

## Reading the Royal Romance: Or, Intimacy in a King's Cabinet

Social and cultural articulations of the body have lately constituted one of the liveliest areas of early-modern scholarship. Privacy, gender roles, separate spheres, domesticity, all have been the subjects of intense inquiry, which has thrown light on the assumptions and conventions that structured the experience of people in the past. Concerned as such inquiry has largely been with the daily lives of ordinary people, it has moved far – farther certainly than did the ‘new social history’ of a couple of decades ago – from the conventional staging-posts of political history. Few of the scholars involved would doubt that broad shifts in human values have occurred,<sup>1</sup> though they have sometimes had difficulty in explaining them.<sup>2</sup> The emergence of privacy, as ideology and as practice, is a case in point. Almost by definition, privacy’s emergence has been imagined at some distance from historians’ familiar, and public, high road of political change. Philippe Aries certainly confessed to a belated recognition of a political matrix in which the ‘private’ was held in dynamic tension with a more ‘public’ order that developed in the later seventeenth century; but his collaborators in the early-modern volume in the *History of Private Life* turned away from politics to a world of social and cultural practices. Their unconcern with contingency is underscored by their repeated shifts in focus between ‘private life’ – a life separate or removed from ‘the public’ – and ‘private lives’, that is, the lives of ordinary people.<sup>3</sup> Such slippage betrays an underlying assumption that the history of privacy and of the middle class are intimately, indeed almost teleologically, linked. And not only the history of privacy: the most analytical of recent writings on the history of women and of manhood have focused firmly on the rise of the middle class as agent of change.<sup>4</sup> Despite a plethora of recent studies of political culture, historians have been oddly reluctant to concede to politics a role in cultural transformation. It is tempting to see this as one more consequence of revisionism: as the domain of politics shrank to the short-term and contingent, it seemed to have little to do with longer-term shifts in outlook. Malcolm Gaskill has been something of a lone voice in calling for attention to ‘the political dimension of mentalities’.<sup>5</sup>

DEREK HIRST

The political dimension of culture and mentality cannot, however, be mapped merely in terms of state-formation. Circumstance, politics, and the traumas of civil war and revolution also had their place. Indeed, at what seems a turning-point in the story – the emergence in England of an explicit debate over personal privacy – evidence points in what must seem a surprising direction, inviting us to reconsider the emphasis given to the middle class. Some of England's earliest articulations of a claim to privacy, and more particularly of privacy as the setting for intimacy and affectivity, involved not an urban pioneer of politeness but a king. Such a contention may seem paradoxical, since spectacle and early-modern monarchy are so often deemed inseparable; but as Ernst Kantorowicz recognised years ago, the social ambiguity of the human body – irreducibly physical and individual yet unavoidably implicated in the polity – centered on the person of the king.<sup>6</sup> The politics of that ambiguity were of course explored and contested in the pamphlet warfare of the early 1640s, and brutally answered by the regicides. Its human meaning, exposed by the capture and publication of Charles I's correspondence in 1645, has not been sufficiently understood, and nor has its part in the history of privacy.

The human dilemmas of intimacy scarcely come to mind as a major theme in England's mid-century troubles. The two prime combatants have become emblems of quite other values: the King, of style and dignity in all eventualities; Oliver Cromwell, of a strenuous appeal to interior truths. Neither posture left much space for the concealments of the affective life. Yet the publication of letters between the King and his prime adviser – who happened to be his wife – made of private embrace a very public matter. Publication of the letters also, and more obviously, proved a political watershed. The royal archive found among the booty after the battle of Naseby on 14 June 1645 confirmed the doubts of those who had from the beginning questioned Parliament's legitimating myth in its struggle against Charles, the contention that the King was ruled by evil counsellors. The captured correspondence demonstrated that it was he who made policy, and indeed dictated all the most objectionable policies: the quest for military aid from foreign powers, promises of toleration for English and even Irish Catholics in return for military support, and contempt for representative assemblies and peace negotiations alike.

Not surprisingly, the radicals in Parliament rushed to publish the evidence, the smoking gun. Their first step, at the beginning of July, was to send a deputation to London's Common Hall, to regale the City's political establishment with readings from the letters, and so to restore the vital flow of political and financial support that had dwindled amidst the trade disruptions and privations of war.<sup>7</sup> The effect was dramatic: friendly newspapers and less friendly accounts concur in reporting hissing – 'exhibitions', *The Kingdoms Weekly Intelligencer* called them – and acclamation at this strange performance.<sup>8</sup> Emboldened, Parliament ordered that a selection from the collection be published.<sup>9</sup> Within a month of a battle that was itself fought a day's

## READING THE ROYAL ROMANCE

hard ride from London *The Kings Cabinet Opened* was for sale on the streets. Not only was its speedy appearance an efficient production-job; it was also a news event. The decision of almost all of the dozen or so London newspapers to publish reports of the Common Hall read-in on July 3 comes as no surprise; but many of the newspapers reported the publication of the book too.<sup>10</sup> Such publicity was given to no other contemporary work.

The publicity seems to have paid off, at least in notoriety. *The Kings Cabinet Opened* sparked more controversy, measured in terms of the other publications it prompted, than almost every other work of those prolific Civil War years.<sup>11</sup> The book itself only went through two editions (though to judge by the large number of surviving copies it sold well), but the storm it generated even precipitated a short-lived newspaper, *Mercurius Anti-Britannicus*, that ran for three weeks in August 1645. Text *The Kings Cabinet Opened* certainly was, but more importantly it immediately proved an event, and some at the time recognised this. Thus, one London newspaper, *The Parliaments Post*, noted against 14 July, 1645, publication day, 'This day there were published the Kings Letters taken in the late fight at NASEBY, which I believe are of as much concernment as all the wealth and Souldiours that we tooke.'<sup>12</sup> The prediction was famously borne out, for *The Kings Cabinet Opened* brought the character and responsibility of the King 'upon the stage', as the editors had proudly predicted it would.<sup>13</sup> The answer the published correspondence gave to the old conundrum of whether or not the King could do wrong was to help bring Charles to his trial, and to the executioner's block.

