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Abstract

After the much beloved, but single and childless, Elizabeth Tudor, the Stuarts of Scotland were next in line for the throne of England. They came to power in a century of political change for the Monarchy. The 'Art' of Majesty looks at how the Stuarts attempted to display itself to the world. Serving a more political rather than artistic purpose, these portraits hide more than they reveal. At a time when the Monarchy needed to project idealized images of majesty, it is these hidden stories which are often the most valuable.
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Introduction

Portraits of monarchs and aristocrats are meant to impress viewers. Gazing upon their portraits, we are meant to be awestruck by the ostentatious displays of power and wealth. But it is difficult for audiences to separate fiction from fact. The sitters may be dressed in the finest textiles and expensive jewels, but the portraits were nothing more than a staged performance. A 1604 portrait of King James VI & I, for example, reflects less of the actual image of the King and more of the personification of the perceived power of the Stuart Monarchy - omnipotent, wealthy and stable.\(^1\) Sent to Madrid as a gift to King Philip IV of Spain, the portrait equally represents the wealth and power of the British Isles. But the Stuart dynasty ruled an island that would experience dramatic political and social changes throughout the seventeenth century, forever changing the position of the Monarchy.

2014 marks the 300th anniversary of the death of Britain’s Queen Anne and the end of the ruling House of Stuart. James Stuart of Scotland, after the much beloved, but single and childless, Elizabeth Tudor of England, united the kingdoms in his person upon accession. Arriving in London in 1603, James I settled in a kingdom that was a player on the stage of international politics. His son and successor, Charles I,

\(^1\) With the exception of King James VI & I, the regnal numbers refer to their rule over England and Scotland, respectively. This work will make note only of their regnal name in England.
affirmed his father’s belief in divine kingship and unquestioned authority by suspending Parliament and ruling as the indisputable ruler of the land - only to lose his head at the end of a Civil War. But after dallying with republicanism under Oliver Cromwell’s Commonwealth, England returned to a monarchial system in 1660 and restored the dynasty under Charles's son and namesake. Despite ruling with the legislature, Charles II was all too willing to flex his political muscle in order to reassert the independence of the Crown. His brother, James II, tried to follow the same policy. But it was his overt practice of Catholicism that found James off the throne after only three years. The Glorious Revolution of 1688 gave Parliament the exclusive right to choose who should sit on the throne, removing the traditional system of hereditary succession. The legislature offered the throne to James’s daughter and son-in-law Mary II & William III. The childless dual monarchs left the throne to Mary’s younger sister Anne, who, like her predecessors, did not have any children when she inherited the crown in 1702. After her death in 1714 the legislature once again decided to whom the crown should be offered. Demanding a Protestant monarch, the throne would pass to the German House of Hanover. The Stuart monarchy, over the course of the seventeenth century, saw its authority challenged, prerogatives limited, and sanctity denied. Nevertheless, the portraits of monarchs became increasingly majestic and dramatic. Undoubtedly, the display of majesty hid much more than they revealed.

Displaying the majesty of the Monarchy was not limited to the monarchs themselves. The family was a crucial component in seventeenth-century European society. In politics and in portraiture, the royal consorts and children were additional jewels of the crown and representations of the social, financial and political capital of the Monarchy. In portraiture, consorts were captured in stately poses while adorned with the most valuable jewels and draped
in the richest fabrics. But these portraits were certainly deceiving. For many of the Stuart consorts, portraiture was one of the key avenues for displaying their Catholic faith, isolating them at the Court of a Protestant kingdom. Royal prichelings, whether painted by Sir Anthony van Dyck or Sir Godfrey Kneller, represented both the fertility and healthiness of the royal family. Though their images would be displayed along the paintings of their parents, many of the royal children – most especially the hopeful heirs and potential monarchs – died before reaching adulthood. Behind these portraits were consorts and children who at times had dynamic relationships with their spouses and parents, complementing or challenging the royal majesty.

What is majesty? The word provides various meanings. While it can mean sovereign or royal power, it can also be defined as impressive stateliness or dignity. In the political sense, majesty means the power of the monarch. The British Government remains Her (His) Majesty’s Government, as the monarch is head of the executive branch. Government ministers represent the conduit through which the monarch’s authority is directed. However, that power is intangible. The tangibility of majesty is represented through the priceless regalia and expensive clothing, often displayed at royal ceremonies. Portraiture, like the government ministers and regalia, served as a conduit for presenting the intangible. Whether they were displayed in royal palaces, country homes of the nobility, in government buildings or in Anglican churches, portraits promoted the idea of august power and great splendor. Even as the power of the monarchs was challenged and, later, declined, Stuart portraiture continued to reinforce that said majesty.

Historians, of art or otherwise, use the medium of portraiture as a way of assessing their preferred sphere of inquiry. Costume historians, using portraiture over the course of the early
modern period, can demonstrate shifts in sartorial trends. Similarly, by identifying similar patterns and key signatures of artists, art historians have used portraits to discover previously unknown works of art. Research into a painting purchased by a priest concluded his £400 purchase was an original Sir Anthony van Dyck – now worth a thousand times its purchase!\(^2\)

And, of course, portraits can be used to analyze the sociopolitical landscape of a country. The analyses of Elizabeth I by preeminent art historians Roy Strong and Amelia Frances developed a strong consensus of the famous queen, one which most twentieth and twenty-first century popular and academic audiences can identify in visual and performance arts.\(^3\) The ‘Art’ of Majesty juxtaposes similar methods with Stuart portraiture.

Art, however, is in the eye of the beholder. Art analysis can be controversial, countering longstanding ideas held in high regard. And the most famous of the English monarchs is no exception. Late-twentieth century revisionists began to shed a new, if not entirely positive, light on Elizabeth I. Susan Doran and Julia Walker challenge Elizabeth’s reinforcement of her status as a virgin in portraiture, or the negative portrayals of the Queen in late-sixteenth century media.\(^4\)

Royal portraits, often believed to be commissioned by the monarchs for their royal court, were believed to be under kingly scrutiny when reproduced for public consumption. However, as Kevin Sharpe demonstrates, these images were managed by actors both within and, at times,
outside of Court, giving less credence to the absolute nature of the Tudor kingship.\(^5\) The same holds certainly true of successive monarchs.

Most scholarship on Stuart portraiture, like the Tudors, focus on the representations of the monarchs themselves. But portraits were equally commissioned to portray other actors. Though focusing primarily on the lives of the more influential Stuart consorts – Anne of Denmark and Henrietta Maria of France – art historians have taken a growing interest in consorts as sitters and royal patrons.\(^6\) No doubt due to the artistic legacy of Van Dyck, studies on royal princlings are often centered on the children of Charles I and Henrietta Maria. However, there has been an increasing interest in the princely court of Henry Frederick, James I’s eldest son and ill-fated heir.\(^7\) Charles II’s consort Catherine of Braganza stands as one of the least influential Stuart consorts. Few works assess her role as patron and sitter of Sir Peter Lely, who would go on to paint the sensuous courtesans and mistresses at the Restoration court. As the daughters of James II, Mary and Anne survived the rigors of premature deaths to become rulers in their own right. Little has been studied on the portraitures commissioned of them as princesses. Works do exist on the images of the royal sisters as queens regnant, though scholarship on Anne’s portraiture is far more prevalent.\(^8\) While few works focus on James II’s portraits during his brief


tenure, avenues have been made in recent years into his role as exiled king and patron. The least studied is that of the only child of Queen Anne to survive infancy, Prince William. Despite his brief and important position as the male, Protestant heir, William’s life was unexpectedly cut short. The few portraits of the Prince that exist, however, hide much more than they show.

