectic model of subjectivity. In December 1642 a London edition of two speeches by the Earl of Bristol and Edward Sackville appeared. Bristol argues passionately in favour of the war, Sackville pragmatically for accommodation.<sup>21</sup> These speeches were intended to influence the ongoing peace negotiations of 1642–3 and underline the differences of opinion held by various factions in the King's court.<sup>22</sup> Two days later a

different publisher produced the King's answer, creating a three-way dialogue in print. That these speeches were intended solely for a London market used to such a means of political expression is likely, as there is little or no bibliographical evidence of the Oxford versions. However, equally important to their appeal is the notion that these speeches were first given at the Council in Oxford and are reprints of Lichfield's originals. The King's speech complements the two others; he ends by favouring accommodation but is pleased that the debate has taken place:

It is no new thing among so many wise men to have severall and farre different conceptions; yet none unrepugnant to reason, or dissensions from truth; as in the severall parts and dimensions of the body the limbs move severall wayes, but all to one end.<sup>23</sup>

Behind this viewpoint lies a keen sense of audience and the changing political situation. Bristol's speech had asserted the divine nature of monarchy: 'Is it fit for a King to beg peace of his Subjects? For the regall authority, the immediate figure of heaven and the Deity on earth, to descend from its supreme height' (*Two Speeches Spoken at the Councell-Table at Oxford*, pp. 4–5). Charles steers clear of such bombast and seemingly ratifies the advisory role of a Parliament. The debate the King describes as taking place between 'wise men' reconstitutes a humanist discursive trope, absorbing such debate into institutional court culture. The polis or forum is replaced by the court. In many ways, this had actually happened; the court physically occupied the Oxford university spaces formerly dedicated to discussion and declamation (the Academic Schools themselves were used to store grain and cloth). The healthy and necessary discussions of his subjects are firmly placed within the configuration ordained by the King, who re-emphasizes his role as the chair and head of the body of debate – whether Parliamentary, courtly, or nation-wide. The speeches also highlight the institutionalization of the culture of criticism that Kevin Sharpe identified in the court of the 1630s.<sup>24</sup> Debate and panegyric is controlled and mediated within a public, or published, space. The ambiguity that Sharpe and also Annabel Patterson find inherent in Royalist expression has been replaced by rhetorical discursive tropes and panegyric declamation, by the logical and clean lines of political debate. What is important here is the issue of control; the speeches are inflected by that of the King. In many ways the breakdown of relations with Parliament was due to their perceived refusal to allow Charles this power any longer.

By introducing an anatomical metaphor, moreover, the King subtly reasserts and reconfigures the hierarchical model of the body, emphasizing the servitude of the limbs and organs to the heart and mind. He does so on the authority of William Harvey's dedication to *De Motu Cordis*, in which the King's Physician wrote of how the heart's operation was 'a divine example of his own actions.'<sup>25</sup> The body of state was being reordered. The speeches of the King articulate a version of paternal monarchy that is concerned about but firm with his wayward subjects. He advises Prince Rupert that 'Tyrants shed blood for pleasure, Kings for necessity', making it clear that his influence is not superadded but pervasive:

Were it against a forraigne enemy, We should permit you to use your owne discretion, but being, as it were, against Our selfe, Our children (all subjects ought to be so to their King, as he is *Pater Patriæ*) blame Us not if We be tender of their receiving the least wound; when the head is sensible of any paine in the inferiour members, wee must necessarily feele what ever is inflicted on him.<sup>26</sup>

Utilizing a refined anatomical metaphor, the King counsels mercy and presents himself as the indulgent head of a unified corporeal state rather than a tyrant out of touch with his people. He conflates two metaphors of state: the nation as body and as family. Both models see the King as the 'head' of a hierarchically controlled space; the family metaphor also emphasizes the patriarchal nature of authority. The family space is subject to the patriarchal authority of the father-King.