It would be going too far to suggest that the letters were left to speak for themselves. The editorial impress was indeed so obtrusive that one royalist reader held those responsible guilty of 'slandering the footsteps of Gods Anoynted, Even for your Paraphrase' that glossed the letters.<sup>14</sup> The editorial heavy-handedness to which he objected was symptomatic of a growing concern among parliamentarian leaders to control representations of this King as some began to contemplate sterner measures against him. The editors were commissioned by Parliament, and paid for their pains.<sup>15</sup> More remarkably, Parliament took steps to avert the challenge of sceptics, for it coupled the order for publication with an order that the originals of the correspondence be displayed in a special room for the satisfaction of doubters. The editors of the volume made the same point as they emphasised the significance of publication: 'the very hand by which they are signed (so generally known and now exposed to the view of all) will averre for us, that no such forgery could be possible.'<sup>16</sup> At the foot of each letter as printed is a certification: 'a true Copy examined by . . .' and then follows the name of one or other worthy MP. The evidence could not have been more carefully marshalled. But if there is a *social* history of truth,<sup>17</sup> this episode was pitched under the bar. The editors in their preface stressed that the issues of fact in the correspondence were so clear as to need no elaboration even 'to the most vulgar capacities',<sup>18</sup> and sympathetic journalists reinforced the work of outreach. 'Have you read

DEREK HIRST

the King and Queenes letters, and paused upon them, they are the Kings owne hand, and those he received from her, are the originals. Did you expect such things in the Kings Cabinet?’ demanded the author of *Perfect Occurrences* excitedly at the start of one issue.<sup>19</sup> The excitement generated by *The Kings Cabinet Opened* was clearly not unrelated to Parliament’s skillful management of the publication. But while we cannot know how precisely the means of delivery were calibrated, we do know something of the care given to the message. The editors of *The Kings Cabinet Opened* assured their readers that Parliament after Naseby had other royal letters at its disposal, ‘too numerous, and vast, and too much intermixed with other matter of no pertinence for publication at this time’.<sup>20</sup> The letters printed were, in other words, carefully chosen.

There is much in the volume about Ireland, and about the Oxford Parliament: these subjects had been the burden of the Commons’ deputation to Common Hall,<sup>21</sup> and the anger they generated was to well up in Westminster Hall three and a half years later.<sup>22</sup> But the claim of political malevolence was rendered more believable by a demonstration of just how an English king had been transformed into an enemy to his state. The pages of *The Kings Cabinet Opened* related a story of seduction, not of the Samson-and-Delilah variety but a seduction of the emotions nonetheless, that made it possible to imagine how Charles might have been corrupted. That story was in one sense subordinate to the national political drama, but, once printed, it quickly developed a momentum that played its own part in delegitimizing the King. As the news reports show, it made it possible for those not given to apocalypticism to speak with contempt of Charles’s person. And it allows scholars a rare opportunity to imagine how the processes of political and cultural history can influence one another.

*The Kings Cabinet Opened* made clear its interest in sex and seduction at the outset. Declaring secrecy and intimacy in its very title – the ‘cabinet’ was the place of withdrawal, of private pursuits – it gave the argumentative game away on its first page, where the preface alerts readers to the warning of the epistle of Jude against seducers of the people.<sup>23</sup> The volume contains no candidates for that role other than the King and his advisors. And while the epistle of Jude – surely one of the least cited of all the works of the Bible – does warn against seductive voices, so do countless other, more resonant, pieces of scripture. The appeal of this, rather than any of the more familiar texts, to the editors of *The Kings Cabinet Opened* could only lie in Jude’s preoccupation with fornication, with sensuality, with Sodom and Gomorrah. Readers were being schooled, in a not-so-subtle way, to look for a particular message in the King’s texts.

Those readers would, however, have needed little prompting before finding in the book a deep vein of sensuality, or at least, of affectivity, of romance. The largest group of letters of what John Milton was famously to call this ‘Sonnetting’ King was to the Queen, Henrietta Maria.<sup>24</sup> The very first letter

## READING THE ROYAL ROMANCE

begins, 'Deare heart . . .'; the third concludes with Charles's hopes to enjoy the Queen's company again, 'without which nothing can be a contentment unto me. And so farewell dear heart'. 'Eternally thine . . . ' 'without thy company I can neither have peace nor comfort within my self.' And so the terms of endearment accumulate. In letter 9, Charles assured his wife, 'I love thee above all earthly things, & . . . my contentment is unseperably conioyned with thine, must not all my Actions tend to serve and please thee? . . . I confesse thy company hath perhaps made me in this, hard to be pleased, but not lesse to be pitied by thee, who art the only cure for this disease. The end of all is this, . . . Beleeve me, sweet heart, thy kindnesse is as necessary to comfort my heart, as thy assistance is for my affairs.' Thirty letters later, the prose became even more excited: 'My heart being full of affection for thee, admiration of thee, and impatient passion of gratitude to thee, I could not but say some thing.'<sup>25</sup>

Parliament's purpose in publishing such a large collection of what we might call intimate correspondence is easy to imagine. That the King was devoted to his wife could have come as no surprise to the many of his foes who had been at Court during the 1630s peace, or even perhaps to those who had read the royal masques of that decade, or seen the engravings of the Van Dyck double portrait of the royal couple. Royal wedded love was there held out insistently as both the essence of and model for earthly harmony.<sup>26</sup> But the assumptions of patriarchy were strong in this society, and uxoriousness was not a quality held up for emulation. Parliament therefore hoped for a propaganda coup in being able to display the King in repeated and extravagant protestations of marital devotion – particularly since these followed extraordinary evidence of marital incapacity. All the letters in the volume but one come from the years of political upheaval in the 1640s; the one exception is item 34, a document of 1626. This had no bearing whatsoever on the current struggles, but abundant bearing on the history of the King's marriage. A year into his marriage, Charles sent a heartfelt, if undiplomatic, representation to his wife's brother and mother: 'It is not unknowne both to the French King and his Mother, what unkindneses and distastes have fallen betweene my wife and mee . . .'. One bout, the young king reported plaintively, 'sett my wife in such an humor of distaste against mee, as from that very houre to this, no man can say that ever shee used mee two dayes together, with so much respect as I deserved of her . . .'. Other new husbands have probably complained to their in-laws in such vein; but did ever one king so lament to another, and his mother? We might well wonder at Charles's determination to carry that rattling skeleton, complete with closet, around the battlefields of England with him. Against such a backdrop, the bathos of one of the Queen's letters, letter 32, 'Be kinde to me or you kill me', seems to locate the whole correspondence firmly in the new genre of romance.<sup>27</sup> Indeed, one newsbook made exactly that point as it began its issue the week of publication with the cryptic, but all too transparent, 'Now the second part is begun, and therefore it is no wonder to see Orlando mad'.<sup>28</sup>

