ABSTRACT

STUART SUITS AND SMOCKS:
DRESS, IDENTITY, AND THE POLITICS OF DISPLAY
IN THE LATE SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY ENGLISH COURT

by Emilie M. Brinkman

This thesis centers on the language of dress and the politics of display during the late Stuart dynasty (1660–88). In the late Stuart courts, fashion and material possessions became an extension of one's identity. As such, this study examines how elite Englishmen and women viewed themselves, and others, through their clothing on the eve of Britain's birth in response to critical moments of identity crisis during the Restoration period. Whitehall courtiers and London gentility utilized their physical appearance, specifically their clothing, accoutrements, and furnishings, to send messages in order to define themselves, particularly their "Englishness," in response to numerous unresolved issues of identity. Therefore, this thesis argues that the roots of English national character were evident in the courts of Charles II and James II as a portion of the English population bolstered together in defiance of the French culture that pervaded late seventeenth-century England.

STUART SUITS AND SMOCKS:
DRESS, IDENTITY, AND THE POLITICS OF DISPLAY
IN THE LATE SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY ENGLISH COURT

A Thesis

Submitted to the

Faculty of Miami University

in partial fulfillment of

the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

Department of History

by

Emilie M. Brinkman

Miami University

Oxford, Ohio

2013

Advisor _____
        P. Renée Baernstein, PhD

Reader _____
        Andrew Cayton, PhD

Reader _____
        Katharine Gillespie, PhD

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.

Introduction

On April 23, 1661, King Charles II of England, Scotland, and Ireland processed through the streets of London with his royal entourage to Westminster Abbey for his coronation. James Heath, a Royalist historian of the late seventeenth century, recorded the magnificence of the spectacle:

> it is incredible to think what costly clothes were worn that day:
> the cloaks could hardly be seen what silk or satin they were
> made of, for the gold and silver laces and embroidery that were
> laid upon them: besides the inestimable value and treasures of
> diamonds, pearls, and other jewels, worn upon their backs and
> in their hats: to omit the sumptuous and rich liveries of their
> pages and footmen; the numerousness of these liveries, and
> their orderly march; as also the stately equipage of the esquires
> attending each earl by his horse's side: so that all the world saw
> it.[1]

A pauper and 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. In drastic contrast to the puritanical style of Oliver Cromwell, Charles's Restoration reinitiated a cultural shift within England to the absolutist opulence of the Continent's royal courts. Heath further wrote of Charles's coronation that "much wonder it caused to outlandish persons, who were acquainted with our late troubles and confusions, how it was possible for the English to appear in so rich and stately a manner."[2] Trimmed with gold and silver lace, Charles's rich coronation suits were, as Jane Ashelford notes, "of course, in the French style."[3] Such a royal garb projected a majestic image of kingly power modeled after Charles's cousin, the Catholic monarch Louis XIV of France (1643–1715).[4] Charles's regal dress attempted to convey to the English people that their glorious king had returned, with an absolutist flair, after decades of tumultuous civil war and staunch parliamentary rule. The renowned Stuart-era diarist Samuel Pepys concluded his observations of the day with his comment, "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."[5]

This thesis examines these splendid articles and how they functioned within the language of dress and the politics of display during the late Stuart period of the seventeenth century. It focuses primarily upon the Restoration court of Charles II (1660–85), with minor attention to the

---

[1] John Whitcomb Bayley, *The history and antiquities of the Tower of London: with memoirs of royal and distinguished persons, deduced from records, state-papers, and manuscripts, and from other original and authentic sources* (London: Jennings & Chaplin, 1830), 101–102.

[2] Bayley, 101–102.

[3] Jane Ashelford, *The Art of Dress: Clothes and Society, 1500–1914* (New York: Harry N. Abrams, 1996), 88.

[4] This influence was particularly evident in the monarchial portraits of the period. John Michael Wright's coronation portrait of Charles II bears striking resemblance to similar contemporary depictions of the Sun King, including the *Portrait of Louis XIV* (1701) by Hyacinthe Rigaud.

[5] Samuel Pepys, *The Diary of Samuel Pepys.* (New York: Modern Library, 2001), 49.

subsequent reign of his brother James II (1685–88).[6] The courtly costume and material possessions of both elite men and women is used as a lens to understand the intersection of dress, identity, nation, and gender during late Stuart England. In the Carolean court, fashion, and goods became an extension of one's identity. This study examines how elite Englishmen and women presented themselves and viewed others through their clothing and belongings. Whitehall courtiers and London gentility utilized their physical appearance, specifically their clothing, accoutrements and furnishings, to send political, social, and cultural messages about their identity. On the eve of Great Britain's birth in the early eighteenth century, the English people experienced a form of identity crisis that affected the several of the most fundamental aspects of life including national character, political affiliation, and religion. Ambiguities concerning national, political, and religious identity were prevalent in late Stuart England as evident by the different ways in which the English people responded to such oppositions with their garments. Both clothes and material items constituted a language for working through these conflicts yet they remained unresolved by the end of the seventeenth century. As a result, a public conversation about dress emerged that allowed some elements of the English people to discuss several aspects of their identity, particularly national character, in contrast to others.

The Restoration court of Charles II offers a particularly significant case study for understanding the deeper meaning of clothing in relation to the self and other persons. As prominent court historians such as Simon Thurley and Malcolm Smuts have argued, Charles's royal court at Whitehall maintained a greater importance and continuity than Parliament at Westminster as the main center of fashionable social life and the focal point of politics and administration. The men and women of the royal court were visual representations of the English government and thus what Charles's court did, ate, and *wore* was especially significant.

Charles's reign began after the death of Cromwell in 1658 and the failed Protectorate of his son Richard (1658–59). The Declaration of Breda in 1660 solidified the return of the constitutional monarchy as Charles inherited an England teeming with numerous conflicting perceptions of political, religious, and cultural identity. The Restoration period experienced the tensions between Whigs and Tories, Protestants and Catholics, and English and Continental powers. Continuous warfare, assassination plots, widespread disease, and a devastating fire exacerbated these tensions throughout Charles's twenty-five year reign. An analysis of the language of dress and the politics of display in the late Stuart court reveals how a portion of the English population coped with these oppositions in an attempt to define themselves, and others, at a critical moment in Britain's national narrative, on the eve of the Glorious Revolution of 1688-89 and the unification of Great Britain in 1707.

Historians and scholars of other disciplines currently question the concept of the English nation as well as an English national identity. As sociologist Krishan Kumar notes in his *The Making of English National Identity* (2003), this "intense debate" centers on the issues concerning how to define "nation," the origin of the English nation, and presence of nationalism throughout the history of the British Isles.[7] Benedict Anderson's theory of "imagined communities" argues that a community, or nation, only exists in the minds of those individuals who perceive, or imagine, themselves as members of that group.[8] Such a definition further stimulates the dispute regarding the

---

[6] This theme of display in Charles's court is also evident throughout, and applicable to, other late Stuart courts including William III (1689–1704) and his coregent and wife, Mary II (1688–1694). Many works of popular print culture that are significant to this thesis were published in the 1690s during the reigns of William and Mary. The recurrent publication of such literary pieces indicates that the Restoration dialogue regarding dress and material culture continued to be an important issue within English society and culture toward the early eighteenth century.

[7] Krishan Kumar, *The Making of English National Identity* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003), x.

[8] See Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (New York: Verso, 1983).

concept of the nation as most academics agree that the nation is also tangible political unit and not simply a state of mind. Medievalist Susan Reynolds offers a rather inclusive explanation of the concept as she states that nations are "natural, given, objectively existing human communities, each of which is assumed, generally in a vague and unreasoned way, not only to have its own common culture, myths, history and destiny, but *also* to be a political community with a right to what is now called self-determination."[9] Therefore, the origin of the English nation is rather polemic due to the numerous and differing characteristics seemingly required for the formation of a nation.

Scholarly positions on the origin of the English nation consists primarily of two camps: the premodernist view, which encompasses those academics who identify the emergence of an English nation *before* the eighteenth century, and the modernist interpretation that argues that the nation appeared during the modern era of British history, or *after* the beginning of the eighteenth century. However, other historians, such as Robert Colls, suggest a less definitive date of origin. Colls argues that many "moments" of English nationalism occurred before, during, and after the beginning of the modern period. Beneath this discussion of the English nation also lies a search for English nationalism and national identity, the latter of which Reynolds defines as "the identity of individuals who claim to belong to a nation (while belonging to other groups from which they claim other identities), or the collective identity of the nation which distinguishes it from other nations."[10] English national identity is, in essence, a feeling of profound "Englishness," or what fundamentally characterizes the English population while at the same time distinguishing it from other nationalities. Perceptions of Englishness are irrevocably tied to the issue regarding the periodization of English nationalism and are therefore subjective based on the era of history as well as one's academic perspective. In *The English: A Portrait of a People* (1999), Jeremy Paxman proposes several characteristics of his notion of Englishness: "irony, brass bands, Shakespeare, Elgar, bad hotels and good beer, drinking to excess, civility and crude language, punk and street fashion, gardening, Cumberland sausages and so on."[11] Yet, Paxman's interpretation, as well as other modernized theories, does not fully explain how Englishmen and women defined themselves in late Stuart England. In the seventeenth century, Englishness meant different things to different people. Yet, a prevailing majority of the English population, as evident by several principal printed works of the period, regarded Protestantism and constitutionalism, in contrast to the Catholicism and absolutism of the Continent, as dominant characteristics of their national consciousness.[12]

Scholars of the English nation, including E.J. Hobsbawm and Rogers Brubaker, have traditionally placed its origin during the 1700s – a century that gave rise to Enlightenment principles, such as rationalism and the politics of reason, as well as numerous national revolutions, like the French and American Revolutions. Brubaker proclaims in *Nationalism Reframed* (1996) "that Europe was the birthplace of the nation-state and modern nationalism at the end of the eighteenth century."[13] Krishan Kumar's controversial *The Making of English Identity* (2003) defends the modernist view of the English nation and English national character but proposes a much later periodization.

---

[9] 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.

[10] Hutchinson, 183.

[11] Aileen Ribeiro, "On Englishness in Dress," in *The Englishness of English Dress*, ed. Christopher Breward, Becky Conekin and Caroline Cox (New York: Berg, 2002) 15. See Jeremy Paxman, *The English: A Portrait of a People* (New York: The Overlook Press, 1998).

[12] It is important to note that the singular concept of "Englishness" differs from "Britishness," an alternate form of national identity that encompasses the varying peoples (English, Scottish, etc.) of the United Kingdom. See Chapter III, "Diplomatic Dress," of this thesis for a thorough examination of Englishness in late Stuart England.

[13] Rogers Brubaker, *Nationalism Reframed: Nationhood and the National Question in the New Europe* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 1.

In his book, Kumar argues that "genuine nationalism" in England was a "nineteenth-century invention – a creation largely of the French Revolution."[14] Additionally, Kumar maintains, a sense of *English*ness, as opposed to the all-encompassing notion of "Britishness," developed only during the end of the nineteenth century when the Empire began its descent.

Alternatively, advocates of the premodernist perspective maintain that an English nation and a sense of Englishness existed in England before the creation of a united Britain with Scotland and Ireland in 1707. However, premodernists do not universally agree on the specific circumstances or moment of English national origin before the modern period. Patrick Wormald traced English nationalism back to the eighth century with Bede's *Ecclesiastical History of the English People*. Reynolds rejects this theory as the Venerable Bede and his historical narrative "cannot be used to demonstrate English national consciousness unless one abandons the idea of the nation as essentially a political community."[15] Instead, Reynolds argues that the medieval kingdoms of tenth-century England, and throughout Europe as well, "were perceived by their inhabitants not merely as the territories that happened to belong to kings, but as territories that also belonged to their peoples…not as equal individuals but as communities of common descent and culture."[16] These medieval communities experienced a form of English national identity through their "collective political identity" and mass solidarity.[17] Adrian Hastings also pinpoints the emergence of the English nation during the Middle Ages but emphasizes language and culture, as opposed to the political structures proposed by Reynolds, as evidence of Anglo nationalism before the creation of the modern English state.[18]

Alternatively, sociologist Liah Greenfeld proposes a later date or moment for the emergence of the English nation and a national identity. Greenfeld's *The Spirit of Capitalism: Nationalism and Economic Growth* (2001) argues that English nationalism, which first appeared during the sixteenth century with the Reformation, transformed national consciousness by 1600 and stimulated economic growth into the modern the age. English national feeling, the result of the Protestant work ethic, facilitated "a new spirit" or "motive force" which "added to its [England's] relatively unimpressive resources an element that reoriented, transformed, and magnified them, inspiring it to undertake a journey for which other societies might have been better equipped and thus giving it a competitive edge over them."[19] English "nationalism was the source of the spirit of capitalism," a theory suggested by Max Weber in 1905, and ultimately influenced other forms of national sentiment centuries later around the world, including France, Germany, Japan, and the United States.[20]

Other historians of the premodernist interpretation also stress the power of religion in shaping the English nation and national identity before the eighteenth century. Since the Reformation, England was marked by religious tension between Catholic and Protestant. Kumar argues that the "deep cleavages," primarily religious but also political, of the English Civil War prevented mass English solidarity during the seventeenth century. Conversely, Anthony D. Smith, Professor Emeritus of Nationalism and Ethnicity at the London School of Economics, rejects this theory and argues that a form of English nationalism was indeed prevalent in the 1600s due to this

---

[14] Kumar, 23.

[15] Hutchinson, 184. Other scholars, such as Kumar, do agree with Reynolds's position regarding Wormald and Bede while still differing on the central issue of periodization and English nationalism.

[16] Hutchinson, 184.

[17] Hutchinson, 184. For more on Reynolds's theory, see Susan Reynolds, *Kingdoms and Communities in Western Europe, 900–1300* (1984; repr., New York: Oxford University Press, 1997).

[18] See Adrian Hastings, *The Construction of Nationhood: Ethnicity, Religion and Nationalism* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997).

[19] Liah Greenfeld, *The Spirit of Capitalism: Nationalism and Economic Growth* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2001), 23.

[20] Greenfeld, 58.

religious division. Smith states that several markers existed in seventeenth-century England that contributed to the formation of the nation: "clear English self-definition, cultivation of a variety of English myths and symbols, strong attachment to an island territory, and so on."[21] These elements of nationhood went hand-in-hand with what Smith refers to as "covenantal nationalism," wherein the Protestant "God was the nation" and not the sovereign.[22] Furthermore, through Stuart-era "tracts, sermons, laws, and wars, Puritans helped to consolidate the development of a sense of English national identity and autonomy, if not unity, among a larger section of the population than hitherto, well before the French Revolution."[23]

Steven Pincus also acknowledges the role of the seventeenth century, specifically the late Carolean and Jacobean periods, in the making of the modern English nation. For Pincus, the Glorious Revolution of 1688–89 served as the significant moment in British history wherein English nationalism truly emerged. He argues that this Revolution of 1688–89 "constituted England's first nationalist revolution."[24] This event was "as much a nationalist revolution as it was a Dutch invasion" as well as "a revolution in support of English government and of war against France."[25] According to Pincus, the majority of the English population believed that James II, to a greater degree than his brother and predecessor Charles II, sought to import French culture, including absolutist government and Catholicism into the Isles: "James, it came to be widely believed, was seeking to replace the English national political culture with that of France."[26] Like Smith, Pincus notes the importance of religion in shaping late Stuart English nationalism for "Protestantism was an essential part of their own [English] national identity threatened by France."[27] Yet while the significance of religion cannot be denied, Pincus acknowledges that hegemonic Protestantism was not the only factor in the creation of English nationalism; Pincus's work represents a revisionist approach that attempts to shift the focus of the Glorious Revolution from solely religious tensions between Protestant and Catholic to administrative issues of the Stuart state. Therefore, Pincus concludes "the revolutionaries of 1688–89 believed that they had saved the English nation – its liberties, its religion, and its culture – from an impending French tyranny."[28]

The tension against France, as well as other social, political, and religious divisions, is also emphasized in the work of Linda Colley as a contributing factor in the creation of nationalism or national feeling in the British Isles. While a proponent of the modernist camp, Colley, like Smith, agrees that the origins of a national identity, whether English or British, lie in the pre-modern era of history. Colley's influential *Britons: Forging the Nation, 1707–1837* (1992) surveys the origins and characteristics of British, not English, national identity as a modern concept derived from pre-modern sources.[29] Colley argues that Britishness emerged during the modern period after England's unification with Scotland and Ireland in the early eighteenth century. However, the seeds of this

---

[21] Hutchinson, 190.

[22] Hutchinson, 191.

[23] Hutchinson, 191.

[24] 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), 78. Also, see Steven Pincus, *1688: The First Modern Revolution* (New Haven: Yale University, 2009).

[25] Steven Pincus, "The Making of a Great Power? Universal Monarchy, Political Economy, and the Transformation of English Political Culture," *The European Legacy* 5, no. 4 (2000): 533.

[26] Pincus, "The Making of a Great Power?," 533. Historian Tim Harris's *Restoration: Charles II and his Kingdoms, 1660–1685* (2005) also argues that the late Stuart monarchy, specifically Charles II's reign, greatly contributed to the Revolution of 1688–89.

[27] Pincus, "The Making of a Great Power?," 535.

[28] Pincus, "'To protect English liberties,'" 78.

[29] Colley and her work, *Britons,* is dissected in greater detail in Chapter III of this thesis.

identity were found in the years previous, during the Stuart period of late seventeenth century. At a time of continual warfare with the Continent, seventeenth–century English "men and women came to define themselves as Britons – in addition to defining themselves in many other ways – because circumstances impressed them with the belief that they were different from those beyond their shores, and in particular different from their prime enemy, the French."[30]

The majority of these premodernist scholars, as well as Colley, maintain different approaches to and perspectives regarding the emergence of the English nation but several of them share similar views relative to this thesis. Firstly, the later premodernists, Pincus and Colley in particular, attempt to identify a moment in this narrative of the British nation that gave birth to the "modern" – a concept defined by Pincus as "a set of sociostructural innovations in statecraft" as well as "an ideological break with the past."[31] The Revolution of 1688–89 brought about such innovations and continuity as James II's absolutist state shifted to the constitutional, and Protestant, administration of William III. The premodernists' search for the emergence of the English nation as well as a sense of national character revealed a coincidence with the rise of the modern British nation-state. Secondly, Pincus, Colley, and Smith all agree that the Restoration era, with its unique social, political, and cultural environment, was the key to the creation of English nationalism and modern Britain. This thesis argues that the roots of the modern idea of English national identity and Englishness were evident in the Restoration period, an early and disorderly point within the British national narrative, specifically through both the court and material culture of Charles II's and James II's courts.