Moreover, the King is sensitive to any wound of the 'inferiour members' of the body of state; this body has a physical and material nature as well as a metaphorical aspect. The state is both the concept of a nation-space and is physically defined in the bodies of the people; both are ruled, interpolated, and constructed by the authority of the monarch. Charles's new court at Oxford was 'almost in the heart of my Kingdome; and it brings more comfort unto me, that I am now in the hearts of my subjects'.<sup>27</sup> Conflating anatomical image with cartographic reality, the King emphasizes that he is ever present, circulating, an integral part of language, society, culture and the physical body of his subjects. Charles makes clear that he is continually watching and categorizing his subjects, that they cannot escape his eye. He defends their liberty of movement, while simultaneously constraining them within a legally defining body-space of nation. Charles' omniscience

leads to a model similar to Foucault's panopticism: the effect being 'to induce in the inmate a state of conscious and permanent visibility that assures the automatic functioning of power'; Charles' surveillance and possession of his subjects furthers his power through a scientific metaphor of subjection.<sup>28</sup> While Foucault distinguishes between disciplinary and sovereign power, his model holds for the example of Charles, a figure crucially liminal in the movement between both models of surveillance and subjection. The strategies deployed by Charles throughout the war suggest an anxiety regarding the movement from sovereign to disciplinary power, the decisive shift in subjectivity and subjectification that the nation is undergoing.

By emphasizing the temporal and in some ways marginalizing the divine nature of the body of state, Charles physically reassigned his role at the head. His influence is enveloping. He lives in the bodies of his subjects, and defines their corporeal and physical space. Royalist political theory during the war continued to deploy the hierarchical head-down model of the body politic, but Charles shrewdly allowed his rhetoric to become less exact and seemingly more open, gesturing towards notions of a mixed or self-limiting monarchy. His reconfiguration of this motif, wittingly or not, undermined the concept of a divinely attributed, centralizing power. He was conversant with the central tenets of Harvey's work, and worked hard to map them onto his own model of nationhood. In his speech acknowledging the welcome of Oxford University, he declared that 'The heart of a Prince is kept warm by the blood of his subjects: the blood of the subjects being not to be preserved, were it not loyally entertained into the heart of the Prince' (*The Kings Maiesties Speech*, p. 5). Debate may take place but under the auspices of the King, thus dispelling any tendency toward republican theorizing. Oxford had proffered a Laudian version of Copernican thought during the 1630s, which, linked with Harvey's work, created an astronomical and physiological context for the inherently hierarchical systems of monarchical rule.<sup>29</sup> Furthermore, Charles' rhetoric of inclusion still asserts a model of space which sees the body of state as circumscribed and total; it is 'absolute' and definite, and controlled by the heart. The influence of blood on the body is more pervasive, invasive and inclusive than standard hierarchical structures deployed by political theorists. The limbs work independently but to one overriding purpose, the service of the crown. Charles had continuously emphasized the political importance of reverence to the state of the King's body; during the war he had to use different forms to mediate

and deliver his message. This reassessment of the King's relationship with his subjects seemingly rejects the head-body model used by Royalist political theorists in favour of a mutually beneficial relationship, almost gesturing toward the theory of a 'contract' between monarch and people. However, the model is still predicated upon a hierarchical interpretation of recent scientific writing and therefore the notion of the state it presents is that of an inclusive body ruled by the heart rather than the head, as Harvey had proved was physiologically correct. The relationship the King posits is warmer and seemingly less exclusive but the rhetoric conceals a firm notion of bodily authority. The country was still dependent upon his will and subject to his whim; he was the delineator and creator of the space of nation.