DEREK HIRST

The radical caucus in Parliament was not interested in merely belittling the King's manhood: it sought to deny it. Political legitimacy and the proper regulation of sexuality and domesticity were after all inseparable, and in their best-selling *Godlie Forme of Householde Government*, Dod and Cleaver had warned, 'It is impossible for a man to understand how to govern the commonwealth, that doth not know how to rule his own house'.<sup>29</sup> Parliament thus stood to gain hugely if it could present the King prostrating himself before his wife. In repeated gestures like the one quoted above – 'thy kinnesse is as necessary to comfort my heart, as thy assistance is for my affairs' – Charles paid tribute, and sometimes did deference, to his wife's aid and advice. When in letter 6 he assured her he would never trust Parliament so far as to go to London – which she hated – for peace negotiations, 'for I esteem the interest thou hast in me at a farre dearer rate', or when in letter 12, on the same theme, he insisted he would never 'do any thing unworthy of thy love', he seemed to set his love for the Queen above even the most pressing political considerations. That impression was reinforced when he assured her that he would not grant any offices without consulting her, and that though some of his courtiers faulted him for giving her too much voice, 'I assure such that I want expression, not will, to doe it tenn times more to thee on occasions'.<sup>30</sup> This was too tempting a target to miss. When it came time for Parliament's editors in their concluding 'Annotations' to point the moral of their work, their first three comments centred on Henrietta Maria: '1. It is plaine, here, first, that the Kings Counsels are wholly managed by the Queen; though she be of the weaker sexe, borne an Alien, bred up in a contrary Religion . . .' '2. The Queens Counsels are as powerful as commands . . .' '3. The Queen appeares to have been as harsh, and imperious towards the King' – and here the editors' citation is to that plaintive and painful letter of 1626 – 'as she is to our Religion, Nation, and Government.' Or as John Milton put it bluntly in *Eikonoklastes* in 1649, 'to sum up all, they shewd him govern'd by a Woman'.<sup>31</sup>

Other watchers had quickly taken up the cue. One London newspaper, *The Parliaments Post*, noted against 14 July, 1645, 'By those we see the Image of the Kings heart drawne by his own hand, and that whatsoever pretences were made for Peace and Religion, the effects were onely as pleased the Queen to stampe them.'<sup>32</sup> The *Moderate Intelligencer*, as always less prosaic and more barbed, expounded the issue of gender more intently: 'Yesterday the Letters found in the Cabinet came in print. Had the matter been as good as the stile; the Resolutions as good, as Royall, [as] the Complements, a Princesse to a Prince; the Designes as much tending to the good of England, Scotland, and Ireland, as to please Her Majesty: Had true Maximes of State, and Englands Interest, been as full in them as Romish and Crown-Interest: . . . Had Royalty consulted with Sages more, and Women lesse, They had been without exception. King James understanding of a great Peere and favourite of his, being fin'd in Star Chamber, and displac'd, said, He was an

## READING THE ROYAL ROMANCE

honest man, but too much ruin'd by his wife. He thought to be uxorious, was the way to misery.<sup>33</sup> Accordingly, King James's son's impassioned subordination to his Queen, as demonstrated in *The King's Cabinet Opened*, became the subject of parliamentary mockery.

The master satirist was Marchamont Nedham, the most important journalist of the revolution, who turned the pages of his newspaper, *Mercurius Britannicus*, into a shooting-gallery for the occasion. He had pounced on the first reading to Common Hall of the letters, and devoted the front page of that week's issue to commentary: 'Our Sovereign Shee-Saint sends a Scolding Epistle out of France . . . to the King Her Husband; wherein (like a true Controlour of the Breeches) She signifies her displeasure.'<sup>34</sup> But his glee knew no bounds with the publication of *The King's Cabinet Opened*. The following week he announced that he had lately been 'very private, and seriously employed in making a Key to open the Kings *Cabinet*; yet there are so many privy Drawers in it, . . . that I mistook it for a Juglers Boxe . . . I will shew you more Tricks here, than ever Hocus Pocus did in Smithfield at Bartholomew Faire . . . it will yeild us at least a Months sport; and I mean to anatomize every Paper week after week, till I have gone quite through.' Nedham was as good as his word, and eagerly proceeded to 'riffling the Cabinet . . . It begins thus, Deare Heart, this is the complementall compellation all along, and she hath so much of it, that none at all is left for Greate Britaine. This is the Deare Heart which hath cost him almost three Kingdoms.'<sup>35</sup> Nedham's marginal annotations then apply the message. Against one royal protestation Nedham remarks acidly, 'Never man thus enslaved to a Woman'; against another, 'A very childish passage'. 'The burden of the song', Nedham concluded wittingly, 'for himselfe, all, *Breeches* and all, are resigned into her hands for all eternity.'<sup>36</sup> That was but a foretaste of the scorn that was to come as he devoted the bulk of three issues of his journal, week after week after week, to deconstructing the King's masculinity as well as his majesty.

The second issue of the series, in the last week of July, brought the most sustained mockery. On the first page Nedham ridicules his critics, the King's defenders. He has some quick slaps for those tempted to advance political exculpations for Charles's evasiveness, and then he gets down to business. 'Others there are, and those especially of the tatling Sexe, which extoll him for his love to his Wife: I pray you take notice of these women, it is ten to one but they have the Breeches; for (I beleeve) no discreet ones will expect, much lesse challenge so much from their Husbands, nor any Wiseman yield so much unto his wife. But what may we say, when a King (whose private affections ought not sway him in publique Affaires) shall forsake the Great Councell of his Kingdome, to be ruled wholly by his Wife? . . . by a Wife of so imperious a nature, as himselfe hath had experience, and often complained?' And then he gets his margin-annotator's teeth into the 1626 message to France. He indulges low humour at the King's expense when he glosses with the leering, 'It was Honymoon at Dover then', Charles's nostalgic report, 'At

my first meeting of her at Dover, I could not expect more testimonies of Respect and Love than she shewed.' But Nedham spends most time snapping in his margins at the newly-married Queen's behaviour, 'A most high affront . . . Another high affront . . . An intolerable affront . . . A Continuation of Affronts . . . Peevish passion.' In so doing, of course, he highlighted what the King was willing to endure. At the end of the letter, Nedham concludes, 'He was so supine and carelesse, as to yield . . .' and in the margin flourishes the rhetorical non-question, 'Who weares the Breeches'.<sup>37</sup> By the third issue in the series, in the first week of August, Nedham felt bold enough to open his front page with the large print, 'Where is King Charles? What's become of him? The strange variety of opinions leaves nothing certain: for some say, when he saw the Storm comming after him [in the West, with another defeat], he ran away to his dearly beloved in Ireland; yes, they say he ran away out of his own Kingdome very Majestically.' At this, Nedham proclaimed '*Hue and Cry*' with a mocking description of the fugitive – 'a guilty Conscience, bloody Hands, a Heart full of broken Vows' – that closed with the personally dismissive, 'If these marks be not sufficient, there is another in the mouth; for bid him speak, and you will soon know him', with an asterisk. Against the asterisk stood the ostentatious marginal note, '*Bos in lingua*', a Latin tag that drew derisive attention to the King's speech defect, and more generally to the infelicity of his words.<sup>38</sup> The startling outspokenness of *Mercurius Britannicus* suggests the role of *The King's Cabinet Opened*, and its apparent, or at least alleged, gender subversion, in changing the terms of debate. *Perfect Occurrences* showed at the end of August how thorough the association of uxoriousness and misrule had become: 'We would not have him undo himself, to undo his subjects.'<sup>39</sup>