These paintings, along with other objects and curiosities, ‘performed’ in a variety of ways. Put on display in the rooms of the rich and famous, they could tell of the collector’s desire for knowledge; a demonstration of adopting court or ‘high’ culture; or, quite simply, an inherent desire to collect and store objects for perpetuity. Among Stuart England’s greatest collectors was Charles I. At its peak, the collection included nearly 2,000 paintings, sculptures, tapestries and other objects d’art by famous Renaissance and Baroque artists. Much of the collection was sold during the republican era. At the Restoration, Charles II initiated efforts to reestablish the collection. Today, the UK’s Royal Collection is ranked among the largest ‘private’ collections in the world. Portraits from the Royal Collection, in addition to artwork from other museums and collections, were integral to this project.

The acquisition and display of portraiture by collectors was, first and foremost, a conspicuous display of wealth. Although this work does not assess the portraiture of Stuart courtiers, they too served as agents of displaying the Stuart majesty. George Villiers, 1st Duke of Buckingham, was a dominant figure in the reigns of James I and Charles I. A major art collector

---

10 Edward P. Alexander and Mary Alexander, Museums in Motion: An Introduction to the History and Functions of Museums, American Association for State and Local History Book (Lanham, Maryland: AltaMira Press, 2008), 25 & 33. Unlike collections owned by other current and former reigning dynasties, the Royal Collection is not housed in a museum but in the occupied royal palaces. However, they are held in trust to the Crown and Nation.
in early seventeenth-century England, the display of his collection was a testament to the royal largesse as it was a boast of his newly-acquired wealth. Unlike their royal masters, portraiture for the seventeenth-century aristocrat or bourgeois was a celebration of their rise in influence and wealth. Agents they were, these traits could equally make them adversaries of the Monarchy.

This study is meant to be not a standalone piece of academic writing. As a companion catalogue to a virtual exhibition and a blog, the ‘Art of Majesty’ brings together paintings of the seventeenth-century English dynasty into one, complete work.\textsuperscript{11} There have been multiple cases and arguments created by historians and art historians over the role of portraiture in society. This work serves not to take one side or the other but to find a compromise, discovering ways in which portraiture acted with or against the desired images of the Monarchy. By using the canvas rather than cannons, the Stuarts attempted to project their idealizations of majesty in a period marked chiefly by the gradual eclipsing of royal power, authority and desacralization.

\textit{Chapter One: The Stuart Monarchs}

Using the arts to demonstrate authority is not a new phenomenon. Antiquity rulers commissioned grand temples and statues to commemorate their reign. A millennia later, Renaissance princes would continue to do the same. Whether cast in medal or painted on canvas,

\textsuperscript{11} The blog, admittedly, did not go as well when it was conceived on paper. The virtual exhibit, however, was far more successful. I also had the pleasure of creating a physical display at the College’s Drake Memorial Library. My sincere thanks to Mary Jo Orzech, Director of Drake Memorial Library’s Library Information and Technology Services, and the library staff for their support.
royal imagery served to convey their role as the supreme ruler of the land. But not all messages were clear-cut.

James VI & I

As already mentioned, James’s portraits by Van Somer present the body politic of the King. They were not only to promote the royal majesty at home but also abroad, as official portraits were sent as gifts to other monarchs. The artist's 1618 full-length portrait of the King shows him placing his left hand on a clothed table with the regalia atop of it.

Dressed in all black, the garter, collar and badge of the Order of the Garter are the most prominent on him. Holding the badge of the Order in his right hand, it is possible the portrait was intended for one of its foreign members. However, a viewer could also interpret hidden, political messages. With his armor left on the floor, James turns his back away from it. His stance in the painting also reflects James’s preferred policy of peace over war. His role as peacemaker was certainly made known when the King attempted to broker marriages for his
eldest son and daughter. Favoring one to marry a Catholic and the other a Protestant, the marriages were to appease religious and political factions at home and abroad.¹²

Van Somer was also responsible for painting the King’s likeness in his state portrait. Evidence suggests the use and function of state portraits came into their own beginning in the Jacobean period.¹³ These portraits are meant to capture the physical and political representations of the Monarchy. James I had a direct hand in his 1620 state portrait by the artist. Dressed in his coronation robes while wearing the regalia, in the background of the painting one can see another artistic project the King undertook at this time: Inigo Jones’s Banqueting House. Like royal representation on canvas, James’s great project at Whitehall would serve the purpose at promoting the King’s majesty.¹⁴ Desiring to portray himself as the Peacemaker of Europe, the Banqueting House would become his “Temple of Peace.” Banqueting House was the stage for the King’s diplomatic negotiations and a space where court ceremonies were performed before a

---

limited audience. Its importance was deemed of value by the King that he demanded it be placed in the background - despite its completion in the reign of his successor, Charles I.

But not all portraitists displayed such conspicuous grandeur. John de Critz (the Elder) was among the first of the Stuart court painters. Many of his works presents a more realistic representation of the King. His 1604 portrait shows James gazing directly at the viewer, rather somberly, as his right hand rests on his hip. He looks more like a member of the nobility than sovereign of the British Isles. It is the distinction of the jewel in his hat, the Mirror of Britain, which became James’s signature or trademark. The portrait housed in Scotland’s National Portrait Gallery is one of many copies that exist worldwide. Despite its mass-production, it is believed the King disliked the portrait. Though he is known for upholding divine kingship – or, more correctly, deference toward the institution of the Crown – James’s portrait by the artist reflects his indifference toward royal ritual. He preferred a casual court etiquette in Scotland than he would enjoy in England. In Edinburgh, James enjoyed ease and open access to his innermost chambers. In London, however, court ceremonial was far more elaborate which

---

limiting access to the royal person.\textsuperscript{17} James’s attitude toward English ceremony was nowhere more evident than his 1603 entry into London. The pomp surrounding his triumphal entry was a momentous occasion, as nearly half a century passed since the last monarch made a royal entry into the capital.\textsuperscript{18} But the new monarch’s dour impression showed lack of interest. Undoubtedly, James’s lack of charisma in the public display made a lasting impression on the English courtiers.

Having a sense for his informality, many of his English courtiers looked to other figures at Court, including Robert Cecil, 1\textsuperscript{st} Earl of Salisbury. The son of the infamous Elizabethan minister William Cecil, Salisbury’s political influence earned him the position of \textit{de facto} prime minister his father enjoyed in the long service to the Virgin Queen.\textsuperscript{19} And while his position was great, it is uncertain to how much influence Salisbury had in the hiring of court painters. But one should not underestimate the role of artistic patronage: among De Critz's clients at the late-Elizabethan court was none other than Lord Salisbury. Like his father’s mistress, Robert’s master appears to have been aware of the role of visual arts in politics.\textsuperscript{20}

Charles I

Daniel Mytens, another well-known painter from the Jacobean court, was given a commission by Charles I in 1631. The artist's full-length portrait of the King shows him standing in what is presumably the Queen’s House at Greenwich. Presenting a more intimate portrayal of

\begin{footnotes}
\item[18] Parry, \textit{The Golden Age Restor'd}, 2. The last triumphal entry into the capital by a monarch was at Elizabeth I’s entry in 1558.
\item[19] David Starkey, ed., \textit{The English Court: From the Wars of the Roses to the Civil War} (London: Longman, 1987), 153. William Cecil died in 1598, four years before Elizabeth I.
\end{footnotes}
the King, Charles is shown dressed in contemporary fashion as he strikes a pose before a table with the regalia atop of it. Royal ornaments an exception, similarities could be drawn between the King’s portrait and equally fashionable men of the time. But as the velvet curtains behind him rises it reveals a Solomonic Column. The inclusion of the column could easily be read as another example of Charles's artistic tastes that were heavily influenced by the early Baroque movement. Indeed, the motif would be drawn and chiseled in everything from buildings to furniture throughout the seventeenth century.