At this point during the late seventeenth century, the English publicly debated what it meant to be English or French and masculine or feminine literarily through popular print culture and visually with clothing and exotic goods. A study of late Stuart material culture signifies that a portion of the English population utilized these items to consider the numerous facets of their identities including national, political, religious, and gender affiliations. Furthermore, these conceptions were not fixed but rather fluid and, most often, entangled with one another. Consequently, this thesis argues that many Englishmen and women utilized these perceptions of "English" to aid in the formation of their other identifications such as gender.

Restoration fashion, as well as other material possessions, provided a valuable lens for understanding the characteristics of English identity during the late 1600s. Studies of court dress have already been conducted on other areas of early modern English history particularly with the Tudor courts of the sixteenth century and the Stuart dynasty during the early seventeenth century. In the Henrician and Elizabethan royal courts, a study of material culture reveals the theme of representation through clothing as a form of political rhetoric. The women of the Tudor courts practiced a form of hood politics wherein the regional or national style of female headwear maintained political significance in a space dominated by factionalism and religious tension.[32] Developing Stephen Greenblatt's theory, scholars have also begun to examine the self-fashioning of monarchs in the early seventeenth century through portraiture and other artistic mediums or material items.[33]

---

[30] Linda Colley, *Britons: Forging the Nation, 1707–1837* (1992; repr., New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2009), 17.

[31] Pincus, *1688: The First Modern Revolution*, 9.

[32] The term, "hood politics," is used in this context to describe a noticeable trend particularly in the court of Henry VIII. Female courtiers such as Anne Boleyn and Jane Seymour utilized the national style of their hoods, either the French-style or Anglicized gable hood, to visually indicate their political loyalties within the court.

[33] See Stephen Greenblatt, *Renaissance Self-Fashioning: From More to Shakespeare* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980); Richard Ollard, *The Image of the King: Charles I and Charles II* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1979); Laura Lunger Knoppers, "The Politics of Portraiture: Oliver Cromwell and the Plain Style," *Renaissance Quarterly* 51, no. 4 (Winter 1998): 1282-1319; Kevin Sharpe, "Representations and Negotiations: Texts, Images, and Authority in Early Modern

Similarly, scholars have begun to seriously consider the significance of dress and material culture in the later Stuart courts. Susan Vincent's *Dressing the Elite: Clothes in Early Modern England* (2003) examines "high fashion" from the Reformation to the Restoration in order to prove how "clothing was an expression of early modern culture but in turn contributed to societal formation."[34] Vincent's work includes an interesting analysis of Charles's avant-garde vest as an expression of the period itself.[35] David Kuchta's monograph, *The Three-Piece Suit and Modern Masculinity: England, 1550–1850* (2003) also analyzes the Carolean vest by identifying its precursory role in reshaping gender dynamics in modern Britain. Kuchta explain how "Charles II's vest inaugurated a new and essentially modern era of masculine aesthetics, one that reversed a long-held association between elaborate display and high social status."[36] *The Three-Piece Suit and Modern Masculinity* represents one of the first recent studies to emphasize the dynamism of Restoration court dress, including all its socio-political aspects, in the context of shaping modern Britain.[37] Furthermore, *Fashion and Fiction: Dress in Art and Literature in Stuart England* (2005) by dress historian Aileen Ribeiro thoroughly surveys dress throughout the entire Stuart period although, as she acknowledges, the book only serves as "a general introduction to some aspects of clothing in Stuart England as mediated through contemporary literature and art."[38] However, there is yet to be a full-length study conducted of Restoration dress and material culture in relation to identity during the late seventeenth century.[39] This thesis attempts to redress this gap in scholarship by focusing on the unique theme of fashion, often stigmatized in academia, during the late Stuart period, an era that maintained remarkable significance in British national history.[40]

England," *The Historical Journal* 42, no. 3 (September 1999): 853–881; Kevin Sharpe, "'So Hard a Text'? Images of Charles I, 1612–1700," *The Historical Journal* 43, no. 2 (June 2000): 383–405.

[34] Susan Vincent, *Dressing the Elite: Clothes in Early Modern England* (New York: Berg, 2003), 5.

[35] This thesis discusses Charles's vest, or the Carolean vest, extensively in Chapter III.

[36] David Kuchta, *The Three-Piece Suit and Modern Masculinity: England, 1550-1850* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002), 1.

[37] Kuchta's work does not, however, focus entirely on the Restoration period, adequately address the agency of female attire, or attempt to provide a concrete interpretation of English national character. This thesis redresses these gaps by focusing on the dress of both male and female Restoration courtiers and how such fashion contributed to conceptions of both the nation and gender.

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

[39] Monographs that focus solely on this subject are extremely lacking as the first complete study of Restoration court culture was published only a few years previous with Matthew Jenkinson's *Culture and Politics at the Court of Charles II, 1660–1685* (2010). Jenkinson's book attempts to provide an examination of Charles' monarchy during the late seventeenth century and the concept of royal representation. *Culture and Politics at the Court of Charles II* represents the tendency of recent historiography to stress continuity from the Commonwealth to the Restoration rather than highlight the differences and dramatic shift from one period to the other. Furthermore, Jenkinson's work represents a break from traditional Restoration court historiography, which emphasizes the eccentricities and licentiousness of the Carolean court. These histories, which include Hugh Noel Williams' *Rival Sultanas: Nell Gwyn, Louise de Kéroualle, and Hortense Mancini* (1915), relied heavily upon the gossipy memoirs of Anthony Hamilton, the Comte de Gramont, 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. Royal mistresses are depicted merely as squabbling shrews and clothing is described only to convey the gross opulence of the Restoration court. While such works are indeed entertaining, they fail to adequately address the deeper meanings behind court interactions and fashions.

[40] The legitimacy of dress history has been consistently questioned during the last half century. Lou Taylor, a prominent dress historian and academic at the University of the Arts London, as well as feminist scholar Angela McRobbie have both addressed scholastic stereotypes of dress in their publications. Specifically, fashion was viewed by the previously masculine dominated world of academia as a feminine, and therefore, frivolous field that could not be acknowledged seriously by historians. This prejudice against clothing remains the subject of much debate within intellectual circles. An additional problem within the field is the notion that the area is underdeveloped. In actuality, fashion history has

Perceptions of Englishness, and their relation to other national identities of the early modern period, were illustrated through court dress as one of the most visual representation of the English nation. The material clothing of Charles and his courtiers, and their vestmentary portrayals in print culture, reflected both the state's and general population's attempt to understand various English identities during the late seventeenth century. This thesis utilizes seventeenth-century descriptions and depictions of Stuart court dress and high fashion as primary evidence. The celebrated diaries of Samuel Pepys and John Evelyn provide invaluable insight into life within the Restoration court. Both contemporaries held prestigious positions at Charles's court and thus their diaries brimmed with richly detailed observations of Stuart art, music, pastimes, food, commodities, and, particularly, modish fashions.[41] Pepys and Evelyn's frequent attention to and interest regarding what was donned by the English élite further indicate that clothing and material culture mattered within the late Stuart courts and were worthy of note and discussion.

Moreover, fashion and material culture were particularly prominent themes in early modern print culture. Numerous novellas, broadsides, dictionaries, pamphlets, treatises, ballads, and poems that centered sardonically on court costume and the socio-political implications of elite fashion were disseminated during the last several decades of the seventeenth century. The authors of such pieces included Stuart courtiers such as Evelyn, author of *Tyrannus* (1661), and his daughter Mary Evelyn, whom was credited with writing the satirical essay *Mundus muliebris: or, The ladies dressing-room unlock'd, and her toilette spread in burlesque* (1690). Such literature illuminates how certain English courtiers viewed the appropriation of foreign culture within their royal court. In contrast, many of the literary works utilized within this thesis were published anonymously and thus do not provide definitive proof of authorship despite scholarly speculations. Despite these historical limitations, such printed literature is still fundamental to this study. Anonymity allowed writers to pen dynamic interpretations of contemporary issues without prejudice and therefore enriched the literary dialogue concerning fashion in late Stuart London. Although numerous names remain unknown, their perspectives and opinions on late seventeenth-century dress stimulated further discourse within print culture during this period.

While popular print represented democratized interpretations of Restoration dress, government documents present various viewpoints of the state, whether the King, his "Cabal," or the House of Commons.[42] Royal proclamations and sumptuary laws reflected government attempts to regulate the purchase and wearing of particular clothing and goods, although royals and the élite frequently disregarded these statutes. Such legislative works reflected parliamentary attitudes towards foreign powers, particularly France and the Dutch Republic, during periods of warfare with Europe and ensuing diplomatic tension. Consequently, government sources signify for this thesis another perception of dress and implanted Continental culture during late seventeenth-century England.

Visual sources, including physical objects, paintings, fashion plates, and woodcuts, also present effective evidence for this study. Objects sources from the late seventeenth century are

---

fostered and maintained a serious conversation regarding the evolution of dress since the publication of the first costume books nearly five hundred years ago.

[41] Samuel Pepys was Secretary of the Navy Board and a Member of Parliament under both Charles II and, subsequently, James II. John Evelyn served as the Commissioner for disease in the counties of Kent and Sussex and also held a seat on the King's Council for Foreign Plantations where he engaged in frequent interactions with great and powerful political figures such as the Earl of Clarendon and the King himself.

[42] The term, "Cabal," refers to an elite group of Charles II's councilors during the middle of his reign, circa 1670. The word is an acronym for five ministers: Thomas Clifford, Baron Clifford of Chudleigh; Henry Bennet, Earl of Arlington; George Villiers, Duke of Buckingham (and cousin of Barbara Palmer, Countess of Castlemaine); Anthony Ashley Cooper, Earl of Shaftesbury; and John Maitland, Duke of Lauderdale.

invaluable but difficult to locate, as "a major gap exists in the availability of such evidence."[43] Fashion scholars Clare Backhouse and Angela McShane state in their article on fashion woodcuts of the late Stuart period that, "Extant clothes are rare (having disintegrated or been recycled since first worn), and museum collections are biased towards durable or precious fabrics that were preserved by those who could afford to do so."[44] Yet, several pieces of clothing from the Restoration court can be located within modern institutions such as the Victoria & Albert Museum in London, which currently maintains the wedding suit of James II to his second wife Mary of Modena and other pieces from the Restoration era. In addition to objects, late Stuart art is also utilized in this thesis despite its restrictions as a form of evidence. Artists such as Sir Peter Lely, Charles II's principal painter in ordinary, and Peter Mignard, a portraitist from the court of Louis XIV, produced a plethora of Restoration portraiture that richly depicted male and female courtiers. Lely's series *The Windsor Beauties* depicted ten of the most prominent women of the Carolean court and their colorful attire. However, such opulent portrayals of court life "can also mislead" as Backhouse and McShane emphasize.[45] In *The Dress of the People: Everyday Fashion in Eighteenth-Century England* (2007), John Styles stresses that period portraits and genre paintings were rarely accurate depictions of individuals. The artist or the sitter often influenced the manner in which one was represented, predominantly through their garments and ornaments.[46] Such an attitude within the extraordinary portraiture of the Restoration period contrasted deeply with the "warts and all" perspective of Oliver Cromwell, which advocated a honest albeit unadorned portrayal. Portraiture, while an essential resource for any analysis of historical dress, thus presents a problem concerning the validity and intent of the wearer's attire.

This study of the late Stuart courts reveals several instances in print and actuality wherein both men and women purposefully dressed in order to convey a particular image or message. However, the impetus for such fashioning cannot always be determined or proved based on the evidence available to the historian. Paintings, fashion plates, woodcuts, and object sources, as well as printed works provide vital evidence yet they still maintain several limitations for the study of dress history. McShane and Backhouse comment 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."[47] Yet while Pepys and Evelyn dutifully recorded who wore what when and where, they could not, and did not, offer precise explanations concerning *why* these courtiers wore certain garments or flaunted specific goods. Nevertheless, the intention is not as significant for this thesis as the manner in which dress was interpreted by different divisions of Stuart society. Even in Restoration portraiture, the representation of the subject superseded the accuracy of the their clothing and accessories. Regardless of the wearer's intent, attire, and accoutrements symbolized something more than simply frivolous frills and bows within English society.

Fashion was a key extension of one's identity. Dress scholar Susan Vincent explains the significance of fashion as a fundamental marker or signifier of late seventeenth-century identity: "What is incontrovertible is that the vestimentary shaping of the body helps shape cultural context and individual personality, because, owing to its fundamental relationship with the self, clothing is

---

[43] 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.

[44] McShane, 339.

[45] McShane, 339.

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

[47] McShane, 338.

vital to the formation of identity."[48] Furthermore, Vincent argues that "'Fashion is not so much a consequence of choice but, instead, some kind of causal agent. Clothes, in a very real sense, do 'make' the man and woman."[49] An analysis of late Stuart fashion reveals that contemporary clothing was not simply important to how individuals were defined or perceived by English society but that these interpretations were multi-faceted in nature. Accordingly, this thesis employs both visual sources such as paintings as well as descriptive evidence found within diary accounts in order to supplement the shortcomings of the other. Taken together, both forms of evidence are utilized in order to provide a thorough examination of how Restoration court dress expressed different conceptions of identity in the late seventeenth century.

Chapter II, "The Character of Clothes," analyzes several principal works of late Stuart cheap print from approximately 1660–1700 in order to understand the underlying social, political, economic, and cultural issues regarding material culture in late seventeenth-century England – specifically, the problems concerning the pervasiveness of foreign culture within the Isles and how this affected English identity. Such pamphlets and treatises were inexpensive to publish and thus widely accessible to English society. Cheap print thus served as a common forum to discuss or debate the nature of material culture in Stuart England. One of the most popular themes debated within printed works, including the satirical *Mundus muliebris* and *Mundus foppensis*, was the permanence of Continental, particularly French, culture throughout urban centers and the royal court. Under Charles II as well as James II, the ambiguity concerning Englishness was particularly facilitated by the appropriation of foreign culture. Therefore, royals and courtiers of both sexes who garbed themselves in the French fashion stimulated a popular discourse during the late Stuart era that discussed the absence of an English national dress and addressed England's diplomatic relationship with France. This literary rhetoric maintained profound significance for how Englishmen and women viewed themselves and others in the context of material culture during the late Stuart period.

Chapters III and IV both utilize dress and material possessions as a lens to examine various forms of identity during the late seventeenth century. In Chapter III, "Diplomatic Dress," the connection between dress and the nation is examined. This section considers the ways in which an Englishman or woman's national, political, or religious identity was expressed through clothing and other items in the Restoration court. By analyzing court anecdotes and aristocratic possessions, the chapter indicates how the issue of Englishness and national character was particularly stressed by the popular themes of French culture within English culture. The thesis advocates that Englishness, in the context of late Stuart-era costume, was perceived as anything non-Continental to a portion of the English population. This sense of English nationalism emerged in response to the prevalence of French and other absolutist culture that was so debated in Restoration London. Thus, the court's adoption of French fashions undermined a conception of identity and lead to a discussion of Englishness on the eve of Britain's birth. This "identity crisis" can be detected through the way in which the English élite, including Charles II, his brother, and mistresses, donned certain clothing in order to communicate particular meanings to the court as well as the wider state; on numerous occasions, courtiers choose to represent themselves in a particular manner through their clothes and these examples of self-expression often clashed with one another. For some, like Charles II, dress was a diplomatic tool to communicate on an international scale while others, such as his Portuguese wife, utilized their clothing to encourage English patriotism at home. Fashion as a mode for self-representation was particularly important to women, who did not maintain a formal position within

---

[48] Susan Vincent, *Dressing the Elite: Clothes in Early Modern England* (New York: Berg, 2003), 4–5.
[49] Vincent, 5.

the government of the state. Therefore, such a medium allowed female nobles to engage in the informal intricacies of court politics and establish considerable influence within the royal court.

Chapter IV, "Gendered Garb," concentrates on the entangled nature of dress, gender, and nation. Drawing on satirical literature and cheap print, this section provides insight into conflicting perceptions of gender roles, and their relation to the nation, within the late seventeenth-century Stuart court and London. The Frenchification of prominent Englishmen through their attire, and other cultural interests, contributed to the emergence of the fop persona, a man excessively preoccupied with his appearance and clothing, in late seventeenth-century popular culture. Foppish courtiers were regarded by English popular culture as the embodiment of French culture and effeminacy. Late Stuart print culture revealed that many Londoners maintained difficulty differentiating between elite Englishmen who fetishized French fashions and Continental aristocrats, like those in Louis XIV's court as Versailles. In addition to the fop character, the "town-misse" provides an interesting study of the intersection between dress and gender. Like the royal mistresses of Charles II such as Barbara Palmer and Louise de Kéroualle, this modern courtesan utilized her clothing and material possessions emasculate her gentleman and dominate late Stuart society in London. Therefore, the conception of the fop and town-misse strained gender dynamics within the Stuart courts and revealed transitions regarding the proper conceptions of masculinity and femininity during the late seventeenth century.

This thesis does not simply offer an ornamented picture of exquisite clothing or the entertaining squabbles between courtiers, which are indeed characteristics of any royal court throughout history. Such a study of late Stuart fashion reveals the deeper implications of clothing and material culture for both the Restoration era and the development of the British nation-state. Carolean court dress reflected the Restoration period itself with the prevailing tensions between English and French, masculine and feminine, Whig and Tory, and Protestant and Catholic. Consequently, these oppositions mark the significance of the Restoration era for the development of various forms of English identities on the eve of the Glorious Revolution and the establishment of Great Britain in the early eighteenth century. The roots of the social, political, and cultural issues sewn into late Stuart dress can be detected with an examination of how certain Englishmen and women utilized popular print culture at the end of the seventeenth century to establish and communicate who they were and what made them unique.