The sense of outrage at the disclosures and commentaries can best be measured in the appearance of a new royalist news-sheet, *Mercurius Anti-Britannicus*, whose three issues were devoted to protesting outrageous tactics in the *King's Cabinet* controversy. Although some of Charles's supporters sought reinforcement from the high ground of kingship,<sup>40</sup> others found exposure to the inmost secrets of the Lord's annointed deeply troubling. One mid-century reader bound his copy of this royal text into a volume of impeccably Anglican 'Forms of Prayer'.<sup>41</sup> Another, who deemed *The Kings Cabinet Opened* 'Malitious', also confessed on the flyleaf that 'this is a difficult booke'<sup>42</sup> – the combination of august provenance and subject matter surely compounded his perplexity. No better solution could be found in poetic inspiration. Writing a year later, after the King's surrender in disguise to the Scots, but with the 1645 catastrophe still firmly in mind, Henry Vaughan could no more 'deny curtains to thy Royal bed' than he could construe the 'Royal Riddle . . . our Hieroglyphic King!'<sup>43</sup> Most responses, though more belligerent, similarly recognised that more was at stake than the familiar items of political and religious controversy. The Earl of Bridgewater brusquely acknowledged the awkwardness of the affair when he annotated his copy of

## READING THE ROYAL ROMANCE

*The King's Cabinet Opened*, and imputed the decision to publish taken by the King's foes 'to their shame, it being not onely a rebellious, but a Clownish action'.<sup>44</sup>

While Charles's defenders found the rationalization of parliamentary or Irish matters relatively straightforward, they were much less certain of the course to tread when they turned to the criticism of the Queen. One apologist declared loftily this was 'not one of those that I think worthy to Answer'.<sup>45</sup> Another tried to deflect the gender-subversion charge with a limp tribute to the King's 'stile masculine', before proceeding to a more enthusiastic – and in terms of cultural history, apparently up-to-speed – defence of the place of romance within marriage. 'Tis true, if this booke had never seene the light, you and I should have made no doubt at all of the King's Conjugall affection, yet I must confesse 'tis here set downe with so much virtue and elegance, and hence appears to be so handsome a thing, that for the time to come I shall love my owne wife the better.' The author challenged patriarchalist assumptions more directly when he insisted, 'It is not onely not unfit for a wife to present advise to her husband, but indeed extreamly proper'. Though he claimed to believe the published letters would in fact 'take off that uxorious slirre that hath been oft urged', there was more than a trace of anxiety in his reflection, 'no mervaille if vulgar eyes dazle at the beames of such a Sunne, and so sometimes cannot see the King, because he doth so well play the Husband'.<sup>46</sup> Others weighed in with more gusto, refurbishing Charles the model husband he had proclaimed himself to be in the Court masques of the 1630s as eagerly as they asserted Charles the model king. 'As a Husband, doe but observe, how kinde He is, and yet withall, how Chast . . . How full of warme expressions of Love, and yet how farre from Wanton.'<sup>47</sup> But such idealizing echoes of the masques could not drown out the noise of controversy. *Mercurius Anti-Britannicus* quickly set to work: 'where the King in Civility to the Queene, stiles himselfe *Eternally Hers* . . . where lyes the Exception? I'st in the Amorousnesse of the Stile? 'Tis no more then such a Husband, could in just Affection say to such a Wife. Nor halfe so much as *Britannicus* himself (if he were whipt to Confession) saies dayly to Her, who hath long since reduced him to Salivation, Sweat and dryed Racke of Mutton; I might for name sake, put Mercury [the prevailing antidote to syphilis] into the Receipt.'<sup>48</sup> That descent into sexual rancour – which certainly alarmed some royalists<sup>49</sup> – was part of the stock-in-trade of robust pamphleteering; but it also betrayed another concern. As *Anti-Britannicus* expostulated, 'To pry into their Princes Curtaines, and to divulge what the Queene said to her Husband in his Armes, is a Crime certainly, next to His who saw a Goddess naked.'<sup>50</sup>

Nakedness is a theme that runs through the royalist counters to *The King's Cabinet Opened*, although it was the nakedness not of the Queen but of the King that caused concern. Most of the royalists who in 1645 reflected on the publication of the intimacies of the King used the scriptural scene of Noah

DEREK HIRST

asleep in his tent, drunk and naked, to shape their outrage.<sup>51</sup> It might be argued that application of the figure of Noah was safely contained by its obvious political bearing – Noah, the very type of patriarchal monarchy, had endured inundation and devastation.<sup>52</sup> But Charles's followers appear to have been drawn as well by the implications of a father exposed as they pondered a king discredited. Looking back from 1647 on the publication of *The Kings Cabinet Opened*, the cleric Edward Symmons insisted at the very outset of his work that Parliament had erred in allowing Marchamont Nedham to fill the margins of his newspaper with his vauntings: 'What reward or commendation can you expect at Gods hand, for maintaining your Beadsman *Britanicus*, to libell against his Sovereigne, to teach and excite by his weekly books, the ignorant and seduced vulgar, throughout the Kingdome, to joyn with him in reviling and laughing to scorn their publike Father.'<sup>53</sup> Other observers were convinced that it was not merely the public figure that had been demystified. In his closing peroration, the author of *A Key* dilated on the affront to Charles himself: 'How hath his happy Government been traduced, and his own sacred Person, exposed.'<sup>54</sup> Indeed, *Some Observations* attributed a programmatic voyeurism to the King's foes: 'I cannot say remember Cham, that discovered his Fathers Nakednesse, for that's not your case; you discover not, you make.'<sup>55</sup>