However, the column was popular among Continental elites and rulers whom, in the majority, were Catholic.\(^2\)\(^1\)

With his religious policies raising eyebrows, and a Catholic consort at his side, this portrait could be read with multiple interpretations of monarch and monarchy.\(^2\)\(^2\)

Charles, however, was never born to rule. As the spare to the throne, his elder brother Henry Frederick was first in line. Henry was an athlete at an early age, showing his prowess in


\(^{22}\) Charles's religious policies were certainly a quandary. Though the King was a Protestant, Charles increasingly desired to move the Church of England toward Arminianism, which, for all intents and purposes, resembled Catholicism in all but name. Henrietta Maria of France, as will be discussed later, was not entirely popular with the masses as she was seen as the liaison and powerful influence for English and Continental Catholics. While many of the famous Baroque artists were Catholic, and their paintings were heavy with Catholic themes and iconography, it is very possible that the Dutch-born Mytens was Protestant. Most of the Dutch Golden Age painters veered away from including Catholic motifs, however, it is uncertain how much dialogue was shared between the artist and the sitter.
the jousting tournaments during the 1606 State Visit of their uncle Christian IV of Denmark.\textsuperscript{23} In contrast Charles was a sickly youth unable to sport, though his health did improve over time. Unable to partake with his brother, Charles instead turned to the performance arts. During the 1610 festivities celebrating his elder brother’s investiture as Prince of Wales, Charles performed alongside his mother and sister in one of Inigo Jones’s masques.\textsuperscript{24} Henry died unexpectedly two years later, making Charles heir. In 1616, Charles was installed as the new Prince of Wales. That year, celebrations were held to commemorate the installment. Charles never overcame his sickly deportment and, as much as he wanted to demonstrate his martial abilities, made a rather lackluster jousting performance.\textsuperscript{25} This was obviously a failed attempt at emulating his late brother. But Charles found others ways to do so, chief among them finding a prospective Catholic bride. As the hand of the Spanish infanta Maria Anna was suggested for Henry, so too was she deemed suitable for Charles.\textsuperscript{26} Though some at Court favored a French match, others - chief among them his mother, Anne of Denmark, and his father’s favorite, the Duke of Buckingham - continued to press for a Spanish match. In 1623, the Prince and the Duke secretly traveled to Madrid, in yet another failed attempt by the future King to emulate his brother.

Something should be said about the Duke of Buckingham. Although he would never hold the position Cecil maintained, Buckingham nevertheless became an influential political force in

\textsuperscript{23} John Nichols, \textit{The Progresses, Processions, and Magnificent Festivities, of King James the First: His Royal Consort, Family, and Court ; Collected from Original Manuscripts, Scarce Pamphlets, Corporation Records, Parochial Registers, &c., &c.} (London: Printed by and for J.B. Nichols, 1828), 80-81. Henry Frederick will also be discussed later.


the early Stuart age. The rumored lover of James I, the handsome George Villiers quickly ascended from humble cupbearer the only non-royal duke in England.²⁷ Competing with members of the aristocratic establishment requires a conspicuous presentation of the favorite’s position. His patronage of the arts would be the most obvious form. His art collection would include works by leading artists - Leonardo, Titian, Correggio, Rubens, and many others.²⁸ In addition, it was Buckingham who brought over Anthony van Dyck in the 1620s. A student of Peter Paul Rubens, Van Dyck would later take on the responsibility for displaying the Caroline majesty.

   As Court Painter, Van Dyck’s works transformed the physically inept Charles into a stately monarch. The power displayed in the portraits appears to have inspired the King personally. The commissions coincide with the Personal Rule era, from 1628 to 1640, when Charles suspended Parliament and managed the affairs of State on his own.²⁹ Among Van Dyck’s works is the famous equestrian portrait of Charles I. Equestrian portraits were nothing new, however, Van Dyck - like so many of his contemporary artists - added dynamism and drama to the portraits, making Charles appear as an august and martial King-Emperor.³⁰ Completed in 1633, the portrait shows the King on a white horse entering through a triumphal arch, armored, as if he ushers in a calm breath of air as the thunderous clouds part and the draped

²⁷ Christine Hille, *Visions of the Courtly Body: The Patronage of George Villiers, First Duke of Buckingham, and the Triumph of Painting at the Stuart Court* (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2012), 103-05. Villiers was first seen by the King for the first time in 1614, when he served at a banquet. His position as Cupbearer was one secured for him by William Herbert, 3rd Earl of Pembroke. The handsome early-twenty something was constantly described for his physical beauty by many individuals, most especially men, at the early Jacobean court.
curtains beat against the wind. Carrying his helmet at his side is his horse trainer Monsieur de St Antoine who, looking up with awe, shows complete deference to the King. On the other side of Charles sits the ‘British’ coat of arms, an overt nod to the Stuart imperium. Originally placed in the gallery at St. James’s Palace, this portrait captures the ideal majesty of the Stuart Monarchy, as well as the undeniable authority of the King. This painting did not fail to impress its viewers. However, the message was certainly far from the truth.

The King’s suspension of Parliament, questions over his faith, as well as his own aloofness, resulted in the Wars of the Three Kingdoms. Beginning in 1639, the civil war did not make a victor out of the King. Edward Bower’s portrait, now in the Royal Collection, also shows how the war had drained Charles physically as well as politically. Comparisons could be made with De Critz’s image of James I, which presents an actual representation of the King. Months before Charles’s death, the artist shows the King dressed in all black, adorned with the Garter ribbon and badge. Sitting in a crimson chair, the King’s pose still gives a sense of command. Defeated in the Civil War, imprisoned – albeit, in a royal palace – and the first English monarch to ever be placed on trial,

31 Sir Anthony van Dyck, Charles I (1600-1649) with M. de St Antoine, 1633, The Royal Collection Trust, London.
32 Edward Bower, Charles I (1600-1649) at His Trial, 1648, The Royal Collection Trust, London.
33 Scott, The Royal Portrait, 92.
Charles's air of stateliness in the portrait reflected the dignity he retained at his trial. Towards the very end, the King never gave in to the idea that it was the elected Parliament who had authority over the sacrosanct, hereditary Crown. While it is possible the portrait was made on the King’s insistence, at least one copy was made for the commissioner who signed his death warrant at the end of his trial.34

The King’s behavior at his trial reflects a disillusioned monarch. Indeed, Charles’s commissioning of portraits and acquisitions of works of art during the Personal Rule era reflect a form of escapism by a monarch who did not or could not fully grasp the sociopolitical realities of his kingdom. Instead of countering his opponents, Charles adopted a policy of ‘privatization’. Decades before Louis XIV removed himself from Paris to Versailles, Charles limited himself to the space of the Court, rarely going about the city or country showing himself to his subjects. The King instead surrounded himself with fine objects and, for a limited audience, starred in plays like Britannia Triumphans and Salmacida Spolia which celebrated the splendor of the absolute monarch.35

---

34 See entry for the portrait. http://www.royalcollection.org.uk/collection/405913/charles-i-1600-1649-at-his-trial
His final performance on the stage would nevertheless be triumphant. Stepping out to a scaffold at Banqueting House on the 30th of January, 1649, Charles attempted to speak his final words but drums sounded him out. Beheaded before a public audience, the sacerdotal nature of kingship was effectively destroyed. Nowhere else in Europe had such an event taken place. Thus began the eleven-year Commonwealth led by Oliver Cromwell. Or, more correctly, His Highness the Lord Protector. Though the ‘Art’ of Majesty focuses on the Stuart dynasty, it is interesting to note that the displaying of majesty, albeit republican, continued to exist during the Commonwealth. However, the ineptitude of Oliver’s successor Richard, as well as other political and economic troubles of the regime, brought the downfall of England’s brief - and so far, only - experiment with republicanism.

Charles II

John Michael Wright, one of the few English artists to gain prominence in seventeenth-century England, painted Charles II in the early years of his reign. However, it remains unknown whether the portrait was commissioned by the King himself or by a supporter of the Crown. Dressed in his state robes, Charles is shown wearing the newly-commissioned crown, orb and scepter made after the originals were destroyed during the Interregnum. With influences from sixteenth-century portraiture, in particular Holbein’s Henry VIII, no one could question that Charles II was the rightful inheritor of the restored Monarchy. The Restoration of the Stuart

---


37 There is some confusion as to when the original portrait was made. Despite it being painted between 1661 and 1662, the Royal Collection has discovered the shoes and wigs are more in common with men’s fashion of the late 1660s onward. In addition, the picture did not come into the Collection until the Victorian age, so it is uncertain if what remains hold true to the original.

monarchy in 1660 brought with it a monarch who desired to exhibit the Monarchy in a mixture of old-meets-new decadence.