II.
The Character of Clothes:
Representations of Dress in Late Stuart Print Culture

Beginning in the 1660s during the early years of the Restoration period, a popular discourse emerged in English print culture that intersected the politics of state and gender with fashion. With the rise of consumption and the public sphere in late seventeenth-century London, dress became an accessible medium for the discussion of domestic and foreign politics as well as gender dynamics within the royal court of Charles II. The characters and personages depicted in popular cheap print, such as pamphlets and broadsides on fashion, reflected the courtiers of Whitehall, the men and women at the nation's center, during the late Stuart courts. The vestmentary issues discussed in texts like Mary Evelyn's *Mundus muliebris* (1690) and the anonymous *Mundus foppensis* (1691) reflected the national, political, religious, and gender tensions that dominated Restoration court culture. The most prevalent of these tensions in both print and political culture concerned the French's continual invading influence over Charles II and his brother James. An analysis of dress discourse within late Stuart cheap print provides context for understanding the various political, cultural, and social aspects of foreign fashions in the Restoration court, and thus explains how and why court costume expressed significance not simply within the court but the wider space of late Stuart London and Continental Europe. In popular print culture, clothing embodied a particular meaning due to several physical characteristics such as color, fabric, or style. Based on these facets, what a character wore, such as a Parisian garment, became an extension of their constructed identity in Restoration England. A caricature's attire was a fundamental component to how they, as Englishmen and women, perceived themselves and, more importantly, to how others, including Continental Europeans, perceived them. Therefore, the foreign Continental styles adopted by characters in English print culture defined their personas as Frenchified fops or officious strumpets in late seventeenth-century England.

The embrace and diffusion of foreign, particularly French, culture in Restoration England was a prominent theme in late Stuart print culture. By the late 1660s, a literary dialogue emerged which vehemently debated the English adoption of Continental culture in the royal court and on the streets of London. The appropriation of French court culture by Charles II, as well as his brother James II, and the increase of England's international trade by the late seventeenth century caused ambiguity and anxiety among a portion of the English population regarding their own national character. Globalization through the import of foreign goods and culture in Restoration England facilitated questions regarding what was perceived as "English." Several authors of popular print searched in vain for a sense of Englishness in a sea of exotic commodities, including clothing and furniture, while other writers celebrated how the developing consumer culture added vibrancy and sophistication to English life. This chapter will analyze this literary debate regarding foreign and Continental fashions of late Stuart London in order to establish the significance of dress discourse within the context of the Restoration court.

Print Culture in Late Seventeenth Century London

From parliamentary proclamations and political broadsides to titillating memoirs and fashion plates imported from France, print culture in late seventeenth-century London was rich, prolific and thriving. During the early sixteenth century, religious publications dominated English print culture. However, secular print proliferated towards the end of the century particularly after the defeat of the Spanish Armada in 1588 with the appearance of victorious war ballads and military pamphlets.

English print culture further developed throughout the seventeenth century with the expansion of parliamentary publications from the 1620s to the 1640s.[50] As the seventeenth century progressed, Stuart print culture flourished as works became more politicized. The satirical nature of Restoration court literature, from figures such as John Wilmot, the notorious Earl of Rochester, as well as the rise of the popular coffeehouses throughout London enabled multiple levels of English society to comment on significant matters of state through pen and paper. By the end of James II's reign in 1688, approximately one thousand booksellers and publishers operated in London. From 1660 to 1695, London witnessed the development "of a considerable range of popular literature" including entertaining periodicals, petitions, sermons, chapbooks, broadsides, treatises, gossip sheets, almanacs, poems, and plays.[51] McShane and Backhouse explain that these forms of literature were identified as "cheap print," or works that were "the most cheaply printed and socially accessible sources."[52] Yet, late Stuart print culture also extended to include other genres of print that were solely dedicated to a rhetoric based on court dress and fashion in general. In 1678, the first fashion periodical emerged with the *Nouveau Mercure Galant,* which often depicted "wearers from the European nobility and royalty."[53] Moreover, imported French costume prints and woodcuts were extremely popular during the late seventeenth century. Samuel Pepys owned a large collection of prints that featured detailed depictions of the French style of dress fashionable at the Restoration court.[54]

Additionally, a rich literary discourse emerged in print culture that centered on the fashions of the English royal court and late Stuart London. This dialogue included reflections on the appropriation of French styles and manner of dress as well as commentaries regarding the immorality or licentiousness of court costume. Numerous poems, pamphlets, dictionaries, and treatises circulated around London that addressed the wanton nature of fashionable dress while other works condemned the slavish devotion to foreign attire and goods. The prevalence of such texts coupled with their popularity and wide dissemination revealed the importance of the language of dress and the power of display to late seventeenth-century English society. The existence of this dress discourse indicated that what was worn and displayed maintained particular significance to different individuals within and outside of the royal court. Clothes and objects were so central to English Restoration culture that they were worthy of widespread discussion and intense debate among numerous levels of late Stuart society.

French Culture in England

One of the most popular themes in late Stuart dress discourse was the adoption and permanence of French culture throughout Restoration England. The Caroline court of the early seventeenth century experienced French cultural influence under Charles I (1625–1649) and his queen Henrietta Maria, the daughter of Henry IV of France and Marie de' Medici. Parliamentary historian Eveline Cruickshanks proclaims that Charles I was "the greatest connoisseur of the arts who ever occupied the throne" due to his enthusiastic acquisition of Spanish, French and Italian

---

[50] For parliamentary print culture, see Chris R. Kyle, *Theater of State: Parliament and Political Culture in Early Stuart England* (Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 2012).
[51] Helen Berry, *Gender, Society and Print Culture in Late-Stuart England: The Cultural World of the Athenian Mercury* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003), 17.
[52] McShane, 337.
[53] McShane, 339.
[54] 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).

paintings.[55] Furthermore, scholars also attribute this flourishing of Continental culture to Henrietta Maria. Erin Griffey, an art historian at the University of Auckland, argues that Charles I's queen functioned as his "cultural counterpart" due to her frequent patronage of European playwrights and painters including Orazio Gentileschi, the Italian artist who previously served at her mother's court in France.[56]

However, French culture truly proliferated within seventeenth-century England with the return of Charles II to the throne in 1660. Charles's Restoration brought more than simply the return of the monarchy: it reinstated the absolutist court culture that had been promoted under his parents and suppressed under Cromwell, in the new French mode.[57] The influence of Versailles's court culture on Charles and James during their exile in France greatly affected the late Stuart court upon their return and thus maintained a more lasting significance for English history. British historian Arthur Bryant explains that Charles's embrace of the French style achieved "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."[58]

During the late seventeenth century, the French court of Versailles was the cultural center of Europe. The world of fashion and style revolved around Louis XIV, the Sun King. Bryant notes that in Restoration England "everything new came from Paris, the Mecca of the civilised world."[59] Consequently, Englishmen and women of late Stuart London looked to France for the latest cultural trends. In the printed satire *The parable of the top-knots* (1691) by John Dunton, a prominent London bookseller and devoted Anglican, the tale's modish 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."[60] This fashionable woman, like many fellow Englishmen and women in literature and actuality, sought to model her own attire after French court dress with the arroy, "A Suit of Cloaths," or the commode, a tall wire used to frame the ridiculously elaborate headdresses popular during the late Stuart period.[61] France became the predominant cultural influence on the English arts during the Restoration period, inspiring painting, music, food, theatre, architecture, and most especially, fashion and material culture which were all integrally tied to the political culture of Continental absolutism.

Clothing remained the most pronounced form of French cultural influence throughout both the reigns of Charles II and James II during the late seventeenth century. English playwright Thomas Shadwell emphasized the role of French dress in shaping English fashion in his satirical plays. In *The Miser* (1672), a comedy of manners modeled after Molière's work of the same name, the Whiggish Shadwell 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] Other English authors of late Stuart literature shared Shadwell's criticism of the French mode and addressed this issue prominently within print culture. Such a dominant cultural attitude stimulated intense anti-French and xenophobic sentiment in Restoration London. Ribeiro notes that this viewpoint remained "a constant undercurrent in English

---

[55] Eveline Cruickshanks, "Introduction," in *The Stuart Courts* (Thrupp, Gloucestershire: Sutton Publishing, 2000), 5.

[56] Erin Griffey, "Introduction," in *Henrietta Maria: Piety, Politics and Patronage* (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2008), 2.

[57] Chapter III, "Diplomatic Dress," of this thesis discusses Charles's French and Continental influences in more detail.

[58] Jane Ashelford, *The Art of Dress: Clothes and Society, 1500 – 1914* (New York: Harry N. Abrams, 1996), 88.

[59] Ashelford, 88.

[60] John Dunton, *The parable of the top-knots* (London: R. Newcombe, 1691), 1.

[61] *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, In burlesque. Together with a short supplement to the fop-dictionary: compos'd for the use of the town-beaus* (London: John Harris at the Harrow in the Poultry, 1691), 25.

[62] Thomas Shadwell, *The Miser: a comedy acted by His Majesties servants at the Theater Royal* (London: Hobart Kemp, 1672), iv.

society" 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] Restoration England's political and diplomatic conflicts with France, as well as other Continental powers such as the Dutch Republic, were projected onto the material world. These periods of discord with France and the Dutch Republic were largely due to commercial competition for control of the world's natural resources and luxury goods. Consequently, one of the most common and accessible focus for anti-French sentiment was dress due to material possessions' direct association with diplomatic conflicts and its function as a conspicuous visual representation of identity during the late seventeenth century.

"Mundus Muliebris" and the Foreign Treasures of the Female Wardrobe

The discourse concerning French dress in late Stuart print culture extended to include popular forms of print such as comedies and poetry. However, cheap print, including pamphlets, broadsides, and ballads, were the most frequent literary genre employed for addressing the English reliance on French fashion. One of the greatest examples of this popular literary dialogue is evident in the satirical pamphlet *Mundus muliebris: or, The ladies dressing-room unlock'd, and her toilette spread in burlesque* (1690). *Mundus muliebris*, first published in London after the Glorious Revolution, presented a window into "the world of the feminine" in late Stuart England through biting tetrameter couplets. The work revealed an apparently emic glimpse behind boudoir doors and into the private realm of women with observations on fashionable dress, baubles, accessories, and furnishings as well as reflections regarding feminine pastimes, behavior, and characteristics.

Mary Evelyn, the daughter of John Evelyn and his wife Mary Browne, was credited with writing *Mundus muliebris*. Mary's life embodied a symbolic reflection of the Restoration court. Her familial position afforded her great insight into the culture of the royal court and even her lifespan correlated with that of Charles's reign. Mary was born on October 1, 1665, during the first years of the Restoration, and died at the Evelyn estate at Sayes Court on March 14, 1685, a month after the death of Charles II.[64] According to her bereaved father, Mary spent the majority of her short years at Sayes Court where she excelled at her studies including French, Italian, history, literature, music and dancing. In his famed diary, John Evelyn portrayed an image of his daughter as the embodiment of Christian virtue and feminine grace reminiscent of nostalgic English womanhood, as opposed to the dissolute ideal of Continental ladies:

> 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 ornamentation that she criticized in her work, but rather by her morality and intellect. Instead of spending time at courtly activities like playing cards or at the theater, which John Evelyn pronounced as an "unaccountable

[63] Ribeiro, 257.
[64] John Evelyn, *The Diary of John Evelyn*, ed. John Bowle (New York: Oxford University Press, 1983), 205.
[65] Evelyn, *The Diary of John Evelyn*, 323

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 Evelyn described in John Evelyn's diary represents a foil to the female courtiers of the Restoration who took delight in the earthly pleasures condemned by both Evelyns. Moreover, the critique of French fashions in *Mundus Muliebris* further symbolized Mary's divergence from the courtly mode, which was greatly influenced by Continental absolutism.

Several historians, including New Zealand scholar Esmond S. de Beer, attribute joint authorship of *Mundus muliebris* to John Evelyn based on certain suggestive entries in his diary. Similarly, Aileen Ribeiro proposes that John Evelyn finished Mary's work in the interim between her death in 1685 and the pamphlet's publication in 1690.[67] *Mundus muliebris* certainly echoed John Evelyn's own pamphlet *Tyrannus: or, The mode* (1661) in which he powerfully condemned the English dependence on French fashion and publicly beseeched the King to forsake foreign style for more patriotic attire.[68] However, the question of whether John Evelyn wrote *Mundus muliebris* is irrelevant for this thesis. Based on their credited written works, both Mary and John Evelyn spoke with one voice and maintained nearly exact sentiments regarding French fashions in Restoration England. Their perspective represented one side of the animated literary debate concerning dress and the nation during the late seventeenth century.

Mundus muliebris commenced with an elegant and elaborate laundry list of everything that was needed for a gentleman to outfit a fashionable woman and maintain her in fashionable comfort during late seventeenth-century England. According to the sardonic pamphlet, a woman was comparable to a ship that must be rigged out with gay streamers but alas would never be "sufficiently adorned, Or satisfy'd, that you have done enough to set them forth."[69] Furthermore, the *de rigueur* of late Stuart London costume required that these necessary decorations follow the Continental mode. Evelyn's inventory included myriad foreign terms regarding clothing, accoutrements, household furnishings, and hygiene that were later defined in the "Fop Dictionary," a brief encyclopedic piece attached to the end of the pamphlet.[70] Yet, the French influence was particularly prevalent throughout the entire document. Evelyn detailed the famous French perfumer *Martial* that emulated the "Frangipani of Rome" and described *Colbertine* as a "Lace resembling Net-work, of the Fabrick of Monsieur Colbert, Superintendent of the French Kings Manufactures."[71] However, *Mundus muliebris* also included objects from other significant Continental powers such as Italy, Spain, Flanders, and the Dutch Republic. Evelyn stated that the following items were needed to appropriately fashion an 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"[72]

---

[66] Evelyn, *The Diary of John Evelyn,* 324–325.

[67] Ribeiro, 252.

[68] John Evelyn's *Tyrannus* is be discussed in greater detail in Chapter III, "Diplomatic Dress," in relation to the fashions of Charles II and his Restoration court.

[69] Mary Evelyn, 1–2.

[70] The significance of the term "fop," is discussed in Chapter IV: "Gendered Garb."

[71] Mary Evelyn, 16–19.

[72] Mary Evelyn, 3.

Evelyn emphasized the necessity for Flemish lace and cambric, a fine white linen that originated in Cambray, as well as the Dutch equivalent of "Holland," which became so popular that "later the name applied to any fine linen."[73]Although the Dutch Republic did not embody the absolutism of other Continental powers, Holland still maintained considerable foreign influence on late Stuart culture.[74] Charles II and James, the Duke of York, spent much of their exile at The Hague and adopted many Dutch cultural influences in addition to those they appropriated from Versailles. Yet, late Stuart England was even more influenced by the Dutch Republic regarding their trade of foreign luxury goods.

The seventeenth century was the Dutch Golden Age, a significant period of European history wherein science, philosophy, learning, navigation, exploration, architecture, sculpture, literature, and commerce all flourished within the Dutch Republic. During this glorious era, Dutch art, science, and trade earned preeminence around the globe as the Dutch Republic created a prominent and profitable empire that extended into North and South America, the Caribbean, West Africa, and South Asia. The Dutch Republic maintained two commercial enterprises that spanned the globe: the United East India Company, or the VOC, a corporation that established a direct shipping route to Asia in 1602, and the Dutch West India Company (the WIC), which was granted a monopoly on all Atlantic trade in 1621. Products from Dutch international trade including Chinese porcelain, Turkish rugs, and New World fur as well as domestic goods such as linen and lace set the standard of living and flooded markets within early modern Europe. Such objects represented Dutch commercial interest around the world that other European powers, principally England, desired to dominate.[75] As a result, conflict ensued between England and the Dutch Republic throughout the seventeenth century with a string of Anglo-Dutch wars beginning in 1652 with the First Anglo-Dutch War and ending with the Treaty of Westminster, which ended the Third Anglo-Dutch war, in 1674. Commercial competition and continual warfare precipitated English attitudes of hostility towards the Dutch in *Mundus muliebris* similar to the anti-French sentiment prevalent throughout the pamphlet as well as other works of popular cheap print. Therefore, the presence of both Flemish and Dutch goods in *Mundus muliebris* further demonstrated the permanence of European culture within late seventeenth-century England.

Mundus muliebris's catalogue of cultural accoutrements also included commodities from transoceanic trade with Continental Europe and the Far East. Evelyn detailed 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*."[76] 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. Catherine's considerable dowry granted England the trade ports of Tangier and Bombay as well as free trading rights with the East Indies and Brazil. Thus, Charles's marriage to Catherine

[73] Cumming, Valerie, C. W. Cunnington and P. E. Cunnington, *The Dictionary of Fashion History* (New York: Berg Press, 2010), 251.

[74] Similar to France, the Dutch Republic experienced an ebb and flow of amicable relations with England due to the consistence of the Anglo-Dutch Wars throughout the late 1660s and 1670s. Dutch cultural influence would later expand and truly permeate within England by the reign of William of Orange (William III) and James II's daughter Mary II in 1688.

[75] By 1700, however, the balance of power began to shift. Britain started to emerge as the Republic's rival empire through military, naval, and commercial supremacy. Nuala Zahedieh argues that the Dutch Republic's political structure and international trade served as a model for the British to emulate. For more, see Nuala Zahedieh, *The Capital and the Colonies: London and the Atlantic Economy, 1660–1700 (*New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010).

[76] Mary Evelyn, 2–4.

allowed for England to gain a strategic foothold in Asia and stimulated a flow of Asian goods into London.

Additionally, *Mundus muliebris* described 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."[77] According to Evelyn's Fop Dictionary, *Iapan'd* indicated a double meaning: either lacquered with "China Polishing" or an item considered "odd or fantastical" and therefore bizarre by English standards.[78] Such foreign objects adorned Queen Catherine's own chambers. John Evelyn remarked in his diary that, "the Queene brought over with her from Portugal, such Indian Cabinets and large trunks of Laccar [lacquer], as had never before ben seene here."[79] Catherine's Portuguese influence on English culture was also evident in the pamphlet with the inclusion of tea as a fashionable beverage: "But I had almost quite forgot, A 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."[80] Catherine was credited with the introduction of tea as a popular beverage and cultural pastime within England while chocolate and sugar further represented the raw resources of trade with the New World that were made possible in part by her marital alliance with Charles.[81] Consequently, Restoration England experienced an explosion of different and exotic cultural influences due to the nation's growing international trade, much to the dismay of several English authors.