Despite the King's assurances that he was still in control of the body of state, much loyalist discourse betrays an anxiety about corporeality:

Lastly, adde hereunto that the King must needs be reputed part of the Parliament, which by supposition was in the beginning waded, but a thing alwayes to be acknowledged for truth; then if the Parliament without the King make the representative body, the King is the reall head to that body of the Kingdom; and it were as absurd as monstrous to exclude the head from acting any thing that should generally concerne the body, since from the head the spirits are derived, which give both sence and motion to the whole body; and that body which will separate it selfe from the head, may please it selfe with the fancy of independency; but the conclusion will leave it a dead, uselesse, and neglected trunk.<sup>30</sup>

The grotesque image of a headless nation-body belies an actual fear of the physical sundering of state from monarch. Denial of the King's authority is 'absurd' and 'monstrous', an act against reason and sense. Charles gives the state 'sence and motion', endowing it with a concept of vitality which is a superadded principle imposed by the divinely appointed head. However, there is a crucial bodily anxiety. The body of state is interfered with, complicated, interrogated, and finally violated. We find a tension between war as dialogue – meeting and interaction – and war as definite either/or, not a mingling. The logic of the pamphlet suggests that the body has something of a parasitic relationship to the King, needing his influence to live.

The use of anatomical figures was increasingly complicated in the light of Cartesian theory and Harvey's work. Thomas Warmstry articulated a new Harveian model of the state:

But besides this weaknesse that adheres unto the meere division, of which this action wholly consists, There is a fountaine of bloud, even a bloody issue opened hereby in this great body; whereat the very spirits and vitall powers thereof doe as it were continually evaporate and flie out: The very Heart-veyne, yea the Arteries, and very channels of life are hereby in danger to be dissected, and the Orifices still to grow wider and wider, whereby it is like to become meagre & languid, and unable to performe the Actions of life; for as in the body naturall the bloud is *thesaurus naturæ*, so in the body politick the bloud of a nation is such a treasure, that the lavishing away thereof by any prodigall waste, must needs bring it low, and render it faint and feeble. And when it is once lost it is not so easily repaired. Indeed wee confesse, that Phlebotomy may be usefull, in some cases unto both, not onely to the naturall body, but unto that of a Commonwealth. And they may both gather strength by the expence of that bloud which is corrupt; but then this is to be done by waight and measure: with the carefull and skilfull hand of a Physician or Surgeon, and that *cum delectu* too, not at all adventure and hazard, and with due regard had unto what the body can beare; this is charily, and warily to be done, not to be committed to the rude hand of the multitude; and great caution be had, that the good bloud may be retained; and this too in case of some urgent necessity, where other milder remedies will not prevaile: but to leave this to a tumultuary performance, as in this case of Civill war, it must needs endanger the very being and consistency of this Common-wealth.<sup>31</sup>

Warmstry's account of the country draws on medical literature of the period, and in particular Harvey's theories. He specifically refers to the 'bloud of a nation', and maps the body onto England. The state has been wounded and must be healed. As Diane Purkiss has argued, the metaphors of dismemberment deployed by Royalist writers throughout the war period have a conceptual and a material resonance.<sup>32</sup> The passage illustrates this, explicitly conflating the 'body politick' with the corporeal body, and showing how the 'bloud of a nation' must be let in order to purge political impurities. The civil war has opened unnatural wounds and resulted in invasive and unnecessary surgery. Warmstry sees the space of the nation being invaded and its integrity being destroyed. The 'very being and consistency of this Common-wealth' is attacked. Similarly, Martin Lluelyn saw the continuing attacks on the King as poisoning the body of state: 'By fraile Advantages, still find it good,/ To keepe th' Infection high ith' Peoples Bloud'.<sup>33</sup> Warmstry's account figures

the King's role as that of the skilful surgeon, bleeding the nation to rid it of illness. This is the action of government, and it is to be used only by highly qualified people, 'not to be committed to the rude hand of the multitude'; the interaction of the people within this process will lead to further infection and bodily violation. The war itself is the blood-letting necessary to heal the nation, but the worry is that the virus will take hold or the purgation will not be effective enough to retain all the pure blood; the death of many good soldiers will be the price of health. While the integrity of the body may be restored, there is still an anxiety about the very 'being' of the body, the commonwealth, the nation. All three concepts are elided together, and we see the fluidity of Royalist notions of space; easily shifting between material space and a conceptual or metaphorical notion of spatial dynamics. Warmstry's ultimate worry is that the space of the nation, the absolute space defined and constructed by the King, has somehow been violated, necessitating a violent and destructive reaction.