Before Charles's royal entry into London, pamphlets were distributed which celebrated the King’s many virtuous habits. But trying to reinforce an image of the King as a sacrosanct monarch was anything but successful. The execution of Charles’s father dispelled any belief in the sanctity of the Monarchy. For this reformed institution, Charles II’s “affability, ease of access, and command of the mot juste” was certainly a breath of fresh air and what the post-Commonwealth Monarchy needed. And it is perhaps not surprising to discover the King’s licentious behavior before and during his reign did not damage the image of the institution. Imitation is the greatest form of flattery: his royal cousin Louis XIV displayed his swagger to the greatest and lowest of France, legitimizing more bastards than he had children with his royal consort. Though Charles did not legitimize his bastards, his acknowledgement of

---

them presented not a King but a man - one with many needs and desires. For the desacralized monarchy, promoting the King’s humanity was a necessity.\footnote{Edie, “The Popular Idea of Monarchy”, 349. Charles II and Louis XIV were first cousins through Charles’s mother Henrietta Maria, sister of Louis XIII.}

Charles’s humanity is certainly put on display in Hendrick Danckerts’s portrait. The Dutch artist was more familiar with landscape paintings than royal portraiture. In the background presumably lies Dorney Court, a country estate not too far from another royal residence at Oatlands.\footnote{There are multiple copies of this portrait. See also the Royal Collection’s entry for \textit{Charles II Presented with a Pineapple}, http://www.royalcollection.org.uk/collection/406896/charles-ii-presented-with-a-pineapple.} In the foreground is a gentleman holding a pineapple, introduced to England in the mid-seventeenth century. The pineapple-holder supplicates himself before a clean-shaven, well-groomed man. This man, with two spaniels in tow, was the \textit{first} gentleman of the realm.
Eschewed of ceremonial robes or classical costume, as was the practice among elite portraiture of this time, Charles II instead looks like a man of fashion, an English dandy. Showing a more intimate side of the King, this portrait would have been displayed in a private room enjoyed by the king’s intimates. It would be unthinkable for such a painting to be in a ‘public’ space where courtiers and visitors would admire a more stately representation of the King. However, Danckerts was not Court Painter. James I had Paul van Somer; Charles I had Sir Anthony van Dyck. Charles II would have his court painter in the person of Sir Peter Lely.

Whereas other artists were forced to flee England’s shores during the republican era, due to their connections with former courtiers, Lely was one of the few to thrive during the republican regime. At one point he was commissioned for an official portrait by none other than the Lord Protector. Lely, like many artists, would be in high demand with the return of the King and Court in 1660. Throughout the first decade of the Restoration, the King’s (first) sister-in-law Anne Hyde commissioned Lely to create a series of paintings - the Windsor Beauties - showing the great ladies of the Restoration Court. Chief among these beauties was royal mistress Barbara Villiers, later Duchess of Cleveland, who would become an influential courtier like her kinsman Buckingham. The actress Nell Gwyn was another sitter, whose features were

44 Despite the Anglicization of his name, Lely was actually of Dutch origin.
46 Most of these beauties were actually royal mistresses or courtesans. Anne Hyde herself was at one point the mistress of the Duke of York, later James II, before becoming his wife and mother of their two daughters - and future queens regnant - Mary (II) and Anne.
47 Lewis Melville, *The Windsor Beauties: Ladies of the Court of Charles II* (Ann Arbor, MI: Victorian Heritage Press, 2005), 64-65. Villiers was also a kinswoman of James I’s favorite the first Duke of Buckingham. Her eldest son Charles Fitzroy was created firstly Duke of Southampton and, on the death of his mother, received her ducal title of Cleveland. His younger brothers Henry and George were created Dukes of Grafton and Northumberland, respectively. Among the Fitzroy daughters, Anne and Charlotte married into the English nobility, while the youngest Barbara became a nun.
used by Lely for the other beauties. With similar facial features, one observer of the paintings quipped they could all be identified as sisters rather than the ladies about the Court.48

It is clear the King preferred a more stately representation of himself. Unlike Danckerts, Lely’s portraits of the King use traditional symbols of authority. In a 1670 three-quarter-length portrait, Charles is depicted wearing armor as the Garter chain sits in the middle of his breastplate. With his right hand holding a general’s baton, and his left atop a helmet, Charles evokes everything that resembles a dignified martial-king. On the window ledge sits the most conspicuous sign of his station - the crown - against the backdrop of cloudy skies. Inspired by Van Dyck’s portrait of Charles I, it is surprising to discover Charles II did not have in his collection any images of himself.49 His collection certainly reflected his behavior, as Charles’s eyes certainly preferred to look at other men’s wives than his own! Yet, for all his bawdiness, the King made attempts to reinforce the traditional practices and prerogatives of the Crown.

49 MacLeod, “‘Good, But Not Like,’” 51. Portraits of Charles II by Lely appear in the inventories of successive monarchs.
Samuel Pepys, famous for his diaries of the Restoration era, noted how Charles reinstated the public ceremony of the royal touch within the early months of his return.\(^5\) A practice from the medieval period, it was believed the monarch could heal individuals of scrofula. This ceremony harkened back to the days where monarchs were truly believed to be God’s representative on Earth. But the Monarchy of 1660 and onwards was very different. No more could a monarch dictate their policies to Parliament. Kings were now forced to wine, dine, and bribe MPs and Lords. This was the age of political parties, with the Commons being divided, and the Lords supporting, either the Petitioners or Abhorrers, later going by the names of Whigs and Tories, respectively. Such maneuvering was felt when Charles had to contend with the legislature on several issues, most importantly the annual negotiations for funding his government. But by carefully managing access to his person and Chamber, making friends out of enemies, Charles was able to choose which party received preferential treatment, translating into indirect influence in politics. Finding friends from both sides of the aisles undoubtedly shielded him against republican sentiment - especially as he increasing used his prerogatives in ways which reminded the public of his father.\(^5\) Safe to say, he died on his own terms. However, the Monarchy would face another dramatic challenge in the next reign.


James II

One of the few ‘royal’ portraits of Charles II’s younger brother James as king is by Sir Godfrey Kneller.\(^{52}\) A German by birth, Kneller began his career as a painter for the elite and upper-middling classes in the late 1670s. Catching the eye of Charles II, he would later be appointed as Court Painter shortly after Lely’s death in 1680. At 34, and living in the country for no more than five years, his rise to the highest artistic position in the land was quite impressive.\(^{53}\) Kneller’s portrait of the new King reflects the influence of Van Dyck. Similar elements could be seen in his father’s equestrian portrait, with the son dressed in armor and a similar dramatic use of cloak as drapery. The anchor, symbolic of James’s position as Lord High Admiral, peeks out from behind him as the background displays an English man-at-war out at sea. This certainly stands out as a representation of regal authority. But there exists some peculiarities. The portrait was not an original, copied from an earlier commission. This is clearly evident by the regalia which does not resemble Kneller’s familiar style.\(^{54}\) But the royal

\(^{52}\) There are, however, plenty of portraits of James as an adult at the Court of Charles II.


\(^{54}\) I would like to thank Ms. Serena Dyer, Assistant Curator (Reference Collections) at the National Portrait Gallery, London for providing me with insight into this particular painting.
head would not get used to wearing the crown. Ruling for only three years, James would be forced off his throne and have to flee across the seas.