Mary Evelyn concluded her popular pamphlet with a reflection concerning the grave consequences of England's dependence on foreign, most notably French, culture. The final lines of the pamphlet addressed the role of the Carolean court in the adoption of French culture within England: "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)."[82] Here, Evelyn particularly emphasized the agency of royal women and female courtiers of the Restoration with their embrace of Continental culture and rejection of an "English" style dress. The ladies of the Restoration court, most notably the Frenchwoman Louise de Kéroualle, were instrumental in utilizing "the arts of fashion as an essential part of French cultural propaganda."[83] In *Mundus muliebris*, fashionable women were portrayed as coquettish surrogates of foreign culture obsessed solely with expensive baubles and frivolous trinkets. Yet, Evelyn was 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. Thus, *Mundus muliebris* reflected not simply issues of English nationalism and xenophobia but also addressed gender roles during the late seventeenth century.[84]

Mundus muliebris also revealed that French culture remained in England after the reigns of both Charles II and James II. Ribeiro states that under the Restoration-era *de rigueur*, or the French mode, reached "an ascendancy it was to retain well beyond the end of the Stuart period."[85] *Mundus muliebris* was published in 1690, following the death of Charles and the short subsequent rule of James that ended with the Glorious Revolution of 1688 and the co-regency of James's Protestant

---

[77] Mary Evelyn, 8.
[78] Mary Evelyn, 15.
[79] John Evelyn, 195.
[80] Mary Evelyn, 11.
[81] For more, see Chapter III, "Diplomatic Dress," of this thesis.
[82] Mary Evelyn, 22.
[83] Ribeiro, 36.
[84] For more on fashion's association with gender, see Chapter IV of this thesis.
[85] Ribeiro, 19.

daughter Mary II (1689–1694) and her Dutch husband William III (1689–1702). Although absolutist court culture was not as prevalent within the royal court of William and Mary as it was during the reigns of Charles and James, John Evelyn, who ensured that his daughter's pamphlet was published, surely felt that the issues addressed in *Mundus muliebris* were still relevant five years after the deaths of both Mary Evelyn and Charles II. The consumption of French culture during the Carolean court of the late seventeenth century was so profound that it became entangled with various aspects of English life by the eighteenth century.

Fashion Dictionaries and the Defense of Frenchness

"Frenchness," those Continental characteristics that defined France during the seventeenth century, infiltrated multiple facets of English culture, from fashion to language. The legacy of French culture during late Stuart England was evident within the English vernacular for stylish dress. *Mundus muliebris* indicated how fashionable Englishmen and women appropriated French clothes, cosmetics, accessories, and pastimes by the end of the Stuart period. When these materials were adopted into English popular culture during the Restoration, their foreign designations became common terms within the English tongue. Ribeiro argues that "with the Restoration, French words for fashion and fashionable pastimes began to make an impact on the English language."[86] French terms embodied a level of elegance and style for Englishmen and women wishing to emulate the fashionable lifestyle of Versailles. Pepys often utilized French terminology in his diary "colluding with the notion that French was the language of gallantry and intrigue."[87] For the English, a French word signified the exoticism of Continental luxury and elegance.

Due to the appropriation of French into the English vernacular, numerous fashion dictionaries and encyclopedias emerged in 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."[88] Sherwood's dictionary revealed what particular French styles and garments were popular among the upper echelon of society in late seventeenth-century England. Francophone terms like *déshabillé*, a state of artful undress made popular with the court portraits of Charles's mistresses, were incorporated into the English vernacular in their original French form or Anglicized as "dishabille."[89]

Another great source for French fashion was *The Ladies Dictionary: Being a General Entertainment of the Fair-Sex* (1694) published by Dunton, one of the first booksellers to acknowledge the market potential for female audiences in London. 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,

---

[86] Ribeiro, 19.
[87] Ribeiro, 19.
[88] Ribeiro, 19.
[89] Ribeiro, 19.

Widows" and such.[90] 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.[91] *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 *Choux* was described as "the round bow behind the Head, resembling a Cabbage, and so the French according so name it."[92] Like Sherwood's dictionary, Dunton's version included Anglicized forms such as "*Colberteen*," a type of lace frequently mentioned in *Mundus muliebris* and its Fop Dictionary.[93] 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."[94] These various dictionaries demonstrated the integration of French culture into the very language of the English and therefore signified the extensive permanence of absolutist fashion in late seventeenth-century England.

Mundus Foppensis and the Vindication of Feminized French Fashion

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 Being the ladies vindication, in answer to a late pamphlet, entitled, Mundus muliebris* (1691) defended the French terminology and culture promoted by the Restoration court. Published a year later in 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 mindless 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."[95] Furthermore, the pamphlet refuted Evelyn's arguments concerning the danger of French culture in England.

The unknown author of *Mundus foppensis*, who adopted a female persona in the prose, maintained that Continental culture added style and vibrancy to the English way of life. French food, clothes, and words brought ornamentation to the rather lackluster English culture of the late seventeenth century. 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?"[96] *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?"[97] Fanciful names allowed women to appropriately designate the feminine articles

---

[90] *The Ladies Mercury* 1, no. 3 (London: T. Pratt, 1693).
[91] N.H., *The Ladies Dictionary: Being a General Entertainment of the Fair-Sex* (London: John Dunton, 1694), 1.
[92] N.H., 10.
[93] N.H., 10.
[94] Mary Evelyn, 20.
[95] *Mundus foppensis*, 1.
[96] *Mundus foppensis*, 4.
[97] *Mundus foppensis*, 5.

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.[98]

A rich and vibrant vocabulary of all the latest French terms was a practical requirement for any fashionable woman in London. The au courant female or "Artist" of the mode required "gay Words" to suitably describe her "Gay Cloaths."[99]

 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."[100] 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*.[101]

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 that characterized the reign of Charles II and James II.

---

[98] *Mundus foppensis*, 6-7.
[99] *Mundus foppensis*, 5.
[100] *Mundus foppensis*, 6.
[101] *Mundus foppensis*, 14–15.

Conclusion

      The discourse concerning fashion and nation in late Stuart cheap print reflected several significant issues of the Restoration era such as the reliance on foreign culture and the absence of an English national dress. Pamphlets like *Mundus muliebris* and *Mundus foppensis* as well as fashion dictionaries and glossaries represented combating perspectives regarding the appropriation of Continental or French culture by the Restoration court of the late seventeenth century. The prevalence of foreign goods throughout late Stuart England questioned and confused perceptions of English national character as writers such as Mary Evelyn and, as will be shown in the following chapter, her father John Evelyn denounced Continental fashions and pined for an authentic "English" style. Such an analysis of the rhetoric of dress in popular English print culture provides a contextual framework for understanding the politics of fashion in Charles II's court. Understanding the tensions between Continental and English national dress is critical in order to comprehend the meaning and rationalization behind the attire of royals and courtiers. The same issues publicly debated in print during late Stuart London were also evident in the Restoration court of Charles II. The next chapter will shift focus from the public sphere of print culture to examine these ambiguities regarding national character and gender roles in the context of Restoration courtiers. The character of clothes explains why the garments worn by the men and women of the Restoration court, like Charles II or Louise de Kéroualle, contained significant meaning in the entangled space of court politics.

III.
Diplomatic Dress:
Threading the Nation with Restoration Fashion

        Frenchified fops in Continental threads, effeminate gallants donned in powdered wigs and ladies with ridiculously opulent hairstyles, or "top-knots," were not merely literary inventions of the imagination.[102] Authors like Mary Evelyn and John Dunton fashioned entertaining caricatures and tales in reaction to popular political, social, and cultural discourse of the late Stuart period. The printed works analyzed in Chapter II reflected the world of the Restoration period, from the glamorous palace of Whitehall to the debauched streets of London. Aileen Ribeiro briefly acknowledges in *Fashion and Fiction* that clothing in Restoration art and literature represented certain aspects of the period itself.[103] Yet, the relation between fashion and periodization requires further examination. Print culture's discussion of dress symbolized the era as the principal tensions between English and French, Protestant and Catholic, and, Whig and Tory were interwoven with the threads of vests and smocks.[104] The inspiration for the eccentric characters and dynamic issues found within late Stuart print culture was detected in the vibrant English royal courts of Charles II and James II. Literature such as *Mundus muliebris* (1690) and *The parable of the top-knots* (1691) were penned in response to the issues regarding fashion and identity that dominated elite society in late seventeenth-century England. Therefore, the material culture of the late Carolean and Jacobean courts was not simply a visual representation of the luxury and factionalism of court life but rather a reflection of the how the individual responded in many varied ways to the Restoration.

        This chapter focuses on the intersection of nation and court dress by examining how the men and women of the late Stuart courts utilized their clothing and possessions as political symbols or signifiers. Ultimately, material culture served as an extension of identity and a mode to communicate this identity during the late seventeenth century. An analysis of the various types of identification signified by court dress revealed that certain Englishmen and women used fashion to discuss how they viewed themselves, and others, at this critical point in British history. A portion of the English population responded to moments of identity crisis, wherein the oppositions regarding nationality, political party, and religion were particularly stressed in late Stuart England, through their clothing and material possessions. Dress allowed courtiers and fashionable Londoners an opportunity to address these issues in an attempt to identify themselves in an ever-changing epoch yet these ambiguities remained unresolved by the end of the Restoration era. Still, such an analysis emphasizes the importance of material culture for the formation of an English national character later during the modern period.

"Englishness" and Attire in Late Stuart England

        One of the principal tensions of the Restoration period concerned one's relation to the nation as evident by early modern print culture's preoccupation with national influences of dress. As David Kuchta notes, "clothing is nothing if not an obvious, all-too-apparent sign of class and

---

[102] The characters of the "fop" and the "top-knot" are thoroughly analyzed in Chapter IV, "Gendered Garb," regarding their vestmentary relation to late Stuart conceptions of gender and how these notions are further entangled with the nation.

[103] Ribeiro, 215.

[104] Restoration court dress also revealed the tensions between the masculine and feminine. This opposition is addressed in the following chapter for issues of gender were entangled with the ambiguities regarding national, religious and political identity.

gender."[105] However, dress was, and still remains, a representation of nationality. Particular garments worn by individuals during the Restoration era illustrated not merely a portrait of how late seventeenth-century English society was structured but rather a grander geographic landscape of late Stuart England. With the continual rise of international trade and consumption during the Carolean period, the selection of foreign goods, including clothing, ornaments, furniture, and other luxury items, increased within London shops. The prevalence of exotic fashions facilitated domestic controversy as England attempted to differentiate itself within a more global and highly competitive world. The intense economic competition between European powers, highlighted by the rivalry between England, the Dutch Republic, and France, stimulated the process of colonization throughout the world. As late Stuart England was barraged with international commodities and differing cultural styles, ambiguity grew among various levels of society concerning what was deemed "English."

The concept of "Englishness" still remains an academic dilemma. As a portion of the English population questioned their Englishness during the late seventeenth century, current scholars of the early modern history continue to debate the concept of an English national identity. Imperial and national historian Linda Colley attempts to identify characteristics of a shared British identity in her innovative work *Britons: Forging the Nation, 1707–1837*. Concentrating on the modern period of British history, Colley locates the roots of British nationalism in the centuries previous to the Acts of the Union in 1707 and the creation of Great Britain. Colley argues that, "notions of Britain and British identity in this period were constructs 'superimposed on much older allegiances.'"[106] 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 increased economic stability after 1700 contributed to the development of a British national feeling. Yet, Colley stresses the importance of religion as the dominant factor in the formation of this identity. Additionally, *Britons* 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 Eugen Weber calls 'a true political personality.'"[107] England's 130-year long period of warfare with France during the early modern period was another significant element in the invention of Britishness.[108] 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."[109] This concept of the "Other" figured most prominently with the "Catholic 'Other'" in contrast to English Protestantism.[110] 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.

Yet, the idea of *Englishness* differed from the united nature of Britishness, which also encompassed the Scottish and the Welsh as the other ethnicities of the British Isles. During the past century, scholarly studies have attempted to identify the historical characteristics of Englishness

---

[105] David Kuchta, *The Three-Piece Suit and Modern Masculinity: England, 1550-1850* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002), 6.
[106] Colley, xv.
[107] Colley, 378.
[108] Colley, 1.
[109] Colley, 6.
[110] Colley, xxii.

particularly in cultural modes such as art and architecture.[111] Nikolaus Pevsner, a German-born British art and architectural historian, identified the "geography of art" during the Reith Lectures in 1955. He described this concept as "what all works of art and architecture of one people have in common, at whatever time they may have been made."[112] Therefore, the geography of art is "national character as it expresses itself in art."[113] Recent studies of the twenty-first century have expanded this study to address how dress reflects national characteristics through time and space.

In her article, "On Englishness and Dress," Ribeiro maintains that the conception 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."[114] 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."[115] Pevsner acknowledges the continuity of national identity with his statement that, "there does not exist anything like a national character consistent over centuries."[116] 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."[117] Hence, this romanticized concept of an English national dress embodies a synchronous "idea of England rather than England itself."[118]

By employing Ribeiro's theory, this study identifies a perception of Englishness or national character regarding late seventeenth-century dress based on popular public opinions found within the print culture of the period. This idea of Englishness, in the context of late Stuart-era costume, meant non-Continental. More specifically, an English fashion 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 referred 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. These diplomatic conflicts contributed to a cohesive feeling for a need of national dress among a portion of the English population as indicated in the vestmentary rhetoric of late Stuart print culture.

The Restoration court's adoption of French fashions undermined this conception of English identity and character. Due to the royal court's close proximity to the state, the English élite's dress was often perceived as the visual standard for national attire. Therefore, the common attire donned by the middling and lower classes in both urban and pastoral settings were frequently excluded from the dress discourse that dominated late Stuart print culture. Writers, including Evelyn and Dunton, were more concerned with the wardrobe of the King and his court at Whitehall, and how they represented the nation internally and externally, than the country clothes of a Lincolnshire farmer or rags of the lowly urbanite; the clothing of those in power was more important in regards to the

---

[111] 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).

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

[113] Pevsner, 11.

[114] Ribeiro, "On Englishness in Dress," 17.

[115] Ribeiro, "On Englishness in Dress," 25.

[116] Pevsner, 12.

[117] Ribeiro, "On Englishness in Dress," 18.

[118] Ribeiro, "On Englishness in Dress," 17.

image of the nation. The presence of Continental culture throughout late Stuart London, but more particularly within the Restoration court, served as a popular topic for public discussion and thus facilitated ambiguity concerning preconceived notions of Englishness.

Politics and the physical body became entangled in the royal court as both male and female courtiers utilized their dress and belongings to send political, social, and cultural messages. Charles himself set the precedent for such an association with his persistent use of politicized material culture throughout his reign. As the head of a rising empire, what Charles chose to wear mattered in a space, his royal court, which emphasized the visual. Furthermore, the bodies of the women intimately tied to Charles, his wife, mother, sister, mistresses, and lovers, were viewed as politically significant in the late Stuart courts. Female royals and noblewomen in Charles's close circle held a considerable amount of power and influence and thus their clothing held great meaning within court politics. As an important cultural signifier, fashion in the Carolean, and later Jacobean, courts maintained unique relevance for shaping identity in the late seventeenth century.

The "Carolean Vest"

The cultural influence of the Continent truly permeated within late seventeenth-century England with the Restoration of the monarchy in 1660. Upon the outbreak of the Second English Civil War in 1648, Charles fled to the Continent where he spent much of his early adulthood. The Hague served as a welcoming haven for the royal family and their loyal Royalists as Charles's older sister Mary was the wife of William II, Prince of Orange (1647–50), and mother to William III, whom would later wed Charles's niece. Furthermore, Charles and his brother James visited the court of Versailles with their mother Henrietta Maria, whom was the aunt of the French king Louis XIV. During his exile in Europe, Charles absorbed the absolutist culture characteristic of Continental Catholic powers in the seventeenth century. When Charles II returned to the Isles as King of England, Scotland, and Ireland, he also brought numerous facets of French and Dutch culture that he would utilize to create his own unique style as monarch.

In regards to art and architecture, a distinctive Restoration style developed based primarily on Continental influences. The opulence of this period style reflected the absolutism of the Continent. Rich materials such as gold and silver embellishment on dark wood and leather pieces as well as extravagant forms including natural motifs characterized this Carolean style.[119] Additionally, Charles's palaces including Windsor Castle, Belton House, and Squerryes Court, once renovated, also exhibited a Continental influence. The food, music, and dance of the Restoration court were also shaped by the French element. Yet, dress and material culture was one of the greatest cultural modes affected. Charles himself mimicked the French fashion with his adoption of the "decadent doublet" popular among male royals and courtiers of Versailles.[120] However, Charles II purposefully abandoned this garment at a critical point during his reign: a month after the devastating Great Fire of London while England was at war with France and still recuperating from the Great Plague of 1665–66.[121]

---

[119] The natural motif, exemplified by shapes such as the acanthus leaf and tulip (symbolic of the Dutch), also represented the recent interest in botany. John Evelyn himself was an avid botanist and also included observations of flora, alongside his notes concerning fashion and culture, in his diaries.

[120] 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): 112.

[121] The Great Plague of 1665–66 was one of the final strains of the Black Death, which had ravaged Europe in the medieval period, within the British Isles. The plague was confined to London and primarily afflicted only the lower orders as Charles II and his court fled to Salisbury to protect his royal person. On September 2, 1666, a large conflagration enveloped the poorer streets of London where several remnants of the plague still festered. The fire was

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." [122] A week later, Pepys observed that Charles and several "great courtiers" donned this new vestment and described it as: "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."[123] Dress historian Valerie Cumming further explains that Charles's vest was "a knee-length coat with elbow sleeves, generally confined at the waist by a sash or buckled girdle, and always worn under a tunic or surcoat."[124] This style differed from the French fashion not simply in terms of cut, shape, or length but due to the initial simplicity of the garment. During the seventeenth century, a puritanical portion of the English population considered the absolutist court culture of the Continent as the epitome of gross opulence. Luxury and "Frenchness" were often indistinguishable to certain individuals within Stuart England and consequently, what was is English was considered unembellished and prudent. In this way, the Carolean vest functioned primarily as a political tool against France as "both anti-French and anti-extravagance."[125]

Originally, Charles's vest rejected flamboyant shades and rich fabrics for more somber tones, such as black and white colors according to Pepys's description, and simpler cloth. Yet while this garment was intended to be a statement against extravagance, de Beer indicates that the Carolean vest was soon adapted into more lavish renditions.[126] A month after the introduction of the vest, Charles donned a grander version for 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 of cloth of silver, and others of other sorts, exceedingly rich … the clothes and sight of the persons was indeed very pleasing, and worth my coming, being never likely to see more gallantry while I live."[127] The return of such extravagant attire signified the royal court's lack of commitment to this new, austere, and symbolically patriotic style. The elite dress of Restoration England soon reverted to the gilded majesty of absolutist court culture.[128] Yet, Charles's attempt to establish such an anti-French and anti-extravagant garment after multiple national catastrophes revealed an attempt, however transient, for an "English," dress that rejected Continental characteristics and promoted insularity.