Warmstry's tract presents the central concerns of Royalist writing, demonstrating key anxieties about war, trauma, invasion and interrogation, bodily completeness, transgression and health. His deployment of an anatomical trope to describe the sick nation and the consequent anxiety about the invasion of the body illustrates the characteristic ambivalence of loyalist writing. War is good and bad, destructive and healing; the enemy is both outside and internal, 'bad blood' and the sword of combat. The body of nation is sickly from external disease and internal corruption. John Taylor, explicitly figuring England as a sick body ('as it is with the Body of Man, so in the Body Politique of the Kingdome') defines the main problem as that of law and property.<sup>34</sup> The problem will not be solved until the Parliament gives the King 'his own againe, which you have proditoriously and perficiously taken' (*The Causes of the Diseases*, p. 10). He has no cure for the condition he discovers, other than the law: 'I suppose that nothing can cure her but the Law well applied' (*ibid.*). This is consonant with Royalist discourses of property, invasion and illegality. However the piece has a characteristic ambivalence in its presentation of the ambiguities of nation: 'Thus have I truly shewed the Causes of the Kingdomes griefes, to be at first a Melancholy madness, then it was hydropically puffed up (in many places) with Ambition, Malice, Revenge, Avarice, Sects, Schismes, and Fantastical Sathanicall Innovations and perturbations' (*ibid.*). The body of the nation is sick but this is a result of internal problems, nothing externally added. The body is devouring itself. Taylor's tract concludes with a plea that is non-polemic: 'O haples England! 'tis thy only good,/ To

Purge well, and give over letting Blood' (ibid.). While this comes at the end of a polemic tract, the anxious distress encapsulated in the presentation of the war and the invasive fragmentation involved in the conflict undermines notions of innate and clear cut identity definition.

The key to understanding this anxiety is the figure of the Roundhead, the enemy, the other which is continually rejected and simultaneously embraced. For the postcolonial critic Homi Bhabha, colonialism is all about facing the colonial other and subjugating it, controlling it. Discourses are deployed in order to control, constrain and subject the other – to define it on European or colonial terms. As we have seen, this type of definition is crucial to Royalism – and to all forms of authoritarian discourses. The reason I use Bhabha, a postcolonial theorist, is that his notion of 'recognition' seem to me crucial and even more tortured during a civil war. As Bhabha argues, 'colonial mimicry is the desire for a reformed, recognizable Other'.<sup>35</sup> Yet inscribed within this need for a recognizable other is the downfall of the system, as it introduces a key ambivalence that constantly undermines the carefully delineated structures of identity. The relationship between the defining Royalist discourse and the defined Roundhead is ultimately doomed to failure. The key concept for Bhabha is the phrase 'almost the same, *but not quite*' ('Of Mimicry and Man', p. 381). This is his concept of 'slippage' – that the other cannot be moulded or coherently defined through discourse. This leads to an uncertainty – an ambivalence that undermines the certainty of discourse, leading to 'resemblance and menace'. Resemblance is a good thing, a recognizable other – but one that similarly menaces by showing the slippage and uncertainty of the defining discourse, the instability of the project. Bhabha uses Foucault to think about how 'the look of surveillance returns the displacing gaze of the disciplined, where the observer becomes the observed and "partial" representation rearticulates the whole notion of *identity* and alienates it from essence' (ibid., pp. 383–4). This deconstructive notion – that power relations, and particularly strategies of representation, simultaneously construct and form the subject while also undermining themselves – is apparent in Bhabha's analysis:

It is as if the very emergence of the 'colonial' is dependent for its representation upon some strategic limitation or appropriation *within* the authoritative discourse itself. The success of colonial appropriation depends on a proliferation of inappropriate objects that ensure its strategic failure, so that mimicry is at once resemblance and menace. (Ibid., p. 382)

The project of colonialism is self-limiting and tends ultimately to failure – Bhabha’s point here is that fixed within the entire phenomenon is an unacknowledged instability that leads to breakdown. As we shall see in the following chapter, Royalism’s attempt at definition through a set of binary oppositions – in this case, male/female, but in other cases cavalier/roundhead – is flawed and undermined. It assumes a fixed and stable language system, that there is meaning in the sign defined as ‘roundhead’. Royalists *desire* stability and meaning, and the menace of the roundhead is that they are not the same, that they defy stable definition. This highlights the instability of language and meaning. The roundhead is *not the same*, but Royalists want to be able to define it. They look the same, walk the same, almost represent the same things, but are not the same; they are other, strange weird, different, uncategorized, uncivilized, and undefined. For Royalists, one of the main sites of dissonance was the concept of an internal invasion, the notion that the cancer of rebellion and the disease of war were somehow from within the nation:

Thou [England] whose pious wombe (like a rich mine)  
Teem’d Christ’s first Ensigne-bearer, Constantine,  
The eldest Christian Caesar, should’st now lie  
Impregnated with this curst progeny  
Of Vipers; most true Vipers, that do know  
Their way to life through their poor Mothers maw:  
Nay, base unnaturall wormes, when borne, these suckt  
Her brest Heart-bloud out; left not till they pluckt  
Their Mothers Head off.<sup>36</sup>

While they are ‘curst progeny’, they are still children of England – recognizable but horrific, related but exiled. This constant slippage between resemblance and difference, mimicry and menace, is the essence of Bhabha’s point about the ambivalence that lies in the heart of colonialism, and particularly colonial representation: ‘The question of the representation of difference is therefore always also a problem of authority’ (‘Of Mimicry and Man’, p. 384). Bhabha analyses the ‘slippage of difference and desire’ inherent in recognition and mimicry – at once rejecting the different other, at once anxiously embracing it in order to give meaning to language: ‘mimicry rearticulates presence in terms of its “otherness”, that which it disavows’ (ibid.). Royalist writing, loyalist discourse, texts of the civil war period – all betray this slippage and this anxious need for definition. Just as Colin Powell desired an

enemy to recognize but distance, so Royalist identity is ill-defined through a series of traumatic encounters and anxious interrogations. Royalism attempts narrative and completion, presenting models of behaviour, legal classifications of subjectivity, textual interpolation, social analyses of self and hierarchical definitions of gender and sexuality. However, the central encounter with the enemy other splinters these assurances and finally, literally, shatteringly, leaves the body of state a 'dead, uselesse, and neglected trunk'.