The beginning of his reign was quite secure. In 1685, Parliament was led by the Abhorrers-Tories who were defenders of royal prerogative. James’s victory over his nephew the Duke of Monmouth also helped his image. Arriving from the Netherlands and making landfall in Scotland, the illegitimate son of Charles II was later suppressed, tried and executed just a few months after James’s coronation. James’s victory would carry a double meaning: as a Catholic, defeating his Protestant nephew would be seen as a triumph for the Catholic cause in England.

Between 1685 and 1686, the Catholic faction worked to convince his younger daughter Anne to convert in order to prevent the succession of James’s elder, Protestant daughter Mary from her inheritance. James also used his royal prerogatives to protect his Catholic favorites serving him, as the Test Act prevented them from doing so. To his Protestant and Whig opponents, James was seen as an English version of Louis XIV rather than the rightful inheritor of the Restoration. And while both parties disagreed on many issues, the one they shared in common was a strong distaste for Catholicism and arbitrary rule. The birth of his son, heir and namesake in 1688 by his second wife Mary of Modena sealed his fate. People were sure the birth of a prince brought up in the Catholic faith would bring England back to the Church of Rome. Actions were taken to prevent such an outcome and, within a span of fifty years, the Monarchy saw the disposal of yet another King.

---

56 Gregg, *Queen Anne*, 44. His first wife died in 1671. James remarried two years later to Mary of Modena.
An unknown artist made a portrait of the King in 1690. Several copies exist, including one at London’s National Portrait Gallery. James is shown once again in armor and breastplate, his left arm leaning against a plumed helmet. In the background a battle takes place. James presents himself as a victor at the decisive battle at Boyne that same year. In reality, his failure against the Williamite Army in July was the final blow to any attempt at restoring the King to the throne. He would have to resign himself to dreaming of how that battle could have changed his life as a monarch permanently in exile.

[Image: King James II, c. 1690
Unknown Artist
Oil on Canvas, 47.520 x 38.740 in. (120.7 x 98.4 cm)
© National Portrait Gallery, London (NPG 366)]

William & Mary

The Glorious Revolution stands out as the first time the Crown was delegated to two monarchs. With James II now in France with his wife and children, the greatest victor was not the Joint Monarchs but Parliament. It was they who decreed that James abandoned his throne. It was the legislature that chose the new monarchs, rather than allow the throne to pass to the actual heir-apparent, the infant James. In addition, Parliament’s list of demands in the form of the Declaration of Rights imposed limitations on the Crown, with the new monarchs obliged to accept them. Historically, it is believed the King’s spiritual body – the divine kingship – is

immediately transferred to his or her successor upon the death of the monarch. In the system of dynastic monarchy, the coronation is simply a display of the transfer of that power. But with James II still alive, and his son with him in exile, the legislature had achieved the impossible: to exorcise the spiritual body and authority of kingship from one person and invest it in another (or, more correctly, others). The Revolution laid the foundation for England’s modern, constitutional monarchy.

Paradoxically, it was important for the majesty of the Monarchy to be displayed under William III and Mary II. Majesty represents tradition, which in turn represents legitimacy. And legitimacy is what strengthens majesty. But trying to fashion William of Orange and Mary Stuart into the image of legitimate King and Queen was no easy task. Everything from the text of the Proclamation Oath, to the festivities surrounding their accession and coronation, was to be undertaken with grave seriousness and great detail. On 13 February 1689 the Declaration of Rights was itself given a stately procession throughout London, arriving with representatives of Parliament to Banqueting House. Led by the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod, they walked across the hall and bowed three times as they approached the King and Queen. Within the confines of the royal space this performance, like the Jacobean and Caroline masques, served its political purpose: a demonstration of Parliament’s encroachment on royal power. Despite this victory, however, royal portraiture still maintained traditional imagery of the monarchs.

---


Sir Godfrey Kneller, like Lely, survived the rigors of revolution. Despite his connections with the previous monarch and his coterie, the artist remained at Court and kept his position.

Among his many works of the new King and Queen were their state portraits. Whereas William opted to wear a simple suit at the proclamation ceremony, a representation of his humility and the desacralized nature of his accession, the artist’s 1690 portrait shows the King in stately robes. Lely also presents Mary in a similar capacity. As representatives of Parliament proclaimed William & Mary co-monarchs, the Queen remained quiet throughout the ceremony. Holding hands with her husband, she demonstrated to the audience that she would defer her powers to
The Queen is shown in Kneller’s portrait with an orb and scepter much smaller than William’s. Moreover, her portrait is shorter by eight inches. Size certainly matters in this case. Nevertheless, with their portraits displayed proudly at Kensington Palace, and copies distributed to embassies, churches, and administrative offices, the portraits clearly made a statement as to who now sat on the throne.

William’s renovation of Hampton Court Palace is equally important in displaying the majesty of the Stuart-Orange monarchy. Initially a home for the humble Knights Hospitaller, Hampton Court was destined to be a spatial display of power. It was also a symbol of the previous dynasty. Who can think of the palace and not conjure images of the powerful Henry VIII or Elizabeth I? But William understood that the palace, as much as portraiture, could aid in directing a narrative. Tudor architecture, most especially for the seventeenth-century Monarchy, could inadvertently display the institution as stodgy and provincial. The King’s project was to create a new Baroque palace that would rival Versailles, showing the Monarchy as modern and on par with its continental counterparts. Unfortunately, the work halted at the sudden death of Mary II in 1694. Though some work continued during the rest of William’s reign and in the years of his successor, Hampton Court remained transfixed between the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

Anne

Mythical or biblical figures often influenced elite portraiture. Catherine of Braganza, Charles II’s consort, was portrayed at times after her namesake St. Catherine of Alexandria. Louis

---

61 Schwoerer, “The Glorious Revolution as Spectacle”, 131-34. William, too, had a claim to the throne; he was his wife’s first cousin as his mother, Mary, was the daughter of Charles I.
XIV of France chose the Greek sun-god Apollo, representing the sun and its symbolic meanings of omnipresence and omnipotence. Queen Anne, the last of the Stuart monarchs, would turn to a historical figure whose legend by the early eighteenth century was already mythic. Anne was to evoke the image of Elizabeth I. Indeed, Anne chose her not only as a muse but would adopt the late monarch’s motto, *Semper Eadem*.

There are several reasons why Anne modeled herself after The Virgin Queen. Above all, one cannot doubt the posthumous legacy Elizabeth I perpetuated nearly a century after her death. As a (proto)nationalist, Elizabeth wanted to stay above politics and sectarianism, a notion Anne

---

63 Gregg, *Queen Anne*, 152.
entirely adhered to when she declared “I know my own heart to be entirely English” - a reference to Elizabeth’s famous speech at Tilbury. As women, both lived in an era of misogyny and one that especially abhorred the rule of women. Unintentionally but not coincidental, one should not forget that neither left any legitimate children to inherit.

A three-quarter length portrait by the studio of John Closterman shows Anne in her coronation robes, which bear a striking similarity to those worn in a portrait by Elizabeth I. Dressed in a costume of gold cloth lined with ermine, Anne wears the regalia along with the collar badge and ribbon of the Garter. The highest order of chivalry in the British Isles, refashioned by her Tudor predecessors, the Garter remained exclusively for men with the sole exception of female sovereigns. Adding the symbols of the knighthood with the symbols of royal authority Anne, like Elizabeth, demonstrates her ‘masculine’ authority as a female king in her own right. Unlike Mary II, Anne did not share the enterprise of Monarchy with her husband Prince George of Denmark.