When Charles retired his French menswear in 1666, many courtiers at home and abroad viewed this act as a political statement against French interests and proclamation for English national character. The creation of the Carolean vest responded to a dialogue within late Stuart print culture as well as the Restoration court regarding England's dangerous reliance on Continental

---

extinguished three days later before it could reach Charles's Palace of Whitehall. Rumors abounded within the city concerning the origin of the fire and many attributed its destruction to foreigners (as late Stuart England was in the midst of the Second Anglo-Dutch War), particularly the French and Dutch. For more on the plague or the fire, see Roy Porter, *London: A Social History* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1994); and A. Lloyd Moote, Dorothy C. Moote, *The Great Plague: The Story of London's Most Deadly Year* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2008).

[122] Pepys, 195.

[123] Pepys, 195–196.

[124] Cumming, 218.

[125] Vincent, 1.

[126] For de Beer and more information concerning the extravagance of Charles's vest, see page 110 of his article, "King Charles II's Own Fashion: An Episode in Anglo-French Relations 1660–1670."

[127] Pepys, 197.

[128] As early as 1661, Charles halfheartedly attempted to control the opulence of material culture in late Stuart England. Yet, his efforts did not often extend to include the royal court. See Charles II, *By the King: 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: Roger Norton, 1661). In this royal proclamation, Charles forbade the embellishment of equipages except for himself and the royal family.

culture. Five years before the introduction of Charles's vest, prominent courtier John Evelyn utilized popular print culture to directly engage the King and his court regarding this controversial issue. Evelyn was born into an affluent family that had risen to wealth and prestige through their gunpowder business and a minor gentry title.[129] The Evelyn family's loyalty to Charles I during the English Civil Wars earned John a post as the Commissioner for disease in the counties of Kent and Sussex as well as a seat on the King's Council for Foreign Plantations. In these capacities, Evelyn engaged in frequent interactions with great and powerful political figures such as the Earl of Clarendon and the King himself.[130] Similar to his daughter Mary, author of the pamphlet *Mundus muliebris*, Evelyn provided invaluable insight into life at the Restoration court due to his position and was credited by many contemporary sources as the inspiration for Charles's new garment.

In 1661, Evelyn published a pamphlet entitled, *Tyrannus, or: The mode*, in which he vehemently rejected foreign fashions and beseeched for the establishment of an English national dress. Evelyn understood the power of dress within Restoration court culture and late Stuart society. He commented 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."[131] Evelyn emphasized the damaging effects of foreign culture to not simply the morale of Englishmen and women but to the English economy as well. He continued his pamphlet with reflections on late Stuart England's commercial interests. 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."[132] Evelyn pondered the possibilities for English national sentiment if the entire population, from prince to peasant, were united in a shared domestic-made dress:

> 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?[133]

Evelyn's perspective regarding the English dependence on foreign culture was a response to the influx of global goods in the Palace of Whitehall and on the streets of London. While England's international trade did indeed thrive at the end of the seventeenth century, several attempts were made by the English government to limit the import of foreign goods in order to bolster economic development and national feeling.

Following these thoughts by Evelyn, Charles II issued a proclamation on November 10, 1666, less than a month after the introduction of his vest, which 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

---

[129] John Evelyn, *The Diary of John Evelyn*, ix.

[130] Bowle, xiii–xv.

[131] John Evelyn, *Tyrannus; or, The mode*, ed. J. L. Nevinson (Oxford: The Luttrell Society by B. Blackwell, 1951), 2.

[132] Evelyn, *Tyrannus*, 18.

[133] Evelyn, *Tyrannus*, 22.

Displeasure."[134] During the Second Anglo-Dutch War from 1665–7, the Stuart state delivered several other similar decrees including one that prohibited all "Foreign Trade and Commerce" in 1665 and another fourteen days later that was specifically directed to the Dutch Republic: "For prohibiting the Importation or Retailing of any Commodities of the Growth or Manufacture of the States of the United Provinces."[135] Such proclamations were indeed common political statements during wartime, however, the declaration against French commodities maintained a significant place within the narrative of the Carolean vest – its issue, so recently after Charles introduced his vest to the world, reflected the importance of material culture and the politics of display for diplomacy during late seventeenth-century Europe.

In his diary, Evelyn himself humbly acknowledged the role of *Tyrannus* in the creation of the Carolean vest as he mentioned that he personally presented Charles with a copy of his pamphlet years before the King buttoned his first vest: "I had some time before indeede presented an Invectique against that unconstancy [the dominance of French fashions] … This Pamphlet I intituled *Tyrannus* or the mode, and gave it his Majestie to read; I do not impute the change which soon happn'd to this discourse, but it was an identitie, that I could not but take notice of."[136] Certainly, the dress discourse featured within late print culture, specifically works like *Mundus Muliebris* and *Tyrannus*, was not simply a public forum to discuss the important issues surrounding French fashion but also functioned as an impetus for change during the late Stuart period. The debate concerning the prevalence of Continental culture in England leapt from the pages of popular printed literature and manifested within broader socio-political events. With the introduction and initial wear of Charles's signature garment, Evelyn and other Englishmen delighted in this visual rejection of French culture. An account of the French reaction to Charles's vest indicated that Louis XIV interpreted the action as such an affront to France.

Pepys commented on November 22, 1666 that Louis XIV retaliated to Charles's vestmentary attack with the following anecdote: "The King of France hath, in defiance to the King of England, caused all his footmen to be put into vests, and that the noblemen of France will do the like; which, if true, is the greatest indignity ever done by one Prince to another, and would incite a stone to be revenged."[137] Pepys was clearly inflamed by the thought of French servants as well as aristocrats in an decidedly "English," or distinctly non-Continental, styled garb. Although several historians, including de Beer, question the accuracy of this account, Pepys's statement nevertheless revealed that early modern European powers practiced, or at least recognized, diplomacy through dress. Charles's vest reflected the tense nature of Anglo-French relations from the late 1660s to the early 1670s. The vest fad declined "with a fresh surrender to France" as Charles consigned the garment to the back of his wardrobe upon renewed relations with the French by 1672 with the outbreak of the Third Anglo-Dutch War.[138] In an addendum to his memoirs, Evelyn lamented: "It was a comely and manly habit, too good to hold, it being impossible for us in good earnest to leave ye Monsieurs vanities long."[139]

---

[134] Charles II, *By the King: 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: John Bill and Christopher Barker, 1666).

[135] Charles II, *By the King: A proclamation forbidding foreign trade and commerce* (London: John Bill and Christopher Barker, 1665); Charles II, *By the King: A proclamation for prohibiting the importation or retailing of any commodities of the growth or manufacture of the states of the United Provinces* (London: John Bill and Christopher Barker, 1665).

[136] Evelyn, *The Diary of John Evelyn*, 216.

[137] Pepys, 198.

[138] de Beer, 111.

[139] John Evelyn, *Memoirs, Illustrative of the Life and Writings of John Evelyn*, ed. William Bray (London: H. Colburn, 1819), 399. While the distinctive Carolean vest was considered passé by the 1670s, Kuchta's *The Three-Piece Suit and Modern Masculinity: England, 1550–1850* (2002) emphasizes the significance of the garment for the development of the modern

While male royals and courtiers, including Charles II, frequently utilized clothing as a political tool, material culture also provided elite women, such as the Queen, formerly Catherine of Braganza, with a mode to participate in the wider, masculine discourse of politics. Despite their exclusion from official governmental posts, female courtiers consistently acted to promote their own personal or familial interests by establishing factional alliances within the court and gaining the King's favor. Elite women, whether a member of the royal family or a noble paramour, could help or hinder the court's appeal and accessibility to the nation, its general population, and other states. Recent studies have proposed a reevaluation of elite women by focusing upon female agency in the cultural, political, and religious life of their respective realm. Particularly, the royal consorts of British sovereigns, such as Catherine of Braganza and Mary of Modena, have only lately received substantial attention within historical scholarship. *Queenship in Britain, 1660–1837: Royal Patronage, Court Culture and Dynastic Politics* (2002) by Clarissa Campbell Orr seeks to acknowledge the manner in which queen consorts contributed to court culture. 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 particular historian. Scholars such as British art historian Jeremy Wood contend that the political and cultural significance of royal women should not be exaggerated. However, 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.

Ambiguity regarding English national identity in the late Stuart courts can also be observed with the physical and cultural transformation of Charles's Portuguese and Catholic wife, Catherine of Braganza. Catherine was the daughter of King John IV of Portugal (1640–56) and his wife Luiza Maria (1613–1666), daughter of the Spanish ruler Juan Manuel Domingo Perez de Guzmán, eighth duke of Medina Sidonia. Edward Corp, Professor of British History at the University of Toulouse, argues that Catherine derived from "a parvenu dynasty, still trying to establish itself in a far-away and vulnerable country, which could provide her with little diplomatic support" when she would later reign as the Queen of England, Scotland, and Ireland.[140] Her early life in Lisbon remains much of a mystery before marital negotiations between Portuguese and English representatives were completed in the spring of 1661. Yet, Catherine's significance to this thesis for her role in shaping cultural identity within Restoration England truly began with her marriage to Charles II.

When Charles signed his marriage treaty to Catherine on June 23, 1661, England's role in the global economy greatly increased. Catherine's dowry granted England the rich trade ports of Tangier and Bombay as well as free trading rights within the East Indies and Brazil. Thus, Charles's marriage to Catherine allowed for England to gain a strategic foothold in Asia and stimulated a flow of East Asian goods into London.[141] Catherine maintained an important role in the importation of foreign culture that was so lamented by authors such as John Evelyn. Evelyn noted the presence of such commodities in the queen's own apartments with the following observation: "the Queene brought

---

male suit as well as the Victorian conception of masculinity. Therefore, although this particular article of clothing was no longer the fashion it remained important for the development of modern history.

[140] 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), 53.

[141] 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).

over with her from Portugal, such Indian Cabinets and large trunks of Laccar, as had never before ben seene here."[142]

However, Evelyn's pleasurable awe of such foreign articles was reduced by his animosity towards Continental culture as evident with his unflattering initial descriptions of Catherine's physical appearance. He recorded 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."[143] The exotic nature of Catherine's native court dress, the bulky and oddly shaped farthingale, contributed to the unflattering image of Portuguese fashion and beauty that Evelyn described.[144] The ridiculous form of this garment as well as her unusual hairstyle earned further critical remarks on her appearance including a comment from Charles II himself that compared her to a bat. Irish courtier Anthony Hamilton maintained a similar opinion of this new foreign queen and her ghastly ladies:

> The new Queen gave but little additional brilliancy to the
> Court, either in her person or in her retinue, which was 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.[145]

These English perspectives concerning Catherine's exoticism reflected the deeper social, political, and cultural tensions of the Restoration period as Corp notes that among other issues, "her thirty years in England coincided with an extraordinary and unparalleled outburst of anti-Catholic feeling."[146]

When Catherine joined the Restoration court, she entered a cultural battleground between courtiers, such as Evelyn, who denounced foreign fashions and those who luxuriated in absolutist court culture including Charles's brother James and Louise de Kéroualle. In this space, foreign women were particularly viewed with scrutiny as carriers of Continental culture with considerable influence over the king. Catherine, a doubly foreign entity as both Portuguese and Catholic, needed to alter her physical presence in order to compete with the other female personalities of the Restoration court, including Charles's dynamic English mistresses such as Barbara Palmer, the Countess of Castlemaine, Frances Stuart, the Duchess of Richmond and Lennox, and the actress Nell Gwyn as well as his Charles's beloved sister Henriette Anne, Duchess d'Orléans and the sister-in-law of King Louis XIV of France. In his article within *Queenship in Britain*, Corp analyzes how Catherine, a strange wife from one of the most Catholic nations in Continental Europe, developed a distinctive identity within the Carolean court. According to Corp, Catherine "put herself forward as *the* patron of Italian culture in opposition to the French culture represented" by Louise de Kéroualle, the Duchess of Portsmouth and French courtesan of Charles II.[147] Catherine appointed Italian composer Giovanni Sebenico to the position of Master of Italian music at her own personal chapel while she commissioned the Baroque artist Benedetto Gennari to paint many devotional works and

---

[142] Evelyn, *The Diary of John Evelyn*, 195.

[143] Evelyn, *The Diary of John Evelyn*, 194.

[144] The farthingale, the formal court dress of Continental powers such as Portugal and Spain, is described in further detail in the following chapter, "Gendered Garb."

[145] Anthony Hamilton, *Memoirs of the Court of Charles II* (New York: P.F. Collier & Son, 1910), 104.

[146] Corp, 53.

[147] Corp, 56.

court portraits.[148] The Queen's political and cultural ingenuity was further illustrated in her artful maneuver to oust Louise by encouraging the amorous liaison between Charles and the bewitching Italian aristocrat Hortense Mancini, Duchess Mazarin and the aunt of Mary of Modena.

By the end of the 1660s, Queen Catherine's position in the Carolean court transformed from an obscure and barren foreign bride to a beloved English consort and contributor to the distinctive court culture of the Restoration period. Catherine's cultural makeover was also evident through her physical person. Corp observed that Jacob Huysmans's portrait of Catherine of Braganza from circa 1662–65 reflected a queen whom was more comfortable in her new English environment. He argues that in this painting, "Catherine grew in confidence and chose a more statuesque appearance. We also see that her curled foretop and falling ringlets gradually gave way to the hair style of the 1670s."[149] Catherine discarded her Mediterranean coiffure and significantly contributed to the rise of a new style within the English royal court. Furthermore, mere days after the Great Fire ravaged much of London, Catherine donned a more Anglicized fashion as a political statement. Pepys recorded that on September 7, 1666, "The Queene was now in her Cavaliers riding habite, hat and feather and horsemans Coate, going to take the aire."[150] Catherine's "cavalier" riding attire reflected the Royalist garb sported by Stuart supporters during the English Civil Wars in the decades preceding Charles's Restoration. Similar to the Carolean vest, which Charles introduced a month later, Catherine's nostalgic attire served as a mode to promote English national sentiment among a devastated populace and, perhaps, improve her image within the court.

Catherine's transformation into an English, or non-Continental styled, queen was absolute through her dress as well as her contributions to both Restoration court culture and English culture in general. Her cultural influence irrevocably shaped perceptions of English national character and the culture of the modern British nation-state. Catherine facilitated the spread of the calico, or painted Indian cotton that would later become a staple commodity of the eighteenth-century British Empire. Moreover, the Portuguese princess introduced and popularized the practice of tea as a recreational beverage, not simply a medicinal remedy, to late Stuart England.[151] Due to its lasting role in English culture, Catherine further distorted 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.

Women's Wear and Restoration Court Politics

While Catherine of Braganza maintained considerable influence in the formation of Restoration court culture, other Stuart scholars stress the more central role of the mistress over the queen consort within the space of the royal court. Rather than cultivating favor with Charles' queen consort and wife, courtiers beseeched his aristocratic courtesans, including Barbara Palmer and Louise de Kéroualle. Stuart historian Nancy Klein Maguire advocates the unparalleled "real political and diplomatic power" of the Carolean mistress over the King.[152] For these ladies, 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.

---

[148] Corp, 59.
[149] Corp, 61.
[150] Pepys, 215.
[151] Corp, 64.
[152] Eveline Cruickshanks, ed., *The Stuart Courts* (Thrupp, Gloucestershire: Sutton Publishing, 2000), 7.

A women's material wealth, 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.[153] Charles's plentiful and competitive array of mistresses utilized their material wealth to demonstrate their dominant position in the court and over one another. Clothing was another mode that Barbara Palmer, Duchess of Cleveland and Countess of Castlemaine, employed for asserting supremacy over her adversaries. Born to the Royalist Villiers clan, Barbara first met Charles II during his exile at The Hague in 1660 and would serve as his principal mistress for approximately twenty–five years. By 1661, Barbara reigned within the Restoration court as Charles's most beloved courtesan and mother of several of the King's illegitimate children. This position was symbolically conveyed through her material possessions to her latest rival, Catherine of Braganza, on the morning of Charles's wedding to the Portuguese princess. Barbara instructed that her petticoats from the previous evening, once freshly laundered, be hung in the royal gardens where every courtier could witness her luxurious undergarments. As Pepys observed, "And in the Privy-garden saw the finest smocks and linnen petticoats of my Lady Castlemaine's, laced with rich lace at the bottom, that ever I saw; and did me good to look upon them."[154] Her fine petticoats informed the entire court, including Charles's new foreign bride, that the homegrown Lady Castlemaine dominated the space of the English royal court.

Therefore, the spectacle of fine things was not simply a demonstration of who owned more extravagant garments but an expression of personal power in Restoration court politics. In her article, "The Mistresses of Charles II and Restoration Court Politics," Sonya Wynne describes how late Stuart courtiers measured a mistress's power by the 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."[155] 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."[156] Barbara Palmer and Louise de Kéroualle received considerable annuities from the Crown and thus broadcasted their influence over the King through their extravagant clothes and possessions. The notorious rivalry between Louise and Nell Gwyn escalated when the Duchess of Portsmouth continually rode past the English actress' comparatively humble abode in her ostentatious coach as a visual reminder to her competition 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 Louise as well as Barbara Palmer.[157]

---

[153] Vincent, 9.

[154] Pepys, 62–63.

[155] Sonya Wynne, "The Mistresses of Charles II and Restoration Court Politics," in *The Stuart Courts*, ed. Eveline Cruickshanks (Thrupp, Gloucestershire: Sutton Publishing, 2000), 173.

[156] Patricia Francis Cholakian, *Women and the Politics of Self-Representation in Seventeenth-Century France* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2000), 95.

[157] The relation between gender and material culture is discussed in Chapter IV, "Gendered Garb." For more on how the Carolean mistresses were portrayed in early modern literature, see the following satirical novellas: *The Life, Amours, and Secret History of Francelia, Late Duchess of Portsmouth, Favourite Mistress to King Charles II* (London: A. Amey, 1734); and Gabriel de Brémond, *Hattige: or The Amours of the King of Tamaran, A Novel* (Amsterdam: Simon the African, at the Black-Prince in the Sun, 1683).