Royalists' fears therefore ran beyond the opening of *arcana imperii* to vulgar eyes. The apologist who imagined Charles in adversity, 'upon David's adventure; which is, to expose himselfe naked against a Gyant', acknowledged the limits of masculine potency.<sup>56</sup> And those limits were physical, even sexual. For all his *gravitas*, the King himself seems to have recognised this, since the chapter in *Eikon Basilike* that engages with his published correspondence introduces a note of real discomfort into that book's smooth blend of Christian humility and political vindication. Charles and his ghost-writers warned those enemies who published his letters that they should 'remember how God blest the modest respect and filiall tendernesse, which Noah's sons bare to their father; nor did his open infirmity justify Cham's impudency, or exempt him from that curse of being Servant of Servants'.<sup>57</sup> With its vague reference to the 'open infirmity' that Noah, the great progenitor, displayed in his tent, *Eikon Basilike* betrayed unmistakable unease about the foundations of power in masculinity and therefore sexuality. Was the infirmity that was opened Noah's drunkenness, or his genitals? – both are in the scriptural source, and both hint equally at the vulnerability of the male.<sup>58</sup> And how could the King not have been uneasy, when his supporters read his letters in just the way Nedham wanted? The author of *A Key to the King's Cabinet*, who pronounced it 'a barbarous and unmanly thing, to betray the secrets between Man and Wife, unto the whole World', surely compounded any damage the enemy had done. Royalists were probably not the only ones who squirmed as they read *A Key's* insistence that the victors of Naseby should 'never have lead a poore Cabinet, Captive; and displayed the King

## READING THE ROYAL ROMANCE

and Queenes Letters in triumph, as they did their Colours; . . . never have made the Spoyles of very Manhood, a sacrifice to the wanton spleen of Man . . . never have prostituted those chast and holy Papers, to the base adulteries of all common Eyes.<sup>59</sup> That image of royal sexuality and intimacy paraded through the streets of London introduced a startling new dimension into partisan politics.

Yet there was warrant for disclosure. Marriage was after all a public institution, and, for men at least, a crucial stage in the transition to full membership of society. The Elizabethan moralist and polemicist Philip Stubbes had underscored the ineluctably public role of marriage when he proclaimed, 'Mariage is the most important matter even to the privatest person that hee can doe all his life long'.<sup>60</sup> Historians have outlined the role of family and household as constituents and guarantors of the early-modern body politic, and have made a similar case for the body physical, whose eccentricities and excesses were intermittently but sometimes vengefully policed by neighbours and magistrates who alleged the health of the body politic as their warrant.<sup>61</sup> All paid at least lip service to the ideal of the body politic and the common weal; and all recognised that in practice countrymen, townsmen, even noblemen – and, *a fortiori*, their womenfolk – were subject to the pulls of emotion and attachment, for which discipline might be invoked. Except to the moralist, little there would have seemed worthy of comment. But was it possible to sustain a matter-of-fact acceptance of the realities of affectivity when affectivity tugged on a king – a king who had conventionally been represented as an office and an icon, and at least in some sense as the very embodiment of the public, or rather of the body politic? The controversy over *The Kings Cabinet Opened* vented both sides of the case. The ridicule and mockery sustained the contention that the proper channelling of sexuality was of public concern, but the dissenting voices indicate that Marchamont Nedham had not written the only script on early-modern affectivity.

However difficult it sometimes seems to separate public from private in the early-modern world, concealment had its own legitimacy. The fig leaves of Genesis and the curse of Noah suggest the antiquity of the prejudice against the exposure of sexuality, with the earlier text's discovery of shame compounded by the Noah story's taboo on the disclosure of male vulnerability. A cursory reading of the *OED* indicates that even in the heyday of the body politic, or of the medieval *res publica Christiana*, various cognates of 'private' – 'privy', 'privity', even 'privacy' – enjoyed an energetic life that was not contained by their elitist cousin, 'privilege', and that apparently had much to do with the sexuality of the 'privy members'. Word-use may be part of some cultural *longue duree*, but it also manifestly participates in narratives of change, and the usages of 'privacy' multiplied in the seventeenth century. Such change is unlikely to have been wholly driven by urbanization, growing material comfort and the emergence of a middle class, for a new concern with the personal and the intimate became evident in polemics in the aftermath of *The*

*Kings Cabinet Opened*. And it was not only royalists who were squeamish. Writing to answer another, and more famous, 'King's Book', John Milton in *Eikonoklastes* blamed that novel concern with the intimate on Charles's bad taste in using *Eikon Basilike* to hymn his Queen – 'What concerns it us to hear a Husband . . . extolling to others the virtues of his Wife: an infirmity not seldom incident to those who have least cause.'<sup>62</sup> Indeed, the determination with which Milton in *Paradise Lost* locates wedded bliss securely within an arbour whose leafy screen is pulled shut, and into which only Satan intrudes, suggests the continuing polemical force of the issue, which was heightened for him by the renewed flaunting of a royal body, that of the profligate Charles II.<sup>63</sup> Milton's ability to join hands with royalists in defence of the seclusions of intimacy suggests how hard it was to rationalize the disclosure of the intimacies of a king, however public his role and presence, other than in partisan terms. But if the public scrutiny of intimacy was improper, what were the criteria that made it so? In the King's own eyes, publication of his letters to his wife was an offence against 'Honour and Civility', or, at worst, 'inhumane . . . barbarous'; to the Earl of Bridgwater, as we have seen, it was a 'Clownish action'.<sup>64</sup> The recourse of both to the discourse of honour is itself suggestive of the location of secludedness in the domain of the elite, rather than of some nascent middle-class. But though Charles and Bridgwater did not reach for the category that would come readily to our minds, others pushed past them to engage more directly with a concept of privacy.

The terms 'private' and 'public' had long been known, and long juxtaposed. The King himself invoked them when, three weeks after the publication of his correspondence, he reflected on the damage done: 'I would fain know him who would be willing, that the freedom of all his private Letters were publickly seen, as mine have now been.'<sup>65</sup> The very elegance of his formulation suggests that by this point the distinction had become familiar enough.<sup>66</sup> Nevertheless, his humiliation introduced new categories to the discussion, and made it possible to draw sharper distinctions. Parliament had flaunted what could be – and were – construed as love letters, rather than merely 'private' correspondence. Some of Charles's defenders made much of the point, claiming that it was above all the very intimacy of the letters that took readers deep into the King's heart, mind, conscience. Lluellyn likened the letters between King and Queen to the disembodied communications of angels, and the author of *Some Observations* underscored, though in more prosaic terms, the assumption that in the language of intimacy lay truth: 'Look upon these Letters as the truest Mirror of the King's mind; Here you may say he was not drawne, but shewed Himselfe to the life.'<sup>67</sup> It was that inner self, expressed only because the King was in communication with his Queen, which was offered to public view and annotation. The great fault of Parliament lay therefore not in divulging captured letters of the King, for the publication of captured correspondence, and the more 'secret' the better, was part of the traffic of partisanship; rather, it was the divulging

## READING THE ROYAL ROMANCE

of intimacy. The King's defenders in the controversy saw that as the bedrock of privacy.