From her wedding day to her accession, Anne’s body dealt with the blows and pains of seventeen childbirths, the emotional loss of each of her children, as well as a variety of illnesses. The visual changes are not hidden in portraiture. Kneller’s 1690 full-length portrait shows a fashionable, slim-waisted Princess. Thirteen years later, Edmund Lilly’s portrait shows a monarch with an expanded waistline. Moreover, her wild and unkempt hair is questionable for
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65 Gregg, Queen Anne, 152.
67 Sir Godfrey Kneller, Bt., Queen Anne, c. 1690, Primary Collection, National Portrait Gallery, London.
68 Edmund Lilly, Queen Anne, 1703, 1703, Blenheim Palace, Oxfordshire, UK.
what is supposed to be a representation of the body politic. The artist’s full-length portrait showcases a Queen transfixed between the intimate and political realms of the royal body. Housed at Blenheim Palace, the message of the portrait is even more fascinating. The only non-royal residence in England designated a palace, Blenheim was the home of Anne’s prime minister-favorite Sarah Churchill. As the Queen’s vanguard, she held the greatest influence over Anne throughout her life. Though her fall from grace would be at her own hands, Churchill was nevertheless a formidable politician in an age where most women’s bodies were relegated to the domestic sphere.

17: Queen Anne (1665-1714) in the House of Lords, c. 1708-14
Peter Tillemans (Flemish, c. 1684-1734)
Oil on Canvas, 55.039 x 48.386 in. (139.8 x 122.9 cm)
Royal Collection Trust © Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II 2014 (RCIN 405301)
Deference to the royal body is implied in Peter Tilleman's portrait of the Queen as she prepares to address both houses of Parliament. Anne, seated in a throne of estate, is attended on by her ladies-in-waiting behind her as holders of the Great Offices of State flank her left and right. With the Law Lords in center, the Lords Spiritual to her right and the Lords Temporal to her left, the great magnates await their royal sovereign to begin her speech. But what dominates the portrait is the foreground. These men - representatives from the House of Commons - are not dressed in ancient robes but in the latest style of the time. Some even carry white sticks, indicating their ranks in the Royal Household! The richness of their colored clothing breaks out against the monochromes of the clerics and peers. With the Queen far in the background, they not only dominate the foreground but, arguably, become larger than life.

Tilleman’s painting represents the culmination of a century of political change. After two revolutions, a compromise developed between the two sides - an agreement which has lasted for more than 300 years. The Queen may sit on the throne, bedecked in her finest cloth and jewels, but it is the gentlemen in the Commons who actually rule. The Monarchy was not seen in the reverential manner the Stuart dynasty inherited, but its last monarch understood there could be other ways in which the institution could be of value. That belief echoes today, with yet another queen on the throne, as the Monarchy acts as the greatest symbol of national unity. The portraits of monarchs over the seventeenth century did become more grandiose and spectacular. But by using iconography and styles of the past, by linking through the canvas a culture of tradition, the portraits of monarchs served as a reminder of the conflicts and casualties that shaped politics over the seventeenth century. Their portraits should be seen not as the supremacy of the institution – but a celebration of its survival.
Chapter Two: The Stuart Consorts

Anne of Denmark

England would have its first royal consort in almost half a century in the person of Anne of Denmark. Beginning in the early summer of 1603 Anne, with her eldest son and daughter in tow, made a lengthy procession to London.\(^{69}\) First arriving at York, the entertainments included elaborate speeches, expensive gifts, and, at Althorpe, the first of many Jacobean masques. Meeting with her husband at Easton Neston on the 27th of June 1603, the royal couple gradually progressed to London.\(^{70}\) A month later they were crowned together as King and Queen of England, Scotland and Ireland. The service was based on the order laid out in the fourteenth-century book *Liber Regalis*. The first coronation of a consort since Anne Boleyn, upon receiving the anointing oil on her breast and forehead, the Archbishop of Canterbury would have proceeded to invest Anne of Denmark with her own regalia. Afterward, she would walk to the King, enthroned, and give a slight bow before being seated herself to his left.\(^{71}\) The ceremony affirmed the new consort’s status as the co-partner in the enterprise of the English Monarchy.

Despite being crowned Anne, like many of the Stuart consorts, remained marginalized at Court by her spouse. Though engravings and prints attempted to create the idealized notion of a strong family unit, the Jacobean royal couple was anything but loving and happy. The King’s homosocial – if not entirely homosexual – relationships with favorites like Buckingham further separated the royal couple. The Queen, however, was not prepared to submit defeat. Thus, the performance of her body would become the chief means of demonstrating her opposition.\(^{72}\)

\(^{69}\) Nichols, *The Progresses, Processions, and Magnificent Festivities*, 169.

\(^{70}\) Nichols, *The Progresses, Processions, and Magnificent Festivities*, 167-188.


Jonson’s 1605 *Masque of Blackness* was one of the earliest spectacles performed at the Stuart court. With its origins set in the High Renaissance, the Jacobean masques did not set any new trends. But this performance was certainly different from prior performances or, indeed, any after. In *Masque of Blackness*, the Queen and her ladies adopted blackface. This was by many accounts a ghastly, unpleasant and embarrassing sight to behold. As the first royal consort in more than half a century, the idealized role of the consort as a “figure of chastity” was at odds with Anne’s performance as an African princess, a figure “latent with an ethnic sexuality.”

Her performance, however, should be seen as a demonstration of her marginalized position at Court, a yearning to be seen and respected as the King’s equal. Her performance was a cry for the proper order to be restored, with her blackness being appropriated as a color “beautiful in its own right,” not as the opponent of the brightness of the Sun but as its equal.

Anne would also demonstrate her resistance in portraiture. As the first lady of the realm, Anne was often posed wearing the most fashionable clothing and jewelry. Anne set the style for English dress in the early decades of seventeenth-century England, favoring a simpler

---

73 Hardin Aasand, “‘To Blanch an Ethiop, and Revive a Corse’: Queen Anne and the Masque of Blackness,” *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900*, Elizabethan and Jacobean Drama, 32, no. 2 (Spring 1992): 272-3.

74 Aasand, “‘To Blanch an Ethiop, and Revive a Corse’”: 274.
silhouette though still using the popular Elizabethan wheel farthingale. What is often absent in many of her portraits is the regalia indicating her status as Queen. It is unknown whether she or the artist requested this informality, however, her paintings show her wearing personal jewelry rather than jewels representing her position as consort. A 1617 portrait depicts Anne in half-mourning dress in honor of her late son Henry Frederick. Among the jewelry adorning the Queen’s collar are jeweled ciphers indicating her mother Sophie of Mecklenburg (the ’S’ with a crown) and brother Christian IV of Denmark (the ‘C’ with a crown). Without any indication of her conjugal family, Anne presents herself as the daughter of Denmark rather than the wife of England. What is even more fascinating in this portrait are signs of her devotional faiths. The ‘HIS’ monogram and large cross are conspicuous signs of her Catholic faith. By 1617, Anne was undoubtedly professing her faith without any fears or worry. She would certainly not be the last one.

Henrietta Maria of France

Henrietta Maria was fortunate to have at her husband’s Court the renowned artist Sir Anthony van Dyck. Beginning in the late 1620s, Charles I’s Court Painter was responsible for capturing the young, royal couple and their brood, with records indicating the King himself had a direct hand in most of these productions. In one of his earlier works, Van Dyck presents the

---

77 Sources debate as to the exact time of her conversion. Some state that she privately converted prior to her 1603 arrival in England. However, one source does mention that there was some enmity between her eldest son and Anne due to her increasing public display. Others, still, state that she was publicly professing her faith after the death of Henry Frederick.
Queen in a more casual and relaxed style emerging in the seventeenth century.  
However, hints to her status are also present, most obviously with the crown placed on the table to her right. The dark colors of the background appear to accentuate the Queen’s alabaster skin. Her piercing dark eyes complement her auburn locks, adorned with a strand of ribbons and pearls. Although there are no overt signs to the Queen’s faith in this portrait, Henrietta Maria was no closeted Catholic.