Louise de Kéroualle: The "Franco-Catholic Whore"

In the Restoration court, Louise de Kéroualle's clothing and possessions did not simply function as an emblem of power. Like Catherine of Braganza, the material culture of the foreign mistress contributed to the creation of different perceptions of identity in late seventeenth-century England. Throughout her fifteen years as Charles' courtesan, the French, and therefore Catholic, Duchess of Portsmouth consistently flaunted her nationality. By the climax of the Popish Plot in 1680, she gained intense notoriety as a destructive agent of vice, fornication, and espionage against the English Crown. Charges of treason were brought against her for promoting the Papist and French interests by facilitating and engaging in clandestine meetings between the King and French ambassadors. One article by Parliament even cited her role as an intermediary of French culture as criminal. Louise was accused of planting a French confectioner within the Restoration court who allegedly attempted to poison Charles II with sweetmeats. Such an accusation was perhaps proposed in relation to the contemporary Affair of the Poisons, a period of scandal at Louis XIV's court in the late 1670s and early 1680s wherein many prominent aristocrats were accused, condemned, and executed for using poisons to commit murder. Therefore, Louise's relationship with the King and within the Restoration court was viewed as dangerous to the monarchy itself as well as English national sentiment.[158]

Although several of the numerous charges against her were superfluous, Louise, like Barbara Palmer, was indeed a central figure in the intricacies of court politics. As a beloved mistress of the King, she also utilized clothing and other possessions to communicate her political position or allegiance to France within the space of the royal court. When a notable or noble French personage died, Louise donned mourning wear in order to visibly and publicly reinforce her close connections to the aristocracy of France. Although Louise's own noble lineage was questionable due to the obscurity of her family's Breton title, she employed her dress to communicate her Frenchness and devotion to her native country. Nell Gwyn, the famed English-born "Protestant Whore," once remarked, "She claims that everyone in France is her relation; the moment some great one dies she puts on mourning."[159] In response to one occasion wherein Louise donned her mourning attire, Nell herself wore black the next day "claiming that she was mourning for the recently deceased Cham of Tartary," because she was as related to this Mongol prince as Portsmouth was to a French duke.[160] As a former citizen of France who conversed often with French ministers, the Duchess of Portsmouth's display indicated her political inclinations towards France and thus incited sardonic responses that addressed both domestic and foreign politics. Another example of this display of French culture was evident in an observation from John Evelyn in 1683 regarding the luxurious splendor of the Louise's apartments: "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."[161] Like her mourning dress, Louise's home displayed the opulence of her native France to the English ministers whom frequently gathered there to confer with the King Charles II about important matters of state.

---

[158] For a complete list of charges, see *Articles of high-treason and other high crimes and misdemeanours against the Dutchess of Portsmouth* (London: J.S., 1680).

[159] John Harold Wilson, *Nell Gwyn, Royal Mistress* (New York: Pellegrini & Cudahy, 1952), 182.

[160] Wilson, 154–155.

[161] Evelyn, *The Diary of John Evelyn*, 308.

Conclusion

Fashion and material culture in the late Stuart courts operated as both a mode to express or engage in politics as well as a way to examine different forms of identity, such as national, political, or religious affiliations, during the late seventeenth century. From the anonymous author of popular print to the King of England himself, Englishmen and women utilized dress to negotiate identity. The rise of globalization within late Stuart England provided the population with various cultural images from other lands to utilize for comparison in the search for their own English national character. The "exotic" infiltrated the English metropole; *chinoiserie*, an artistic style of goods and commodities in the late seventeenth century, dominated London shops while John Evelyn diligently recorded and appraised the Eastern garb of Turkish, Persian, and Muscovite ambassadors whom visited Charles's court. Consequently, differing concepts of "Englishness" and "Otherness" emerged from such cultural examinations of dress within print and the royal court. The "Continental Other," the European foreign, manifested within Stuart court dress, notably with the absolutist fashions of Charles II, and Louise de Kéroualle's Frenchified abode.[162] Alternatively, Catherine of Braganza's personal belongings represented another "Other," the Eastern exotic. These conceptions of national character and identity facilitated visible responses, such as the Carolean vest, from Englishmen and women within the court and capital.

Furthermore, the diplomatic dress of the Restoration period did not simply address the issue of nationality but also gender in the politicized rhetoric of late Stuart costume. Women actively engaged in this dress discourse – as Anthony Hamilton observed in his *Memoirs of the Court of Charles II* that, "a woman does not dress herself with so much care for nothing."[163] The following chapter analyzes the physical image and clothing of such women, as well as men, within late Stuart England in order to illustrate the interconnected relationship of different forms of identity with the deeper oppositional tensions of the era.

---

[162] The phrase, "Continental Other," is utilized here to propose an additional dimension to Colley's theory of "Otherness." This thesis employs the phrase to represent the foreignness of Continental European absolutism in comparison to the Protestantism and constitutionalism of the British Isles.

[163] Hamilton, 228–229.

IV.
Gendered Garb
Sexual Dynamics and Late Stuart Court Dress

The courtly attire of fops, gallants, whores, and top-knots did not solely problematize perceptions of national, political and religious identity in late seventeenth century England.[164] English conceptions of gender, another form of social identification, were undermined by the permanence of Restoration court culture throughout early modern London. The royal garb of the late Carolean and Jacobean courts entangled notions of gender identity with nationality, political affiliation, and religion. In contrast to the period's fluid conceptions of English national character, gender roles, and dynamics were relatively established within late Stuart England. Restoration court dress traversed these gender boundaries by distorting the dichotomy between the masculine and the feminine. Late seventeenth century modish, and thus predominantly French, male fashions were viewed by a portion of the English population as effeminate while another popular perspective depicted the mistress with emasculating power due to her spectacular material wealth.

Such interpretations of fashionable men and women were embodied in the fanciful caricatures that dominated late Stuart print culture from approximately 1660–1700. The inspiration for these characters, including the Frenchified fop and the modernized mistress, originated in the royal court. As the previous chapters have demonstrated, popular late seventeenth century treatises and pamphlets on fashion addressed the late Stuart state in response to the paramount, contemporary issues within England, such as cultural imperialism, diplomacy, and gender dynamics.[165] In her article on gendered characters in Restoration drama, Moira Casey argues that "the comedy of the manners" found within late Stuart literature "became a representation of as well as commentary on the values of the court."[166] Printed works that reflected the ambiguity concerning gender dynamics in late Stuart London were modeled after Restoration courtiers such as Barbara Palmer, the Duchess of Cleveland, Louise de Kéroualle, the Duchess of Portsmouth, John Wilmot, the second Earl of Rochester and Charles II himself. Therefore, this chapter links the elite attire of Charles's court to the popular literary discourse on clothing, material goods, and physical appearance. Such an analysis indicates how material culture was a significant factor in determining gender roles in late seventeenth century England. Additionally, examining the association between gender and dress further reveals the role of material culture in the development of different forms of identity at the twilight of the early modern period.

Defining Dandies: Girly Gallants and Fancy Fops

The fashionable gentleman of the Restoration was portrayed in various forms through picture and print. An extensive rhetoric emerged during the late seventeenth century centered on the numerous interpretations of the modish man including descriptions of his personal characteristics, physical appearance, and habits. One of the most popular personalities in late Stuart print culture

---

[164] A "top-knot" denotes "a knot or bow of ribbon worn on the top of the head by ladies towards the end of the seventeenth and in the eighteenth century." (*Oxford English Dictionary*) Yet, the term also refers to the woman who dons such an extravagant hairstyle. These top-knots served as theatrical characters in late Stuart print culture with exaggerated versions of the faddish style.

[165] See Chapter II, "The Character of Clothes: Representations of Dress in Late Stuart Print Culture," and Chapter III, "Diplomatic Dress: Threading the Nation with Restoration Fashion", of this thesis.

[166] Moira E. Casey, "The Fop: 'Apes and Echoes of Men': Gentlemanly Ideals and the Restoration," in *Fools and Jesters in Literature, Art, and History,* ed. Vicki K. Janik (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1998), 207.

was the gallant, a Casanova-like character predominantly defined as a philanderer but also referred to a "man of fashion and pleasure" or a "fine gentleman."[167] The anonymous author of the sardonic pamphlet, *The Character of a town-gallant exposing the extravagant fopperies of some vain self-conceited pretenders to gentility and good breeding* (1675) identified a "town-gallant" as a "Bundle of Vanity, composed of Ignorance and Pride, Folly, and Debauchery; a silly Huffing thing, three parts Fop, and the rest Hector."[168] This formula for a gallant indicates its close association with the fop, a gentleman "who is foolishly attentive to and vain of his appearance, dress, or manners."[169] As an exquisite dandy, the fop was depicted as a more ridiculous, unmanly character than the gallant who maintained a trace of machismo with his small portion of the Hector, a "swaggering fellow, a swash-buckler, a braggart, blusterer, or bully."[170]

A gallant fully embraced all the decadence and debauchery characteristic of the Restoration ecourt. He attended balls and the theater, visited St. James's Park in his splendid equipage, maintained a mistress in excellent fashion and, of course, always dressed in the finest attire found within the shops of London. The author of *The Character of a town-gallant* emphasized the role of clothing in the creation of the town-gallant's identity. The gallant's "first care is his Dress, and next his Body, and in the fitting these two together, consists his Soul and all its Faculties."[171] Devotion to fashion was such an important facet of his identity that dress became entangled with and indistinguishable from the gallant's other characteristics, specifically his negative attributes. His clothes were an extension of his immorality as the author of the comical printed piece, *The parable of the puppies* (1691) explained that "all his Discourse is of Dresses, Pimps and Whores, or the like insignificant Stuff, embroidered now and then with Oaths and God-d---mes, which renders him the Scorn of all Civil Company."[172] *The Character of a town-gallant* also stressed this association between costume and iniquity with claims that the gallant "is valuable just according to the price of his Suit, and the merits of his Taylor: A Spawn of Gentility, that inherits only the Vices of his Ancestors, and is like to entail nothing but Infamy and Diseases on Posterity."[173]

The gallant's depravity can be attributed largely to his rampant sexuality, which was intricately tied to the consumption of material culture. In *The Character of a town-gallant,* the gallant's debauchery was reflected in his search for women, who were identified solely by their attire: "Every thing with him is an incentive to Lust, and every Woman Devil enough to tempt him, Covent-Garden Silk-Gowns, and Wapping Wast-coateers, are equally his Game, for he watches Wenches just as Tumblers do Rabbets, and plays with Women as he does at Cards, not caring what Suit he turns up Trump."[174] Similar to the Restoration rake, a character personified by the libertine Earl of Rochester and defined as "a fashionable or stylish man of dissolute or promiscuous habits," the gallant's sexual prowess with the fairer sex was one of the most significant characteristics of his

---

[167] "Gallant, adj. and n.," *Oxford English Dictionary Online*. December 2012. Oxford University Press. http://www.oed.com.proxy.lib.muohio.edu/view/Entry/76238?rskey=GdjaNb&result=1&isAdvanced=false (accessed January 5, 2013).

[168] *The Character of a town-gallant exposing the extravagant fopperies of some vain self-conceited pretenders to gentility and good breeding* (London: W.L., 1675), 2.

[169] "Fop, n.," *Oxford English Dictionary Online*. December 2012. Oxford University Press. http://www.oed.com.proxy.lib.muohio.edu/view/Entry/72746?rskey=Xbmmy6&result=1 (accessed January 5, 2013).

[170] "Hector, n." *Oxford English Dictionary Online*. December 2012. Oxford University Press. http://www.oed.com.proxy.lib.muohio.edu/view/Entry/85354?rskey=iGYdQw&result=1&isAdvanced=false (accessed January 5, 2013).

[171] *The Character of a town-gallant,* 2.

[172] *The parable of the puppies, or, The top-knots vindicated* (London: T. Burdet, 1691), 4.

[173] *The Character of a town-gallant,* 2.

[174] *The Character of a town-gallant,* 3.

identity in late seventeenth-century English society.[175] The gallant's successful amorous relationships with women proved his masculinity despite his rather unmanly devotion to clothes and perfumes. Yet, Casey notes that the ideal gentleman of Restoration England "pays attention to his clothes and dresses fashionably, but at the same time does not overly concern himself with his scent and appearance."[176] Restoration ideals of masculinity emphasized that an Englishman should display "a certain nonchalance" in regards feminized trifles, such as dress and luxury items.[177] Thus while his heterosexuality, however licentious, reflected his masculinity, the gallant's intense interest in fashion was criticized in popular print culture during the late seventeenth century.

However, the character of the fop, or the "the clown of the Restoration," served as a greater source of public and literary ridicule in late Stuart London than the shameless, yet thoroughly masculine gallant and rake.[178] The fop "reveal[ed] much about ideal traits of both masculinity and femininity during the period of the Restoration" by crossing the boundaries between sexes.[179] To a greater extreme than the gallant, the fop embodied "a meticulous adherence to trivialities of style, a ridiculously extreme attention to the fine points of etiquette, and an overemphasis on fashion and adornment" which all corresponded "to Restoration notions of femininity."[180] In contrast to the town-gallant and rake caricatures, the fop was fundamentally feminine and, therefore, always remained unsuccessful in his sexual pursuits of women, who spurned him for his unattractive attention to fashion. Several printed works of the late seventeenth century reflected this female perspective of comic foppery.

The anonymous author of *The parable of the puppies, or, The top-knots vindicated* adopted a feminized voice to combat the critique of female fashions in John Dunton's *The parable of the top-knots* (1691) by attacking men for their own vestimentary hypocrisy. *The parable of the puppies* responded to Dunton, a prominent bookseller of late Stuart London, by acknowledging the femininity of the foppish man: "And the Author of the Top-Knots had better held his Peace, than provok'd a Female Pen against the Fops of his Sex; pretty Womanish things, that first taught us, and now exceed us in all manner of Effeminacy."[181] In the flowery prose of the work, the author condemned the foppish rituals of personal appearance, including the application of elaborate hairstyles and cosmetics normally associated with femininity. The pamphlet sardonically queried, "Is it not a manly Exercise to stand licking his Lips into Rubies, painting his Cheeks into Cherries, patching his Pim-ginits, Carbuncles and Buboes?"[182] Such a toilette was viewed as too feminine even in the minds of Englishwomen who "laugh[ed] in her Sleeve at the ridiculous effeminacy and softness of him, who might otherwise pass for a Man."[183]

This perspective illustrated how the fop was identified within Restoration society as a foil to the ultramasculine gallant or rake "and as an example of gentlemanly breeding taken too far."[184] Cultural imperialism of the late seventeenth century, predominantly from France, eroded the masculinity of the Englishman. Andrew Williams argues that the fops of Restoration comedy were

---

[175] "Rake, n.7," *Oxford English Dictionary Online*. December 2012. Oxford University Press. http://www.oed.com.proxy.lib.muohio.edu/view/Entry/157646?rskey=uZ67aq&result=7 (accessed January 5, 2013).

[176] Casey, 210.

[177] Casey, 210.

[178] Casey, 209.

[179] Casey, 207.

[180] Casey, 208.

[181] *The parable of the puppies, or, The top-knots vindicated* (London: T. Burdet, 1691), 3.

[182] *The parable of the puppies,* 3.

[183] *The parable of the puppies,* 4.

[184] Casey, 211.

not born, but fashioned.[185] He explains that, "Their natural state has been perverted or denied by a 'studious search' of fashion where the character is routinely depicted as somewhat of 'less' than a 'natural' man."[186] Therefore, the fop served as "a faded version of a man, a 'shadow' or an 'echo' of the gallant" in Restoration society due to the deluge of French fashions that overwhelmed England during the late seventeenth century.[187] This process of demasculinization and Frenchification represented what Casey refers to as ""the false wit, exaggerated fashions, and superficial aspirations of pretentious Restoration courtiers."[188]

The Frenchification of the Fop

A man's passionate obsession with fashion, effeminate characteristics, and consumption of Continental goods "Frenchified" him into the character of the fop during the Restoration era. This process of Frenchification revealed the entangled nature of gender, nationality, and dress at the end of early modern Europe. Foppish courtiers were regarded by English popular culture as the embodiment of effeminacy and flamboyant French culture. As evident by the numerous satirical publications circulating within late seventeenth-century London, many experienced difficulty differentiating between the elite Englishmen who fetishized French fashions and outlandish foreign courtiers who dressed in ladies' attire and applied copious amounts of rouge. The infamously feminine figures of the French royal court further solidified the English association between France and foppery. One of the great effeminates of Louis XIV's court was his brother Philippe d'Orléans or "Monsieur," the duke of Anjou and husband of Charles's sister Henrietta.

Seventeenth century Europe produced a wealth of personal correspondence and memoirs that allowed for the dissemination of court gossip, particularly surrounding Monsieur, between the British Isles and the Continent.[189] Additionally, the English princess Henrietta's position as the wife of Philippe certainly contributed to her homeland's identification of French courtiers as feminine fops. For English audiences of the late Stuart period, Monsieur served as the epitome of foppish effeminacy. Louis Crompton argues that Philippe's femininity was "an essential part of his nature" and his identity in late seventeenth-century France.[190] From an early age, Anne of Austria encouraged her son Philippe, who possessed a "delicate beauty," regarding his affinity for girlish clothes and amusements.[191] Such interests persisted into his adulthood. Philippe d'Orléans adored all the feminine aspects in seventeenth-century life; Crompton states that Monsieur was captivated by "women's dresses and adornments, loved jewels, perfumes, huge wigs, colorful ribbons, high heels, and malicious gossip"[192] Philippe's transvestitism was a central component of his feminine personality and played a significant role in how the English linked conceptions of Frenchness and foppery.

Yet while the fop character was indeed exceedingly feminine, he was never portrayed as a transvestite or homosexual.[193] Fops did not dress in women's clothes but did dress *womanly* in perceived nature to the English eye. Furthermore, popular culture emphasized his gendered

---

[185] Andrew P. Williams, *The Restoration Fop: Gender Boundaries and Comic Characterization in Later Seventeenth Century Drama* (Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen Press, 1995), 41.
[186] Williams, 41.
[187] Casey, 211.
[188] Casey, 208.
[189] Louis Crompton, *Homosexuality & Civilization* (Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University, 2003) 339.
[190] Crompton, 341.
[191] Crompton, 341.
[192] Crompton, 341.
[193] Casey, 209.

characteristics over his sexuality in contrast to other Restoration characters such as the rake, the notorious philanderer in English society. Casey explains that the fop was "a manifestation of the asexual nature of the fool" because while he "value[d] his reputation as a ladies' man" the fop could "succeed neither in heterosexual relationships with women nor in the homosocial world of the Restoration rakes."[194] Although Philippe d'Orléans's identity as a cross-dresser and sodomite did not contribute to his association with the Frenchified fop, his feminized image and intense interest in women's fashion united the perceptions of the foppish and French, and thus tied gender and nationality.