In making such a case for privacy, royalists seem to have extended the generally acknowledged claims of the body and its 'privy members' to incorporate the transactions of intimacy. The story of Noah in his tent implicated not just the male body but privacy in marriage, since the story told of fathers and sons; and through the eternal servanthood – and blackness? – visited on Ham it declared the unmanliness and not merely the dishonour of prying and disclosure. The elevation of a domestic intimacy that was tied to sexuality is unmistakable. From the other side of the fence, John Milton claimed to agree, as he scornfully demanded of *Eikon Basilike's* rescue work, 'What concerns it us to hear a Husband divulge his Houshold privacies. . .?'<sup>68</sup> On this shared commitment to the intimate seclusions of affectivity and domesticity, some commentators reached further to articulate what looks like a claim to privacy. Thus, Lluellyn began with a blunt insistence on the privacy of thought and an unstated assumption – presumably built upon the dictum that marriage makes one flesh out of two bodies – that marital conversation is no less internalized than thought. He quickly proceeded by way of a taboo on voyeurism into a broad claim for intimate communication: 'Our Thoughts no Commons, but Inclosures are: / What bold Intruders then are who assaile, / To cut their Princes Hedge, and break his Pale! / That so Unmanly gaze, and dare be seen / Ev'n then, when He converses with His Queene?' Lluellyn made the juxtaposition of voyeurism and privacy clearer a few lines later when he denounced those who would the 'Private View'.<sup>69</sup> The proliferating images of his couplets underscore the richness and complexity of thinking about the (royal) body, for the talk of hedges and fences unmistakably introduces considerations of property and rights. The author of *A Key to the King's Cabinet* made the association clearer and more emphatic when he condemned the publishers of the letters for their readiness to 'break downe the Hedges of Nations, or of Nature'.<sup>70</sup> The inchoateness of the terms used is as suggestive as the obvious and powerful claim that there was something natural, but – or almost certainly *and* – also something proprietorial, about a 'private' that centered on but was not limited to the body.<sup>71</sup>

The letters captured at Naseby, and then broadcast in print, helped bring Charles to the block. They occasioned a remarkable episode in the history of the book, that allows us rare access to sustained acts of reading, both partisan and private. The letters published in *The King's Cabinet Opened* also demanded that their readers think of the King as human being, as subject, in a narrative very different from the more familiar story of King *vs.* Parliament. That narrative – of subjectivity – is one that many of Charles's subjects found even more troubling to experience than modern scholars have found it to construct. Not least, the controversy over the letters reminded them, and reminds us, of the relation of 'manhood', of virility, to power: it is a subject

DEREK HIRST

dear to anthropologists but until the recent work of Elizabeth Foyster, Susan Amussen and Alexandra Shepard it was largely lost to historians.<sup>72</sup> Equally in need of further examination is the history of privacy. While the relation of subjectivity and the private crystallized in the 1645 controversy, it is not the argument of this paper that the affair of *The Kings Cabinet Opened* was responsible for the recognition of any new claim of right. The speed and confidence with which controversialists articulated their positions suggest instead that the terms for a discussion of privacy centered in the body and the affections were already available. Nevertheless, those terms had been scattered and unformed until the exposure of the person and body of the King – quite as much as the emergence of an opposite pole in ‘the public sphere’, or the rise of a middle class – brought them together and extended their reach. The king’s body physical constituted a powerful site of tensions, and the diary of Samuel Pepys, with its patently guilty pleasure in all the evidence of royal fleshliness, suggests how powerful a charge it could administer. It was scarcely coincidental therefore that in a time of accelerating drift away from a governing metaphor of the body politic and towards an increasingly articulated distinction between public and private worlds, the bodily needs and affections of two successive kings should have been so much in view. That fact may suggest a methodological corrective.

We have become accustomed in recent years to the practice of social history from below. The press fascination of the 1640s with the royal marriage hints at a counter-flow. It was the royal romance that was publicized and circulated by parliamentary authority, and reflected on by a host of commentators. However ‘functional’ privacy was to ‘early-modern reproductive rituals, ensuring female modesty’,<sup>73</sup> the highly topical meaning of the story of Noah for the plight of the patriarch surely played its own part, alongside the enduring seclusions of childbirth and the emerging delights of the domestic hearth, in the ideological shift to a new world of privacy. When the lusty Lancashire apprentice Roger Lowe beckoned his sweetheart down the path of romance after the Restoration, and braved her parents’ displeasure to visit ‘the Cabinet that received the choice of my affection’, he surely borrowed from the representation of the late king. In so doing, he unwittingly challenged the modern assumption that it was the middle classes who pioneered intimacy and affectivity.<sup>74</sup>

Washington University, St Louis

DEREK HIRST

## Notes

- 1 An early and famous exception to this observation is Alan Macfarlane, *Origins of English Individualism* (Oxford, 1978). In a rather different vein, Laura Gowing’s location of privacy in the female condition and the female body closes the door to both contingency and crisis: Laura Gowing, ‘Ordering the Body: Illegitimacy