Henrietta’s marriage contract allowed her to practice Catholicism within the confines of her own space. Establishing her household at Somerset House, the Queen’s residence became the effectual ‘court’ for Catholics. Here, Henrietta Maria displayed portraits of herself, husband and children as well as paintings from Rome. Placed in her private chapel, these gifts were rumored to be given in exchange for Charles’s conversion. The Queen’s confessional proclivities certainly did not sit well with the English population. It also did not help the French consort’s image when she refused to be crowned at Westminster, objecting herself to the Anglican rites of communion. Unpopular as she was with her religious identity, her cultural identity had an immediate, positive effect on English

---

78 Van Dyck, *Queen Henrietta Maria*, before August 1632(?), The Royal Collection Trust, London.
decoration and decorum.\textsuperscript{80} And cultural exchange was not welcomed by her French entourage, who wished to limit her Anglicization. At the same time her husband’s favorite Buckingham maintained his influence over Charles I. It was only after the dismissal of her entourage, and the assassination of Buckingham in 1628, that Henrietta was able to fulfill her prime role as consort.\textsuperscript{81}

Van Dyck’s portrait of the Queen, housed in the San Diego Museum of Art, was completed long after the reconciliation of the royal couple and the expansion of the royal family. Her position as royal consort is certainly indicated by the crown placed on the table, though it is quite hidden. It is the youthful, illuminating presence of the Queen’s body which overshadows the crown. She holds in her lap a flower, symbolic of the powerful role of her womb in procreation and extending the Stuart dynasty. Flowers have long held a symbolic role as being representative of womanhood and fertility. And even to the most undiscerning viewer, they would have identified the Queen’s role as the mother of five children.

\textsuperscript{80} Caroline Hibbard, “Henrietta Maria in the 1630s,” in The 1630s: Interdisciplinary Essays on Culture and Politics in the Caroline Era, ed. Ian Atherton and Julie Sanders (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2006), 97.

by the portrait’s date.\textsuperscript{82} However, roses were also symbolic of the Virgin Mary. And it is certainly not a coincidence that the colors of the Queen’s dress are those traditionally used in images of the Virgin. By placing her hand directly in front of the crown, the painting equates Henrietta Maria’s political triumph as Consort with her religious triumph as the Kingdom’s leading Catholic. Though English Catholics saw her as the embodiment of the Virgin, Protestants demonized her as a vessel of popery – a legacy which remained with her to the Civil War and beyond.

Catherine of Braganza\textsuperscript{83}

\begin{figure}[h]
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\caption{Catherine of Braganza, c. 1660-61
Dirk Stoop (Dutch, c. 1615-1686)
Oil on Canvas, 48.5 x 39.5 in. (123.2 x 100.3 cm)
© National Portrait Gallery, London (NPG 2563)}
\end{figure}

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{82} Elizabeth Hyde, "Gender, Flowers, and the Baroque Nature of Kingship," \textit{Villas and Gardens in Early Modern Italy and France}, edited by Mirka Beneš and Dianne Suzette Harris, 225-48. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, 2001. By 1638, Henrietta Maria had given birth to two sons and three daughters. The last two, Anne and Elizabeth, died in 1630 and 1650, respectively. The Queen would go on to have two more children.

\textsuperscript{83} Catherine of Braganza was a Portuguese \textit{infanta}. Born in 1638, her father \textit{Dom John}, Duke of Braganza, would be recognized as King of Portugal two years later following their independence from Spain.
\end{flushleft}
Writing of his wife shortly after her arrival, Charles II detailed the features of his Catholic consort in a letter to his chief advisor Lord Clarendon. “If I have any skill in physiognomy, which I think I have,” he asserts, “she must be as good a woman as ever was born.”

In the early years of her consortship, Catherine was painted by Sir Peter Lely. He gives much detail to her attire, highlighting the texture of the rich fabric and drapery. The iridescence of the Queen’s skin is emphasized against the rather dark background. This portrait bears a similarity to one of Van Dyck’s portraits of her mother-in-law Henrietta Maria. Unlike his Windsor Beauties, Lely displays Catherine as the idealized royal consort, preferring regality over sensuality. The portrait contrasts with an earlier one done by the Dutch artist Dirk Stoop, who paints Catherine in the rather somber, conservative fashions of the Portuguese court - styles which changed little over the century.

Bringing a substantial dowry to her husband, including Bombay and Tangiers, Catherine also brought a large Portuguese retinue. Coming from a conservative Catholic country, her ladies-in-waiting and priests were not entirely fond of the licentious Restoration court. Their departure eventually came over the issue of the Queen’s body.

---


Similar to Henrietta’s French retinue, Catherine’s expatriates advised her against learning the English language, customs, as well as urging her not to adopt the sartorial trends displayed at Court. Like all royal consorts, the Queen’s adoption of the English (or, more correctly, French) habit was an important step as it reflected “a crucial corporeal manifestation of her submission” to her adoptive country. Refusing was a great dishonor to her husband, a show of disrespect to the Court and, for an open Catholic in a Protestant country, yet another possible means of attacking the body politic of the Crown through the body of the consort.

Meanwhile, Catherine’s consortship was overtaken by her husband’s mistresses. They not only established a patronage network but would become progenitors of children carrying the royal bloodline. Despite his dalliances, the King showed some compassion towards her. This was especially demonstrated by refusing to divorce the Queen on grounds that she did not provide any princelings. With her role at Court limited, Catherine could not have been as involved in court culture and politics as her two predecessors. Nevertheless, people of influence continued to pay court to the Queen. Credited with developing drawing room etiquette, courtiers entered her royal chambers to gossip over tea. The Portuguese consort may have been publicly shamed, and her role overtaken by mistresses, but she still attempted to carve out her own

---

88 The King’s other official mistresses included Louise de Kérouaille, later Duchess of Portsmouth, and Nell Gwyn. Their children would marry into the greatest families of England, with several of their boys being granted titles of nobility. Many of their descendants include the late Diana, Princess of Wales; Sarah Ferguson, Duchess of York; and prime ministers such as Sir Winston Churchill and David Cameron.
Whilst paying court, courtiers would have seen paintings such as Carlo Dolci’s *The Penitent Magdalen*, gifts sent on behalf of British diplomats based in Catholic countries. Like her mother-in-law, Catherine enjoyed the right to practice her faith within the confines of her household. Similarly, she was never crowned. But whereas the French Queen refused to be crowned in an Anglican ceremony, the Portuguese Queen was unable to due to her Catholic faith. The English public would forever cast a negative light on Henrietta’s refusal to be crowned, but would not be as equally hostile towards Catherine. If there was no greater conspicuous display of majesty, the coronation of royal consorts invested them with an especial status that no one could explicitly take from them (save divorce or beheading!) Without such a ceremony, the queen consort was only a title and nothing more. In addition, by not providing heirs, Catherine had failed in her most important role as consort: to perpetuate the Stuart dynasty. If the body of the consort was to aid in exhibiting majesty Catherine had failed in all respects.

Mary of Modena

Mary of Modena’s portrait by William Wissing was to coincide with the accession of James II in 1685. The fact that Kneller, as Court Painter, was not commissioned for this work hints this informal, three-quarter length portrait was intended for more private rooms at Court, or copied and sent as personal gifts. Denude of any conspicuous signs of her royal station, Mary is painted seated as her left arm rests gently on a dog instead of a crown. Amidst the rather somber brown hue of the background is a pink rose to the Queen's right. This flower could be seen once again as a sign of yet another consort's Catholic faith. However, at the time of the painting's

---

89 Brett Dolman, David Souden, and Olivia Fryman, *Beauty, Sex and Power: A Story of Debauchery and Decadent Art at the Late Stuart Court (1660-1714)* (London: Scala, 2012), 76.
90 However, the failed Popish Plot of 1678 placed Catherine in the center of a conspiracy, with the Queen being accused of attempting to kill Charles II.
commissioning, it should more importantly be read as a sign of fertility. The most obscure of the consorts, ironically, Mary of Modena would have the greatest impact on her husband and the country.