# Index

- Absolute space, 22–53  
Achinstein, Sharon, 79, 83, 94, 120  
Act of Supremacy, 25–6  
Adultery, 123–4  
Agitators, 4  
Anatomical metaphors of state, 12,  
15–16, 37  
Artisan preachers, 108–16  
‘Ascending’ theory of political  
systems, 8–9  
Ashmolean Museum, Heberden coin  
room, 183n74  
Authority of the text, 63
- Babel, 86, 88, 95  
*Battaile on Hopton Heath*, 157–9  
Beards, 101–8  
Bhabha, Homi, 17, 18, 19, 94, 129  
Birkenhead, Sir John, 42, 50, 51–3,  
153  
Birkhead, Henry, 153, 194n24  
editor of *Bevill Grenville*, 152–3  
*Book of Sports*, 112  
Brome, Alexander, 43, 111  
Bulwer, John, 102  
Burt, Nathaniel, *Militarie Instructions*,  
145–6  
Butler, Judith, 50, 91
- Cartwright, William, 153, 155, 156  
Caruth, Cathy, 143–4, 165, 170  
Caussin, Nicholas, 91  
Cavalier stereotype, 90, 105  
Censorship, 46–53, 83, 185n103–4  
De Certeau, Michel, 56  
Charles I, King of England  
bodily fragmentation and  
iconography, 165–75  
guarantor of meaning and value, 6,  
28, 41, 46, 164–75  
lawgiver, 20, 24  
proponent of accommodation, 11  
Chartier, Roger, 56
- Cleveland, John, 69, 86, 91  
‘The Hue and Cry after Sir John  
Presbyter’, 106–7  
Clothes, 101–8  
Clothing and identity, 103–4  
Copernican thought, 13, 38–9  
Corns, Thomas, 90  
Council of Oxford, personnel,  
181n41  
County Proclamations, 23, 37  
Cowley, Abraham, 24, 80, 101, 118,  
147, 174  
*The Civil War*, 104, 121–3, 132–3,  
135, 160–4  
Creed, William, 133  
Cromwell, Oliver, 102
- Dale, John, 133, 134  
Davenant, William, *Salmacida Spolia*,  
192n35  
Dedications, 81–2  
Denham, John, 68, 91, 159, 194n22  
Derrida, Jacques, 5, 141  
Digges, Dudley, 10, 61, 89, 154–5  
Distribution of official Proclamations,  
30–3  
Dobson, William, 101, 108, 122  
Drunkenness, 111  
Duppa, Brian, 50, 119
- Eikon Basilike*, 166–7, 194n39  
Elegy, 148–64
- Family  
as political model for nation, 9, 12,  
24  
and royalist political theory, 118–19  
Fane, Mildmay, 42, 69, 114  
Fanshawe, Ann, 144–5  
Fell, John, 128  
Ferne, Henry, 109, 114, 117  
Foucault, Michel, 13, 22, 25, 46, 96,  
126–7

- Gage, Sir Henry, 149–50  
 Gayton, Edward, 115  
 Gore, 159–62  
 Gorgons, 122, 133  
 Grand Remonstrance, 8  
 Gray, William, *Chorographia*, 104  
 Grenvill, Sir Bevill  
   elegised, 152–7
- Habermas, Jürgen, 54  
 Hair, 101–8  
 Hall, Henry, 49  
 Hall, John, 54  
 Hall, Stuart, 91  
 Hardacre, P.H., 177n  
 Hartlib, Samuel, 54, 66  
 Harvey, William, 12, 13, 14, 38, 156,  
   178n25  
 Harwood, Richard, 55  
 Heath, Sir Robert, 183n66  
 Herrick, Robert, 56, 69, 102  
 Heylin, Peter, 151–2  
 Highmore, Nathaniell, 183n58  
 Hill, Christopher, 84  
 Hollar, Wenceslaus, 36  
 Homosociality, 135–40  
 Hughes, Ann, 36  
 Humanist theories of reading, 62  
 Hutchinson, Lucy, 91
- Identity  
   and civil war, xiv–xv  
   and physical disruption, 7  
 ‘Intended Reader’, 55, 76–82
- Jermyn, Henry, 119  
 Jones, Ann Rosalind, 103  
 Josselin, Ralph, 180n33
- King, Henry, 165  
*Kings Cabinet Opened*, 71–6
- Lacan, Jacques, 167  
 Laud, Archbishop William, 47, 50,  
   113  
   elegised, 151–2, 193n16, 193n19  
 Lee Malcolm, Joyce, 90  
 Legal configuration of identity, 20–53  
 Letters, 76–82
- Lichfield, Leonard, 49, 57–9, 71  
 Lluellyn, Martin, 42, 69, 73–4,  
   111–13, 124, 139, 159–60  
 London, 154, 156  
 Longinian Sublime, 168  
 Lovelace, Richard, 45, 69, 133, 137–9,  
   146, 163–4  
 Loxley, James, 51, 153, 163
- Maclean, Gerald, 166, 190n38  
 Manuscript, 66–71  
 Marcus, Leah, 112  
 Maria, Henrietta, Queen of England,  
   7, 117, 118, 127  
 Marvell, Andrew, 172–5  
 Mayne, Jaspar, 7, 135, 153, 154, 156,  
   182n56  
 Milton, John, 54  
   *Areopagitica*, 82–9  
*Mercurius Aulicus*, xiv, 31, 32, 38, 43,  
   45, 50, 65, 79, 100, 103, 104,  
   106, 109, 111, 118, 121, 127, 159  
*Mercurius Rusticus*, 6  
*Musraum Oxoniensium*, 127–35
- Nedham, Marchamont, 100  
 Newsbooks, 71  
 Nicholas, Sir Edward, 75  
*Nineteen Propositions*, 26–9  
 Norbrook, David, 172–3, 189n3
- Oxford, 144, 152  
 Oxford Court, 1, 6, 12, 33–44, 49, 50,  
   180n37  
 Oxford Parliament, 34–6
- Parker, Henry, 8, 9, 70  
 Parliament  
   as site of invasion, 115  
 Parliament of Hell, 161  
*Parliament of Ladyes*, 119–21  
   relationship between King and state  
   is ‘trust’, 177n
- Patterson, Annabel, 48, 52  
 Phillips, Katherine, 165  
 Plague as metaphor, 22, 24  
 Potter, Lois, 50, 52–3, 55, 166, 168  
 Presbyterianism, 100  
 Prison, 44–6