## READING THE ROYAL ROMANCE

- and Female Authority in Seventeenth-Century England,' in Michael J. Braddick and John Walter, eds, *Negotiating Power in Early Modern Society* (Cambridge, 2001), p. 50.
- 2 See for example the recent controversy over the place of women's history in grand narratives of change: Judith Bennett, "'History that stands still'", *Feminist Studies*, 14/2 (1988), 269–83; Bridget Hill, 'Women's history: a study in change, continuity or standing still?', *Women's History Review*, 2/1 (1993), 5–22, and Judith Bennett, 'Women's History: a study in continuity and change', *ibid.*, 2/2 (1993), 173–84. See too the challenge to periodization issued by Amanda Vickery, 'Golden Age to Separate Spheres', *Historical Journal*, 36 (1993), 383–414.
  - 3 Roger Chartier, ed., *Passions of the Renaissance* (Cambridge, MA., 1989), pp. 5, 9–10 and *passim*: both Aries and the volume's editor, Chartier, accord England a place of prominence in their account.
  - 4 Vickery, 'Golden Age to Separate Spheres', 383–414; Elizabeth Foyster, *Manhood in Early Modern England* (London and New York, 1999), pp. 207–18.
  - 5 Malcolm Gaskill, *Crime and Mentalities in Early Modern England* (Cambridge, 2000), p. 307. Of especial interest for the present study is his contention that the seventeenth century witnessed the politically-inspired erosion of 'the intimacy of self-regulating communities': *ibid.* p. 263.
  - 6 Ernst H. Kantorowicz, *The King's Two Bodies* (Princeton, 1957).
  - 7 See *Three Speeches Spoken at a Common-Hall, Thursday the 3. of July 1645*.
  - 8 *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer* 1–8 July 1645 [E292(15)], p. 850. *A Perfect Diurnall* 30 June–7 July 1645 [E262(17)], p. 804, called the hubbub 'almost unexpressible', while *Mercurius Anti-Britanicus* 4–11 August [E296(9)], p. 10, testified angrily, 'all that heard . . . gave a shout, as lowd as that which the people gave Herod'.
  - 9 *True Informer* 29 June–5 Aug. 1645 [E292(9)].
  - 10 See, for example, *Mercurius Britanicus* 14–21 July [E293(15)]; *Moderate Intelligencer* 10–17 July 1645 [E293(6)], p. 159; *Parliaments Post* 8–15 July 1645 [E293(2)], p. 8; *Perfect Occurrences* 11–18 July [E262(25)]; *Perfect Passages* 9–16 July 1645 [E262(23)], p. 301.
  - 11 Only Henry Parker's *Observations* (1642) exceeded it: for this, see Michael Mendle, *Henry Parker and the English Civil War* (Cambridge, 1995), esp. pp. 90–110. Parker was, ironically, the prime editor of *The Kings Cabinet Opened*.
  - 12 E293(2), p. 8.
  - 13 *The Kings Cabinet Opened*, preface.
  - 14 Anon., *Some Observations upon Occasion of the Publishing their Majesties Letters* (Oxford, 1645), p. 13.
  - 15 Mendle, *Henry Parker and the Civil War*, pp. 25–26.
  - 16 *Kings Cabinet Opened*, sig. A3v. In a striking testimonial to the circulation of and familiarity with the King's signature, *Mercurius Veridicus* for 28 June–5 July 1645 reported that the letters now made available for all to see were written by a hand 'best known of any in England': E292(8), pp. 89–90. The main royalist newspaper claimed that the offer of inspection on the premises was made in the hope of identifying royalist sympathisers. *Mercurius Aulicus* 13–20 July 1645 [E296(33)], p. 1664.
  - 17 Steven Shapin, *A Social History of Truth: Civility and Science in Seventeenth-Century England* (Chicago, 1994).

- 18 *The Kings Cabinet Opened*, preface.
- 19 *Perfect Occurrences* 11–18 July 1645 [E262(25)].
- 20 *The Kings Cabinet Opened*, preface.
- 21 See *Three Speeches*, passim.
- 22 The damage was such that, one newspaper reported on 5 August, James Kirk, a Gentleman of the Bedchamber, ‘was lately trussed up . . . for not being carefull of preserving the Cabinet of Letters’. *True Informer* 29 July–5 August 1645 [E292(9)], p. 83.
- 23 *The Kings Cabinet Opened*, preface, sig. A3.
- 24 The phrase is one of Milton’s kinder terms of abuse for him: Don M. Wolfe, ed., *The Complete Prose Works of John Milton*, 8 vols (New Haven, 1953–82) [hereinafter *CPW*], III, 420–21.
- 25 *The Kings Cabinet Opened*, pp. 1, 3, 4, 6, 8, 38.
- 26 See too Thomas N. Corns, ‘Duke, Prince and King’, and Ann Baynes Coiro, ‘“A Ball of Strife”: Caroline Poetry and Royal Marriage’, in Thomas N. Corns, ed., *The Royal Image: Representations of Charles I* (Cambridge, 1999), pp. 1–46.
- 27 *The Kings Cabinet Opened*, pp. 32, 34–36.
- 28 *Perfect Passages of Each Dayes Proceedings in Parliament* 9–16 July 1645 [E262(23)].
- 29 John Dod and Robert Cleaver, *A Godlie Forme of Householde Government* (1612), p. 16.
- 30 *The Kings Cabinet Opened*, pp. 6, 12, 39.
- 31 *Ibid.*, 43–44; *CPW*, III, 538.
- 32 *Parliaments Post* 8–15 July 1645 [E293(2)], p. 8.
- 33 *The Moderate Intelligencer* 10–17 July 1645 [E293(6)], p. 159.
- 34 *Mercurius Britannicus* 30 June–7 July [E292(10)], p. 801.
- 35 *Mercurius Britannicus* 14–21 July 1645 [E293(15)], pp. 809–10. *Parliaments Post* 15–23 July 1645 [E293(20)], p. 4, reached a similar verdict, reporting that from ‘his Conscience and his Kingdome [the King] is led away a Captive by two such mighty Tyrants as Necessity and Love’.
- 36 *Mercurius Britannicus* 14–21 July 1645 [E293(15)], pp. 811, 814.
- 37 *Mercurius Britannicus* 21–28 July 1645 [E294(5)], pp. 817–20.
- 38 *Ibid.*, 28 July–4 Aug. 1645 [E294(29)], p. 825: I am grateful for the identification to a participant in the ‘England’s Age of Revolution’ conference in Chicago, in November 2001. It is striking that when Nedham was driven by the storm of protests over the hue-and-cry to publish if not an apology then at least a disclaimer, it was on the mistiming of his comments about the King’s dealings in Ireland (since Parliament had its own talks afoot) and his apparent attempt ‘to disgrace the King in his naturall infirmity, (as some conceive [sic])’, of stuttering on which he focused; he offered no extenuation for his comments on the royal marriage: *Mercurius Britannicus, His Apologie to All Well-affected People* (1645), esp. p. 5; also *Aulicus his Hue and Cry Sent forth after Britannicus* (1645).
- 39 *Perfect Occurrences* 22–29 August 1645 [E264(3)].
- 40 As did the Oxford writer who held Parker and his editorial colleagues guilty of ‘slandering the footsteps of Gods Anoynted, Even for your Paraphrase’: *Some Observations*, p. 13. In similar vein, the subtitle to Anon., *A Key to the Kings Cabinet* ([Oxford], 1645), denounces the ‘*Blasphemous Observations*’ of the parliamentary orators at Common Hall.