Another significant facet of Frenchification was the fop's ridiculously outlandish clothing and overall physical appearance. Similar to the colorful motley of Renaissance jesters, the fop's ostentatious and exaggerated costume conveyed a similar image of foolishness to a portion of the English population who recalled the simplicity of Cromwell's Interregnum. Charles and his court looked to the French court for the latest styles as "French fashions were ahead of English ones."[195] France was the mode for fashion and luxury in the seventeenth century as Iris Brooke argues that in Restoration London, "it was indeed more fashionable to pretend not to be English than to pride oneself on the age and nobility of one's family."[196]

Even though many modish Englishmen and women enthusiastically observed the fashion principles of Louis's Parisian court, others questioned and scorned French styles due to their gross opulence and extremity. In seventeenth-century France, male and female dress's "frills and furbelows had been carried to excess, where each new peculiarity was exaggerated almost out of control."[197] Brooke describes the hilarious immobility caused by a woman's extravagant French ensemble: "great bunches and bows of ribbon worn on the shoes, the deep lace collar from shoulder to elbow that practically pinioned a woman's arms to her sides and the long pointed stomacher which made the curtsy a movement from the knees only."[198] Additionally, garments on the Continent often produced comical silhouettes such as the farthingale, "a structure, variously shaped, using hoops of rushes, wood, wire or whalebone, for expanding the skirt of a gown under which it was worn."[199] The Catherine wheel farthingale produced a ridiculous "tub-shaped hang of the skirt."[200]

French clothing was not simply bizarre or peculiar to the English eye but extremely opulent. Wigs, or periwigs, were often dusted with gold filings "so that they might glint in the sunlight or candlelight."[201] Articles of clothing and hairstyles were superfluously embellished as men and women utilized "Pulvillio," which Mary Evelyn described as a "Sweet Powder for the Hair" in the attached "A Short Supplement to the Fop-Dictionary" of *Mundus foppensis* as well as "Orangers," or "Gloves scented with Oranges."[202] Indeed, "no form of personal adornment was deemed too extravagant to have its adherents" in foppish costume.[203] Every component of the fop's ensemble was intricately embellished and simplicity denoted one's deficiency of seventeenth-century Continental style. In *The*

---

[194] Casey, 209.

[195] Iris Brooke, *Dress and Undress: Restoration and Eighteenth Century* (1958; repr., Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1973), 5.

[196] Brooke, 25.

[197] Brooke, 16.

[198] Brooke, 16.

[199] Valerie Cumming, C. W. Cunnington and P. E. Cunnington, The Dictionary of Fashion History (New York: Berg Press, 2010), 79.

[200] Cumming, 35.

[201] Brooke, 25

[202] *Mundus foppensis*, 26.

[203] Brooke, 25

parable of the puppies, or, The top-knots vindicated, the fop character emphasized the importance of excessive ornamentation in the creation of his Frenchified identity:

> He thinks it the rankest Heresie in the World, to believe any
> Man can be Wise or Noble, that is in plain Cloaths. And therefore
> looks down with Contempt on every body, whose Wigg is not right
> Flaxon; And calls the whole Tribe of Levy dull Fellows, because
> they go in Black, and wonders any People should think they can
> ever speak Sence, When they wear neither Lac'd Crevats, nor
> Pantaloons.[204]

The fop explained that dull shades and unlaced clothes were taboo in fashionable English society; the plain, unembellished garb of English Puritans, like Oliver Cromwell, and Jews were viewed critically by the modish gentility. The loud colors and tawdry trimmings of French fashions were the essential accoutrements for a fop's wardrobe. Therefore, the fop's adherence to outlandish French fashions further reinforced the English conception of the character's Frenchification.

Many works of late Stuart print culture, including several addressed to the Charles II and his Restoration court, directly acknowledged the "French" characteristics of the fop character. The authors of these poetical satires vividly illustrated how the fop dressed, acted, and spoke in the French manner, much to the detriment of the English population and nation as a whole. Consequently, the Frenchified fop projected a negative image of "social otherness" in late Stuart England comparable to Colley's theory of "Otherness" in relation to modernized notions of English national feeling.[205] Through Frenchification, "the fop displayed an unparalleled deficiency of social aptitude which castigated him to the fringes of fashionable society" in late Stuart England.[206] The Frenchified fop's marginalized role in English society was evident in the multitude of pamphlets, treatises, and plays that caricaturized this fool.

Several of these printed works identified the fop's use of specific language as significant in the process of Frenchification. Chapter II, "The Character of Clothes: Representations of Dress in Late Stuart Print Culture," revealed how the French language influenced the discourse of fashionable dress in Restoration England. The fop was Frenchified not simply by his devotion to French fashions but also by his habitual use of French terms in everyday life. The anonymous author of *The parable of the puppies* scorned the fop's depreciatory use of French terminology in the following description of a conversation between two sparkish, or foppish, men: "I will not trouble you with all the Impertinent Dialogue that passes between 'em; but after they have Parrotted over the Brandenburgh, Chedreux, Escla't, Orangers, Picards, Pulvilio, Rous, Surtout, and a deal more of Ribble Rabble, Pedlers French … the spark sallies forth of his Chamber like a Peacock."[207] The term, "Pedlar's French," referred to an antiquated and base rhetoric "used by criminals among themselves" and, hence, signified an "unintelligible jargon," or "gibberish."[208] Instead of socially elevating himself as a modish man of sophisticated civility, the fops' Frenchified language criminalized him within English society as he became associated with ostracized groups such as peddlers and rogues.

---

[204] *The parable of the puppies*, 3–4.
[205] Williams, 44.
[206] Williams, 37.
[207] *The parable of the puppies,* 3.
[208] "Pedlar, peddler, n.1". *Oxford English Dictionary Online.* December 2012. Oxford University Press. http://www.oed.com.proxy.lib.muohio.edu/view/Entry/139635?redirectedFrom=peddler (accessed January 5, 2013).

The character of the Frenchified fop reveals how late Stuart England intertwined gender, nationality, and dress in the formation of one's identity. The fop's Frenchification reflected the dichotomy between French and English culture that dominated the Restoration era. Casey advocates that "the fop's most instructive quality was his embodiment of the France-England competition" of the late seventeenth century.[209] Late Stuart print culture also identified the tension between these two cultural forces in several satirical works. *The Character of a town-gallant* lamented the loss of English virtue for the feminized, foreign antics popular among the nation's male youth, the fledging fops. The broadside explained that that fop adopted a "New Mode" every month, and "instead of true Gallantry (which once dwelt in the Breasts of Englishmen) he is made up of Complements, Cringes, Knots, Fancies, Perfumes, and a thousand French Apish Tricks."[210] An immoral, Frenchified toilette directed his existence as he "placeth his very Essence in his outside, and his only Prayers are, that his Father may go to the Devil expeditiously, and the Estate hold out to keep his Miss, and himself in good Equipage."[211]

The feminized authorial voice of *The parable of the puppies* echoed these sentiments regarding the depravity of the Englishman's devotion to French culture. In the final verses of the text, the author countered on the foppish men who criticized women for their extravagant appearance and appealed to the fop that he reclaim his masculinity for the good of the entire English population, including both sexes: "I dare be bold to challenge you in the Name of all our Sex; begin you, and shew a good Example, leave off all this effeminate Clutter; abandon your Fopperies and Vices, and act like Men of Sense, and I'll engage the Women will quickly follow your Steps."[212] Only the consignment of French fashions and the adoption of a reformed "English" dress would bolster national sentiment in order for both men and women to reassume "the ancient Spirit and Valour of our renown'd Ancestors the Picts … and make all the World to tremble at the Name of the English Amazons."[213]

The Town–Misse: The Modernized Mistress and "Independent Woman"

Similar to male characters of the gallant, rake, and fop during the Restoration era, late Stuart print culture also produced caricatured conceptions of femininity. Such characters as the fantastical top-knot, the foppet or feminized version of the fop, and the controversial "town-misse," a domineering and materialistic courtesan, addressed the same themes and issues as their male counterparts. Particularly, the misse revealed the changing perceptions of gender dynamics during late seventeenth-century England. The image and role of the mistress in Restoration society shifted with the continual rise of international trade and consumption. With the influx of new luxury goods into late Stuart London, the understanding between the modish gentleman and his mistress changed to accommodate the demands of a new consumer culture. This town-misse, or modernized mistress, was "an honest Courtezan" that "differ[ed] from your ordinary Prostitute" because she desired, and required, a luxurious lifestyle of fashionable goods from her town-gallant in exchange for her love.[214] This new form of mistress maintained that any fashionable Restoration gentleman should not "expect to have any Comodity that's rare without a price proportionab'e."[215] The mistress, as a female of quality, deserved only the finest European wares in payment for her sublime services, which surpassed all other females including the wife. The author the popular pamphlet, *The Town-*

---

209 Casey, 211.
210 *The Character of a town-gallant,* 3-4.
211 *The Character of a town-gallant,* 3-4.
212 *The parable of the puppies,* 4.
213 *The parable of the puppies,* 4.
214 *The Character of a Town Misse* (London: W.L., 1675), 1.
215 *The Town-misses declaration and apology, or, An answer to the character of a town misse* (London: J.T., 1675)*,* 5–6.

misses declaration and apology, or, An answer to the character of a town misse (1675) explained that latest "custome has voted it dishonourable for any Gentleman of Quality, not to maintain his Mistress in far better Equipage than his wife."[216] Therefore, such opulent goods were emblems of power not simply over men but other women, such as competitive courtesans and shrewish wives. This societal policy was also reflected within the Restoration court as John Evelyn described the wealth of Louise de Kéroualle's apartments in comparison to Queen Catherine's rooms: "I was Casualy shewed the Dutchesse of Portsmouths splendid Appartment at Whitehall, luxuriously furnished, and with ten times the richnesse and glory beyond the Queenes, such massy pieces of Plate, whole Tables, Stands etc: of incredible value."[217]

The exchange of luxury, and often foreign, goods became the basis for the relationship between men and their mistresses during the Restoration era. Such an agreement between the gentleman and town-misse was evident not simply on the streets of late Stuart London but within the space of the English royal court. The image of the modernized mistress reflected how Charles's official courtesans, such as Barbara Palmer, the Duchess of Cleveland, and Louise de Kéroualle, the Duchess of Portsmouth, were viewed in the world of the Restoration court and in the wider sphere of English popular culture. Like the town-misse character of print and picture, material culture was also central to the royal mistress in the space of the royal court. Court dress, among other articles, functioned as a mode for demonstrating a Carolean courtesan's position over other mistresses as well as Charles II himself. Their sexual power over the King was purposely displayed through the garments, ornaments, and other possessions bestowed upon them by Charles, and the Royal Exchequer, for their role in the bedchamber. With both the misse caricature in late Stuart print culture and the royal mistress of the Restoration court, fashion and other belongings became a feminine tool for emasculation.

Satirical pamphlets, broadsides, and novellas vividly illustrated the creation and characteristics of the worldly town-misse.[218] The seventeenth-century term, misse, was contemporarily defined as "a kept woman, a mistress; a concubine" or a "prostitute, a whore"[219] John Evelyn made several references to "misses" within the court and London throughout his lengthy diary of the Restoration for it was "at this time they began to call lew'd women."[220] The term later developed into a variant form with the town-misse, "a young woman who lives in a town" or, specifically, "a prostitute."[221] The connection between the misse and urban space revealed the city's

---

[216] *The Town-misses declaration and apology,* 5.

[217] Evelyn, *The Diary of John Evelyn*, 258.

[218] In contrast to the recent wealth of scholarly material centered on masculine characters such as the rake and fop, the discourse on the Restoration town-misse remains tragically underdeveloped. Margaret Lamb McDonald's *The Independent Woman in the Restoration Comedy of Manners (*1976) does focus on the "the saucy, independent young woman of Restoration comedy" but does not utilize print culture nor addresses the sexual role of the mistress over her gentleman. (1) However, Natalie Zemon Davis's notion of the "Woman on Top" attempted to explain the disorderly element to Early Modern perceptions of gender role reversals. Additionally, other recent studies have strived to examine the abundance of printed works including fashion woodcuts. Angela McShane and Clare Backhouse's article on Top-Knots and Lower Sorts: Print and Promiscuous Consumption in the 1690s" (2010) analyzes the popular figure of the top-knot in late Stuart print culture. For more, see Margaret Lamb McDonald, *The Independent Woman in the Restoration Comedy of Manners* (Salzburg, Austria: Institut für Englische Sprache und Literatur Universität Salzburg, 1976); Natalie Zemon Davis, "Women on Top: Symbolic Sexual Inversion and Political Disorder in Early Modern Europe," in *Society and Culture in Early Modern France: Eight Essays* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1975).

[219] "Miss, n.²," *Oxford English Dictionary Online*. March 2013. Oxford University Press. http://www.oed.com.proxy.lib.muohio.edu/view/Entry/119940?rskey=nuyiua&result=2&isAdvanced=false (accessed March 21, 2013)

[220] John Evelyn, *The Diary of John Evelyn*, 126.

[221] "Town, n.," *Oxford English Dictionary Online*. March 2013. Oxford University Press. http://www.oed.com.proxy.lib.muohio.edu/view/Entry/204044 (accessed March 21, 2013).

integral role as the center for both culture and immoral behavior. By the late Stuart era, a man or woman associated with the town, or "on the town," meant in "the swing of fashionable life, pleasure, or dissipation."[222] Therefore, London served as the ideal stage for the misse to gain riches and reputation as a fashionable woman about town.

Ironically, several works of late Stuart print culture argued that the town-misse derived from pastoral obscurity. In *The Character of a Town Misse,* the companion piece to *The Character of a town-gallant exposing the extravagant fopperies of some vain self-conceited pretenders to gentility and good breeding,* the critical anonymous author explained the lowly ancestries of this new kind of courtesan. While "she talks high of her Family, and tells a large story how they were Ruined by the late [Civil] Wars," in actuality the urbanized mistress "is only the Cub of a Bumkin, lickt into a Genteel form by Town Conversation."[223] Such a description corresponded to the Breton heritage of the French-born Louise de Kéroualle as her nobility was constantly questioned by English courtiers. However, despite such humble origins, this modernized mistress maintained unwarranted vanity for "she takes upon her more Pride, than would have serv'd six of Queen Elizabeths Countesses."[224] However, the town-misse combated such censure and claims of "that pitiful Pedigree" in *The Town-misses declaration and apology.*[225] This parody argued that the town-misse embodied all the civilized qualities of English gentility and urban society during the late seventeenth century. The town-misse advocated that her sophisticated airs were the result of her noble breeding rather than the talented mimicry of her betters: "Tis well known we are Illustriously descended, and educated after the best Modern manner for raising a Woman to Grandeur, Dancing, Singing, Balls, Masks, Masquerades, Plays, Frolliques, Rambles, and Assignation have been our continual business."[226] Such a fashionable curriculum reflected the socio-culture of Restoration London and further revealed the town-misse as a representation of English urbanity at the end of the seventeenth-century.

In addition to her modish talents in the ballroom and boudoir, the modernized mistress was also skilled in the art of fashionable dress. In order to capture the attention of a potential suitor, the town-misse was required to don ostentatious attire and acquire suitably luxurious accommodations to conduct her business: "puts herself in a good Garb, gets a Maid…and hires Noble Rooms richly Furnished about Covent-Garden, there she takes State upon her, and practises every day four hours in the Glass, how Greatness will become her."[227] Similar to the outrageous garb sported by the fop, the modish woman in late Stuart London utilized fantastical cosmetics, comic clothing, and ridiculous hairstyles, the majority of which followed the French fashion. Brooke notes that by the turn of the eighteenth century, the "French mode required that ladies' make-up should make them look unreal; with red cheeks, painted with lacquer."[228] Such an extreme toilette corresponded to the ridiculous images of the town-misse in late Stuart print culture. Furthermore, the extravagant top-knot, "a large bow or bunch of ribbon loops worn on the top of the head," emerged in the early seventeenth century and soon became an exceedingly popular hairstyle by the Restoration period.[229] Dunton's *The parable of the top-knots* described the hilarity of the female top-knot. In the pamphlet, the divine character of Mother Nature was bewildered by the following image of a female top-knot: "I see a moving Pyramid of Gayities, a walking Toy-shop, a speaking Gallimaufry of Ribbons, Laces, Silks and Jewels, as if some upstart mimick Nature had been at work on purpose to upbraid my Skill

---

[222] "Town, n.," *Oxford English Dictionary Online.*
[223] *The Character of a Town Misse*, 4.
[224] *The Character of a Town Misse*, 7.
[225] *The Town-misses declaration and apology*, 6.
[226] *The Town-misses declaration and apology,* 6.
[227] *The Character of a Town Misse*, 5.
[228] Brooke, viii.
[229] Cumming, 117.

and tell me that in framing Woman I left out the Essentials."[230] The exaggerated nature of this woman's hairstyle had distorted perceptions of feminine identity to the extent that "Dame Nature" could not recognize her own creation.

Yet, female fashions were not simply perceived as oddly extravagant or exaggerated but also indecent. Low-cut gowns and off-the-shoulder styles were the mode by the late seventeenth century. Such a style was often referred to as "undress," or "anything that fell short of full dress."[231] Moreover, the Frenchified term, *déshabille* was also utilized to describe this "state of being partly undressed, or dressed in a negligent or careless style; undress."[232] *Déshabille* represented a conscientious carelessness in dress that was prevalent throughout the Restoration court. Charles's principal court portraitist Peter Lely painted the female subjects of his collection, the "Windsor Beauties," in fashionable *déshabille*. Among these modish "beauties" were Barbara Palmer, the Duchess of Cleveland, Frances Stuart, the Duchess of Richmond and Lennox, and Charles's own sister, Henrietta, the Duchess of Orléans; these women were the principal female figures in the Restoration court.