- Privy Council, 33  
 register, 180n37
- Proclamations, 25–33, 39–40, 181n47
- Prynne, William, 1, 9, 20–1, 47, 51–2,  
 62, 81, 102
- Purkiss, Diane, 15, 144
- Putney debates, 4
- Quarles, 93
- Raymond, Joad, 180n29
- Riddles, 96–100
- Roebuck, Graham, 90
- Romero, George A., 36
- Roundhead caricatures, 90–116,  
 189n21  
 women, 121–7
- Royalist  
 anxiety, 144–5  
 aporia, 108–9, 171  
 caricatures, 90–116  
 definition in conflict with  
 Parliament, xiv–xv, 44  
 and the end of language, 170–5  
 language, 62–6, 115  
 and loyalty, 2–3  
 political theory, 48, 118  
 space, 55–6  
 sublime, 164–75  
 theories of reading, 61–7, 186n26
- Rupert, Prince of the Palatine, 6, 62,  
 86, 101
- Scots, 104
- September 11, 2001, xii
- Smith, Sir John, 149–51
- Smuts, R. Malcolm, 176n4(ii)
- Smyth, Adam, 186n26
- Sodomy, 123, 124–5
- Stallybrass, Peter, 103
- Stapleton, Robert, 66–7
- Steevenson, Richard, 134
- Sublime, theory of, 142–8, 164–75
- Symmons, Edward, *A Militarie Sermon*,  
 81, 91
- Taylor, John, 16, 41, 50–3, 118  
*A Preter-Pluperfect*, 82–9  
*The Devil Turn'd Roundhead*, 95, 102  
*Stop your noses*, 95
- Technology of warfare, 142–8, 157
- Theatrical representations of the  
 death of Charles I, 169–70
- Thomas, Peter, 180n29
- Trauma theory, 141–8
- Virgil, *The Aeneid*, 156
- Virilio, Paul, 141, 176n1
- Walker, Edward, 47
- Waller, Edmund, 69
- Waller, William, 118
- Walsingham, Edward, 149–51
- Ward, Richard, *The Character of a  
 Warre*, xiii, xvi
- Warmstry, Thomas, 15
- Weaver, Thomas, 45, 130–7
- Whitelocke, Bulstrode, 34, 181n42
- Wilcher, Robert, 1
- Winterson, Jeannette, *The Passion*,  
 141–2, 170
- Wiseman, Susan, 77–80, 119
- Women, 117–40  
 as public figures, 118–21
- Žižek, Slavoj, 142–8, 170