## READING THE ROYAL ROMANCE

- 41 Henry E. Huntington Library, California, accession # 438000:33. Although *The Kings Cabinet Opened* is chronologically the last item in a collection that is clearly mid-century, it remains possible that the whole was assembled and bound together after the appearance of *Eikon Basilike*, which of course shaped many subsequent representations of Charles I.
- 42 The endorsement (in a mid-17th-century hand) to the badly cropped flyleaf in fact reads, 'This is a difficult booke to . . . [the first letter of the cropped word could be "g", "y", "q", or a "p" with an abbreviation] and Malitious.' Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley, Rare Books Room, DA396/A22K5/1645 c.2.
- 43 Henry Vaughan, 'The King Disguised', lines 35, 40. The pressure of *The Kings Cabinet Opened* on an equally perplexed John Cleveland is surely evident in his reference to the enigmatic King as the 'Text Royall'. John Cleveland, 'The Kings Disguise', line 97. Both are quoted in James Loxley, *Royalism and Poetry in the English Civil Wars* (Basingstoke, 1997), p. 144.
- 44 Henry E. Huntington Library, California, Rare Books Room, catalog # 54008. The reasons for Bridgwater's social stigmatization of the King's enemies are apparent in the polite prohibition on loose sexual talk and display: see especially Anna Bryson, *From Courtesy to Civility* (Oxford, 1998), pp. 161–3.
- 45 *Some Observations*, p. 6.
- 46 Anon., *A Letter, in which The Arguments of the Annotator, and three other Speeches Upon their Majestie's Letters Published at London, are Examined and Answered* ([Oxford], 1645), pp. 2, 4, 6.
- 47 *A Key to the King's Cabinet*, p. 52.
- 48 *Mercurius Anti-Britannicus, or The Second Part*, p. 14.
- 49 Edward Symmons, *A Vindication of King Charles : or, A loyal subjects duty. Manifested in vindicating his soveraigne from those aspersions cast upon him by certaine persons, in a scandalous libel, entituled, The Kings cabinet opened* (London, 1648), preface, sig. A3.
- 50 *Mercurius Anti-Britannicus, or, The Second Part of the King's Cabinet Vindicated*, p. 30.
- 51 Hirst and Zwicker were therefore not quite correct when they argued that Marvell was remarkable in drawing a story of rage and shame from the figure of Noah, the archetypal father and monarch; where Marvell was remarkable was in so brutally juxtaposing the act of creation with the state of nakedness: see Derek Hirst and Stephen Zwicker, 'Andrew Marvell and the Toils of Patriarchy: Fatherhood, Longing and the Body Politic', *ELH*, 66 (1999), 643–44.
- 52 John Milton, commissioned by Parliament to confute *Eikon Basilike*, found this claim easy to confront. He denied any resemblance between Charles and Noah, since 'he at that time could be no way esteem'd *the Father of his Countrey*, but the destroyer'. *CPW*, III, 543.
- 53 Symmons, *Vindication of King Charles*, p. 9. Symmons then went on to urge modesty and shame before, on p. 14 and throughout, returning to magnify the offence of those who traduce the father, or in this case, the King as father of the country. The Oxford poet Martin Lluellyn similarly thought the offence the greater in that Parliament 'Let in the *Madnesse of the People* too': [Martin Lluellyn], *A Satyr, Occasioned by the Author's Survey of a Scandalous Pamphlet Intituled, The King's Cabanet [sic] Opened* (1645), p. 2.

- 54 *A Letter*, p. 41; *A Key to the King's Cabinet*, p. 53. Two years later the clergyman Edward Symmons also thought the controversy had 'uncloath'd the King'. Symmons, *Vindication of King Charles*, p. 241. Symmons dated his 'Preface to the Reader', Oct. 25, 1647.
- 55 *Some Observations*, p. 8; *A Satyr*, p. 2. *A Letter*, p. 21, held out consolation in the eventual fulfillment of the curse: 'Tis no presumption to thinke that the crime of Cham will at length meet with Cham's reward.'
- 56 *Mercurius Anti-Britannicus; or, The Second Part*, p. 28.
- 57 *Eikon Basilike* (1649), chap. 21: 'Upon His Majesties Letters taken and divulged.' See also the meditation appended to the chapter, which prays that the ill his enemies intended against him may 'returne on their owne heads, that they may be ashamed, and covered with their owne confusion; as with a Cloake'.
- 58 *A Letter*, p. 21, carefully defined Noah's failing as drunkenness, but it is unlikely that an author who began his pamphlet with attacks on the disclosure of marital secrets thought the relevance of Noah's infirmities to Charles limited to a taste for alcohol which had never been imputed to the King.
- 59 *A Key to the King's Cabinet* ([Oxford], 1645), pp. 2–3. The author continued [p. 4] by attacking the 'masculine eloquence' of Parliament's July 3 deputation to the Guildhall, which had seized 'the Mayden-head of the Citties Attention'.
- 60 Philip Stubbes, *The Gaping Gulf* (London, 1579), sig. B vii.
- 61 See, for example, David Underdown, *A Freeborn People* (Oxford, 1996).
- 62 *CPW*, III, 419.
- 63 Milton, *Paradise Lost*, bk. IV, lines 690–775, 799–800. Milton had of course engaged with issues of married love in the divorce tracts.
- 64 *Eikon Basilike* (1649), chapter 21.
- 65 Charles to Edward Nicholas, three weeks after the publication of *The Kings Cabinet Opened*, in *Reliquiae Sacrae Carolinae* (1650), p. 224.
- 66 See for example Nedham's offhand judgment that a king's 'private affections ought not sway him in publique Affaires': above, p. 217. For discussion of the theme of private interest and public concern, see Irene Coltman, *Private Men and Public Causes* (London, 1962), and J. A. W. Gunn, *Politics and the Public Interest in the Seventeenth Century* (London, 1969).
- 67 *A Satyr*, p. 2; *Some Observations*, p. 2.
- 68 *CPW*, III, 419.
- 69 *A Satyr*, p. 2. Lluellyn's argument is exactly that made by Marvell in his 'First Anniversary', lines 291–2: the voyeurist son is guilty of self-exposure as well as of exposing his father.
- 70 *A Satyr*, p. 2; *A Key to the King's Cabinet*, p. 3. See too the royalist attempt to deflect attention from disclosures of the King and Queen by reflecting on promiscuity in London: 'he was thought most publique, who least confined himselfe to inclosure': *Mercurius Anti-Britannicus*, p. 29. The place of hedges in these early discussions of privacy invites speculation on the naming of the privet hedge – already so-called in the mid-sixteenth century – whose etymology the *OED* deems obscure.
- 71 *A Satyr*, p. 2; *Some Observations*, p. 2.
- 72 Foyster, *Manhood in Early Modern England*; Susan Amussen, 'Punishment, Discipline and Power: the Social Meanings of Violence in Early Modern England', *Journal of British Studies*, 34/1 (1995), 1–34; Alexandra Shepard, 'The Meaning

READING THE ROYAL ROMANCE

---

of Manhood in Early Modern England' (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Cambridge University, 1998).

73 Gowing, 'Ordering the Body', p. 50.

74 W. L. Sachse, ed., *The Diary of Roger Lowe* (New Haven, 1938), p. 24.

**Address for Correspondence**

Professor Derek Hirst, History Department, Washington University in St Louis, St Louis, MO63130, USA, e-mail: dmhirst@artsci.wustl.edu