Yet despite the elite popularity of this style, late Stuart print culture acknowledged the immorality of this form of dress with scornful condemnations of the plentiful exposure of flesh. Like the gallant, the town-misse's plunging necklines represented a significant component of her identity that contributed to her image as dissolute figure in Restoration society. *The Character of a Town Misse* observed that, "Her Skin is much Clearer than her Conscience, which makes her go with her Neck and shoulders all Bare."[233] The modernized mistress was viewed as a "very Butcher, that exposes her own Flesh to Sale by the Stone, or if you please a Cook that is Dressing her self all day with poinant Sauces, to be tasted with the better Appetite at Night."[234] Such an alluring *déshabille* was required, despite its perceived immorality, for a town-misse in order to attract her gentleman and thus obtain further desirable decorations.

After the mistress dressed herself in a sufficiently captivating garb and secured fashionable apartments, her next "business is to make her self be taken notice of" and thus "her main Market-place is the Balcony, which she frequents as constantly as any Lady in a Romance" until "she at last attracts a Wealthy Gallant."[235] Once the gentleman was ensnared by the fashionable beauty of the town-misse, the author of *The Character of a Town Misse* explained how the couple developed a formalized contract, or "Articles," that detailed the exchange of goods: "he promises to allow her a hundred and fifty pounds a Year, and she Swears a Thousand dissembling Oaths, how infinitely she loves him, and that she will prove constant, and true to him alone, and never be concern'd with any other man in the VVorld."[236] The town-misse's skills regarding fashion and attraction were so proficient that, "the silly Fop is so fatally bewitcht as to believe her" flowery promises of love and devotion.[237]

A fundamental condition of this agreement between the foppish man, who only succeeds sexually in this sense because he is purchasing a female's amour, and the mistress was that he provide her with all the material necessities for fashionable life in Restoration London. According to *The Character of a Town Misse*, the mistress:

[230] Dunton, 1-2.

[231] Brooke, vii.

[232] "Dishabille, n. and adj.," *Oxford English Dictionary Online*. March 2013. Oxford University Press. http://www.oed.com.proxy.lib.muohio.edu/view/Entry/54439?redirectedFrom=deshabille (accessed March 21, 2013).

[233] *The Character of a Town Misse*, 7.

[234] *The Character of a Town Misse*, 7.

[235] *The Character of a Town Misse*, 5.

[236] *The Character of a Town Misse*, 5.

[237] *The Character of a Town Misse*, 5.

has her Boys in Livery, her House splendidly furnisht, and
scorns to stir abroad without a Coach and six: She glitters in
the Boxes at the Play-house, and draws all Eyes after her in
the Street, to the shame and Confusion of all honest Women,
and Encouragement of each pretty Girle that loves fine Cloaths,
good Chear, and Idleness, to turn Harlot, in Imitation of such
a thriving Example.[238]

In addition to expensive furnishings, elegant equipages, and private theater boxes, the town-misse retained an impressive retinue of servants in dignified uniforms. *The Character of a Town Misse* also listed other stylish members of a 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."[239] Such a reference connected to contemporary accounts of both the Duchess of Portsmouth and the Duchess of Cleveland. In Pierre Mignard's 1682 portrait of *Louise de Kéroualle, Duchess of Portsmouth*, the painting prominently featured a splendidly dressed young African servant holding a conch shell brimming with Louise's numerous pearls.[240] Furthermore, Pepys's diary indicated on January 27, 1666 that Barbara Palmer also retained a "little black boy" among her stylish retinue of servants.[241] Therefore, Charles's principal mistresses possessed exotic luxury items similar to the rich commodities characteristic of the infamous town-misse, the modernized mistress of the late seventeenth century.

Conclusion

Both the caricatures of the fop and the town-misse, or modernized mistress, revealed the ambiguity concerning gendered roles in late seventeenth-century England. The entangled nature of identity produced several varying perceptions of gender, including masculinity, homosexuality, and femininity, in relation to other facets of character, such as class, political affiliation, and nationality. The foppish gentleman of late Stuart print culture was not simply considered effeminate but Frenchified by English audiences. The connection between these two characteristics facilitated controversial literary conversations regarding English notions of masculinity as well as "Englishness" in general. Similarly, the town-misse also traversed social, cultural, political, national, and gendered boundaries in the late seventeenth century. As evident in popular print literature and the royal court, the modernized mistress dominated their male customers and female competition through their physical appearance, dress, and belongings. Moreover, this display extended to include issues of national feeling as the foreign nature of the courtesan's clothes and commodities shaped her identity as emasculating as well as decadently immoral, and therefore French, in late Stuart England. *The Character of a Town Misse* provided another example of this Frenchified emasculation through material items. The pamphlet details the following necessity for the modernized mistress: "a French Merchant to supply her with Dildo's, or in default of those she makes her Gallants Purse maintain two able Stallions (that she loves better than him) for performance of points wherein he is Defective."[242] The town-misse utilized a *French* good to compensate for the sexual deficiencies of

---

[238] *The Character of a Town Misse*, 7.

[239] *The Character of a Town Misse*, 7.

[240] See Pierre's Mignard's painting, *Louise de Kéroualle, Duchess of Portsmouth*, currently located in the National Portrait Gallery in London.

[241] Pepys, 204. For more on how Africans were commodified as fashionable accessories for Europeans by the early eighteenth century, see Simon Gikandi, *Slavery and the Culture of Taste* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2011).

[242] *The Character of a Town Misse*, 7.

Englishmen and thus revealed France as a corrupting sexual and emasculating influence. Consequently, the material characteristics of the fop and town-misse were intricately tied to different forms of identity as individuals attempted, unsuccessfully, to define gender and national character in late seventeenth-century England.

V.
Conclusion

The Restoration era ended on February 6, 1685 with the death of Charles II at the age of fifty-five. His illness appeared suddenly and mysteriously days before and thus rumors swirled throughout the country involving fiendish plots, popery, and poison. John Evelyn observed that Charles's final words to his brother and heir were reflective of his reign: governed with concern for his domineering mistresses and evasive of the controversial issues of state, including the contentious problem of religion and the succession. In his diary, he recorded that, "He spake to the Duke to be kind to his Concubines the DD: of Cleveland, and especially Portsmouth, and that Nelly might not sterve; I do not heare he said any thing of the Church or his people, now falling under the government of a Prince suspected for his Religion, after above 100 yeares the Church and Nation had ben departed from Rome."[243]

With Charles's death, James II rose to the English throne amidst residual dissention from the Popish Plot and Exclusion Crisis of 1678–81. As an open Papist, James II shared his brother's interest in the absolutist court culture of the Continent. When James married his second wife, the Italian princess Mary of Modena, in 1673, he sported a richly embellished wedding suit in the French *justaucorps* style.[244] The wool garment, embroidered with silver gilt threading in an elaborate floral design, greatly resembled the Sun King's signature military jacket that was the popular men's fashion of Versailles. Dressed in the *justaucorps*, James's appearance "was virtually indistinguishable" from his cousin, Louis XIV.[245] James's reign as King of England, Scotland, and Ireland further continued the widespread diffusion of Continental, particularly French, culture that truly flourished under Charles II. Ribeiro notes that the later Jacobean court attempted to model itself culturally after the France: "he [James II] even ordered those [his courtiers] who visited Versailles to observe closely the trappings of state there so he could copy them at his own court."[246] However, James's affinity for French culture, absolutist state policies, and Roman Catholicism contributed to the brevity of his rule.

In November 1688, a Dutch army under James's son-in-law William, the Stadtholder of Orange, and daughter Mary landed on England's southwestern coast in order to take the British crown. Although James maintained a well-trained, professional army, William's growing force, consisting of his own Dutch troops and the multitude of eager English sympathizers that quickly joined his ranks, intimidated the English king into submission. A mere two months after the Dutch invasion, James fled to France and proceedings began to establish William and Mary as King and Queen of England, Scotland, and Ireland. Contemporary accounts declared this series of events a "Glorious Revolution" due to the implausibility of William's victory and the speed in which James was overthrown.

However, Steven Pincus renames this event "England's Revolution of 1688–89" as a more appropriate designation in his book *1688: The First Modern Revolution* (2009). Pincus argues that Revolution of 1688–89 was the world's first modern revolution and a "landmark moment in the emergence of the modern state" as well as English nationalism.[247] However, Pincus's work does not claim that this modernization resulted in an absolute fracture with the social, religious, and

---

[243] Evelyn, *The Diary of John Evelyn*, 318.
[244] This treasured article of clothing is located in the costume collections at the Victoria & Albert Museum in London.
[245] Ribeiro, *Fashion and Fiction*, 255.
[246] Ribeiro, *Fashion and Fiction,* 255.
[247] Pincus, *1688: The First Modern Revolution*, 6.

intellectual nature of England during the beginning half of the seventeenth century. In *1688,* Pincus indicates that England's revolution began long before William of Orange landed on English soil in 1688. The insurgency maintained a longer timeline than the several months in which the Dutch force invaded and William and Mary were crowned. The roots of English national character and the subsequent modern British nation-state were evident in the late Stuart courts of the seventeenth century.

Pincus argues that the tale of English nationalism commenced with the reign of James II and the various ways in which he transformed English politics and culture during the late seventeenth century. Since James's state policy was modeled after the popish and absolutist government of his French cousin Louis XIV, it emphasized the centralization of monarchial power, authoritarianism, and the territorialization of empire. Therefore, Pincus advocates that such a system ensured that the revolution would be "popular, violent and divisive" among the English population and contribute to the emergence of what he acknowledges as the "modern."[248] Pincus's interpretation of the Glorious Revolution, like Linda Colley and British historian Tim Harris, stresses continuity with the Carolean and Jacobean periods and consequently indicates the role of the late Stuart courts in the creation of modern Britain and a true national sentiment.

Despite the profound transformations of 1689, French culture and the multiple issues surrounding its prevalence in England remained a divisive issue well into William III's reign in the 1690s.[249] The political and religious threat of absolutist France had been eliminated with the Glorious Revolution but the culture of the French "Other" was deeply solidified in late seventeenth-century England through the reigns of Charles II and James II. The notion of cultural Otherness became, and continued to serve as, a fundamental component to how certain Englishmen and women analyzed their national identity, often in contrast to these Others, during the final years of the Stuart monarchy. Popular printed literature from 1660–1700 addressed the Continent's cultural dominance in England through the controversial theme of dress discourse beginning in the early years of Charles's Restoration. Works such as John Evelyn's *Tyrannus* played a fundamental role in widening this conversation to include not simply the peddler of cheap print but princes of state. A large portion of English society engaged in the vestmentary debate on Continental culture in late Stuart England; the King himself participated with his vest while anonymous Londoners circulated their perspectives regarding a national culture. This literary dialogue took a material form as both male and female courtiers utilized their clothing, accessories, furniture, and equipages, to engage in the discussion of English national character on a grander political scale – affecting both high and low politics as well as foreign and domestic issues. Consequently, the language of dress and the politics of display reflected the need to work through identity issues, define the self, as well as others, and denote different forms of identification essential to late seventeenth-century European life.

For Charles II, his signature garment allowed him to make a pointed political statement of individuality against Louis XIV, his dynamic cousin. Alternatively, clothing and personal possessions functioned as a mode for women, including Queen Catherine and the Carolean mistresses, to participate and identify themselves in court, state, and international politics. Due to the multi-faceted nature of identity, these portrayals entangled notions of nation, religion, and gender during Restoration England. The concept of "Englishness" was negotiated between insiders or Englishmen and women, outsiders like Continental Europeans, and other markers of identity including gender. With the rise of globalization by the end of the seventeenth century, the English populace began to seriously consider their national character in comparison to other powers at this critical moment

---

[248] Pincus, *1688: The First Modern Revolution*, 475.
[249] Mary II died earlier during the decade in 1694 of smallpox.

before the unification of Great Britain in 1707. Such a study of Restoration court culture refashions the role of the late Stuart period in the narrative of British history by placing greater significance on dress and commodities in shaping perceptions of English national character. These conceptions of English nationalism were influenced by Colley's theory of "Otherness," which can be detected during the late seventeenth century with England's tenuous relationship with France. Like the Revolution of 1688–89, Restoration court dress and late Stuart fashion contributed to the how modern Britain unfolded in the early eighteenth century.

Restoration court dress and material culture offers a rather unique analysis for the study of the "nation" within seventeenth-century England. A study of the language of dress and the politics of display in the late Stuart court does not simply offer an ornamented picture of squabbles between courtiers that occurred within numerous royal courts throughout history. Court dress reflected the Restoration period itself as the principal tensions between English and French, Protestant and Catholic, masculine and feminine, as well as Whig and Tory were interwoven with the threads of vests and gowns. This thesis concerning the various aspects of dress and identity during the Restoration era is significant for the development of English national character on the eve of the Glorious Revolution and the establishment of Britain in the early eighteenth century. Indeed, additional studies would further prove that clothes do not simply "make the man," or woman, but history.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

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

Brémond, Gabriel de. *Hattige: or The Amours of the King of Tamaran, A Novel*. Amsterdam: Simon the African, at the Black-Prince in the Sun, 1683.

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

The Character of a Town Misse. London: W.L., 1675.

Charles II. *By the King: A proclamation forbidding foreign trade and commerce*. London: John Bill and Christopher Barker, 1665.

————. *By the King: A proclamation for prohibiting the importation or retailing of any commodities of the growth or manufacture of the states of the United Provinces*. London: John Bill and Christopher Barker, 1665.

————. *By the King: 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: John Bill and Christopher Barker, 1666.

————. *By the King: 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: Roger Norton, 1661.

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

Evelyn, John. *The Diary of John Evelyn*. Edited by John Bowle. New York: Oxford University Press, 1983.

————. *Memoirs, Illustrative of the Life and Writings of John Evelyn*. Edited by William Bray. London: H. Colburn, 1819.

————. *Tyrannus; or, The mode*. Edited by J. L. Nevinson. Oxford: The Luttrell Society by B. Blackwell, 1951.

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

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

The Ladies Mercury 1, no. 3. London: T. Pratt, 1693.

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

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, In burlesque. Together with a short supplement to the fop-dictionary: compos'd for the use of the town-beaus. London: John Harris at the Harrow in the Poultry, 1691.

N.H. *The Ladies Dictionary: Being a General Entertainment of the Fair-Sex*. London: John Dunton, 1694.

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

Pepys, Samuel. *The Diary of Samuel Pepys*. Edited by Richard le Gallienne. New York: Modern Library, 2001.

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

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

Secondary Sources

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

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

Bayley, John Whitcomb. *The history and antiquities of the Tower of London: with memoirs of royal and distinguished persons, deduced from records, state-papers, and manuscripts, and from other original and authentic sources.* London: Jennings & Chaplin, 1830.

Beer, Edmond S. de. "King Charles II's Own Fashion: An Episode in Anglo-French Relations 1660–1670." *Journal of the Warburg Institute* 2, no. 2 (October 1938): 105–115.

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

Brooke, Iris. *Dress and Undress: Restoration and Eighteenth Century.* Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1973. First published 1958 by Methuen & Co.

Brubaker, Rogers. *Nationalism Reframed: Nationhood and the National Question in the New Europe.* New York: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Casey, Moira E. "The Fop: 'Apes and Echoes of Men': Gentlemanly Ideals and the Restoration." In *Fools and Jesters in Literature, Art, and History.* Edited by Vicki K. Janik, 207–214. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1998.

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

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

Conway, Alison Margaret. *The Protestant Whore: Courtesan Narrative and Religious Controversy in England, 1680–1750.* Buffalo: University of Toronto Press, 2010.

Corp, Edward. "Catherine of Braganza and cultural politics." In *Queenship in Britain, 1660–1837: Royal Patronage, Court Culture and Dynastic Politics.* Edited by Clarissa Campbell Orr, 53–73. New York: Manchester University Press, 2002.

Crompton, Louis. *Homosexuality & Civilization.* Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University, 2003.

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

Davis, Natalie Zemon. "Women on Top: Symbolic Sexual Inversion and Political Disorder in Early Modern Europe." In *Society and Culture in Early Modern France: Eight Essays.* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1975.

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).

Elton, Geoffrey. *England Under the Tudors.* New York: Routledge, 1991. First published 1955 by Methuen & Co.

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

Greenblatt, Stephen. *Renaissance Self-Fashioning: From More to Shakespeare.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980.

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

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

Harris, Tim. *Restoration: Charles II and his Kingdoms, 1660–1685.* New York: Penguin Books, 2005.

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

Cambridge University Press, 1997.

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): 179–203.

Jenkinson, Matthew. *Culture and Politics at the Court of Charles II, 1660–1685*. Rochester, NY: Boydell & Brewer, 2010.

Knoppers, Laura Lunger. "The Politics of Portraiture: Oliver Cromwell and the Plain Style." *Renaissance Quarterly* 51, no. 4 (Winter 1998): 1282–1319.

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.

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

McDonald, Margaret Lamb. *The Independent Woman in the Restoration Comedy of Manners*. Salzburg, Austria: Institut für Englische Sprache und Literatur Universität Salzburg, 1976.

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, 337–357. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2010.

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

Ollard, Richard. *The Image of the King: Charles I and Charles II*. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1979.

Paxman, Jeremy. *The English: A Portrait of a People*. New York: The Overlook Press, 1998.

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

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

————. "'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, 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): 531–545.

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

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

————. "On Englishness in Dress." In *The Englishness of English Dress*. Edited by Christopher Breward, Becky Conekin, and Caroline Cox, 15–27. New York: Berg, 2002.

Sharpe, Kevin. "Representations and Negotiations: Texts, Images, and Authority in Early Modern England." *The Historical Journal* 42, no. 3 (September 1999): 853–881.

————. "'So Hard a Text'? Images of Charles I, 1612–1700." *The Historical Journal* 43, no. 2 (June 2000): 383–405.

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

Reynolds, Susan. *Kingdoms and Communities in Western Europe, 900–1300*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1997. First published 1984 by Clarendon Press.

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

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

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

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

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.

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

Williams, Andrew P. *The Restoration Fop: Gender Boundaries and Comic Characterization in Later Seventeenth-Century Drama*. Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen Press, 1995.

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

Wormald, Patrick. "The Venerable Bede and the 'Church of the English.'" In *The English Religious Tradition and the Genius of Anglicanism*. Edited by Geoffrey Rowell, 13–32. Nashville: Abingdon, 1992.

Wynne, Sonya. "The Mistresses of Charles II and Restoration Court Politics." In *The Stuart Courts*. Edited by Eveline Cruickshanks, 171–190. Thrupp, Gloucestershire: Sutton Publishing, 2000.

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