Though the openly Catholic King had two daughters by a previous marriage, they were brought up as Protestants. Their succession ensured the nation that England would not return to Catholicism. However, the birth of a son on the 10th of June, 1688 changed everything. The prince, James Francis Edward Stuart, immediately preceded his elder siblings in the line of succession. Weeks following the birth, gossip filled London coffeehouses and streets of a changeling being smuggled into the Queen’s bed via a warming pan. This gossip would be the spark which forced her husband off the throne and forever change what was and would have been Mary’s life in England. Moreover, the Glorious Revolution changed the prerogatives of the monarch, with Parliament now forcing their demands on successive rulers as a requirement to accepting the crown. The role of the consort
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91 At the time of the painting, Mary’s four children with the King all died from illnesses.
92 Gregg, Queen Anne, 17-18, 55. Prior to the reforms made in 2013, younger male heirs would immediately move up in the line of succession, followed by elder sisters.
may have been picturesque, but these three queens’ open practice of the Catholic faith presented obstacles that the Stuart Monarchy could not entirely overcome.

George of Denmark

George of Denmark, Queen Anne’s consort, was the only English consort of the seventeenth century to be openly and faithfully Protestant. In addition, he became the second male consort in English history when his wife succeeded to the throne in 1702. Precedence would have given him some share of power, at least *jure uxoris*, as was done with Mary I’s consort Philip of Spain. However, to be seen as a king by right of his wife would not be the case for this Prince. Anne may have been a loving wife, but there was ‘one mistress and no master’ when it came to the governance of the realm. Indeed, as Anne upheld the model of a *female* king, her husband George of Denmark was modeled as a *male* queen.

As already discussed, the bodies of the consort did not belong to her but to her husband and the State. Whereas in many cases such bodies were female, George, rather than Anne, embodied the etiquette of consortship. It was *he* who was brought over to reside in England, unlike his sister-in-law Mary II who was sent over to Amsterdam. George became the property of England, rather than Anne belonging to Denmark. Settling at Whitehall’s ‘Cockpit’, the Prince of Denmark was to have none of his compatriots in the household. Although he was appointed to the Privy Council by his father-in-law James II, he did so as his wife’s “political proxy” as it was unthinkable for a non-ruling female to attend the highest council of state.
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93 Philip II of Spain was briefly King Consort of England during the years 1554 to 1558 when married to Mary I. William III was co-monarch rather than a royal consort.
95 Gregg, *Queen Anne*, 32. However, she was properly titled ‘Princess of Denmark’ by contemporaries.
George was emasculated within the private and public spheres of Household and Court politics. This certainly would not present itself in portraiture.

The practice among many princes of Europe, George’s portraits depict him as a valiant commander on the field. In his three-quarter length portrait by John Riley, the Prince is adorned in classical costume, holding a baton and leaning against a column.97 The armor breastplate, costume and baton are strong symbols of martial – and thus masculine – power. In reality, the Prince was never a commander on the field. Despite his senior military appointments, authority was solely exercised by the likes of John Churchill. It is also interesting to note that Anne did not even grant an additional royal title to her husband when Queen, as his ducal title of Cumberland was conferred to him during the previous reign.98 But these portraits served not just to boost the ego of a marginalized prince. Many of these images served the interests of Anne herself. As Queen, Anne could not be portrayed as a martial-king on horseback as her grandfather had done decades before. The portraits of Prince George, like his body, were used fill in the void that Anne’s sex could not fulfill.

---

98 Beem, “‘I Am Her Majesty’s Subject,’” 473.
From the public sphere of Parliament and Cabinet, to the private sphere of the Household, George’s marginalization would have greatly emasculated him. However, his personal thoughts are not entirely known to us, as written journals do not exist (or have yet to surface!) But it is clear he felt a strong bond and sense of duty to his Queen and country. Indeed, George never found consolation in the bed of another. Royal marriages may have been beneficial for the State. But in the case of Anne and George, this was a loving affair.

Chapter Three: The Royal Family

25: Charles I and Henrietta Maria with their two eldest children, Prince Charles and Princess Mary (‘The Great Peece’), 1631-32
Sir Anthony van Dyck (Flemish, 1599-1641)
Oil on Canvas, 119.61 x 100.98 in. (303.8 x 256.5 cm)
Royal Collection Trust © Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II 2014 (RCIN 405353)

Van Dyck’s ‘The Great Peece’ is one of his earliest works as Court Painter. Commissioned in the earlier years of the Personal Rule era, the portrait shows Charles I,
Henrietta Maria and their two eldest children Charles (II) and Mary (later Princess of Orange, mother of William III).\textsuperscript{99} Despite its intention to be an intimate portrayal of the royal family, this portrait is nevertheless riddled with symbolism. As the King, Prince and Princess look toward the viewer, Henrietta Maria looks toward Charles I, a sign of deference to him as husband and Sovereign. Van Dyck includes a pillar behind the seated King, conveying a sense of power and masculine authority. As the billowing clouds open up one can see Parliament Hall in the distance. The Crown of Henry VIII, a representation of absolute kingship, obscures the seat of the legislature even further. This portrait is a potent symbol of both the role of Charles as undisputed lord of the land as well as his house. But it also shows the role of the Stuart royal family as a unit – strong, healthy, dutiful and, most importantly, fertile.

The Stuarts were certainly not lacking in children, a sharp difference from their dynastic predecessors. The portraits of the princes and princesses celebrated their birth and maturity. And, in a similar fashion to their parents, their portraits would be commissioned by and for a variety of reasons. On canvas, the princelings were glorified as future martial-kings or cultured consorts. The following three princelings to be discussed were chosen for such purpose. Each were celebrated by the people – within and beyond the Court – as the hope for England’s dynastic and political future. With their stories intertwined, however, fate chose a different course for them.

\textsuperscript{99} The portrait was known as ‘The Great Peece’ (sic) by contemporary observers.
Henry Frederick of Wales

The eldest son of James I, Henry Frederick Stuart’s likeness was captured by Robert Peake (the Elder). A renowned Elizabethan painter, one of his most celebrated portraits shows the young Prince on the hunt. Two versions of the portrait exist, with little difference save his English companions Sir John Harington and Robert Devereux, 3rd Earl of Essex. As companions of Prince Henry in art and life, they are seen kneeling before the Prince. Meanwhile, Henry prepares to unsheathe his sword as he prepares to make his final strike into the fallen deer.¹⁰⁰ This celebrated the future king who, just at the tender age of nine, was recorded by courtiers and diplomats alike for his athletic prowess. Henry’s portrait presents the health of the first male heir

¹⁰⁰ The version with Devereux is housed in The Royal Art Collection, with a date of around 1605.
in over fifty years, the virility of the dynasty, as well as the hopeful traits of the expected future King of England.

But there was much space – physically and otherwise – between James and Henry Frederick. Shortly following his birth, Henry would grow up away from Court, placed in the care of the Earl of Mar.\textsuperscript{101} Though not unusual for royal children, the distance between father and son would shape two very different personalities, quite unlike the relationship between mother and son. In addition to inheriting Anne of Denmark’s fair hair and features, he would also share her passion for the arts. Whereas his father diverted himself with handsome young men for his pleasure, Henry surrounded himself with men who craved for the visual and martial arts. Indeed, Henry’s princely court became one of the principal nerve-centers for Jacobean culture.

Peake’s 1610 portrait of the 16-year-old Prince gives credence to that statement. Often painting him either on the hunt or in armor, Peake’s sitter is shown dressed as a courtier. The portrait reinforces Henry’s wealth, with brightly-colored, luxurious fabrics accessorized with expensive jewels. His choice of Venetian fabric and style is no coincidence: an admirer of Italian art and fashion, his adoption of this habit would have also been seen as a mark of flattery toward

\textsuperscript{101} Catharine MacLeod et al., \textit{The Lost Prince: The Life & Death of Henry Stuart} (London: National Portrait Gallery, 2012), 11.
the Serene Republic. The portrait’s date coincides with his investiture as Prince of Wales. The ceremony and festivities surrounding the occasion bore all the hallmarks of a coronation. Sadly, this would be among the last of his ceremonies. Dying at the age of eighteen, Henry unexpected death in November 1612 occurred at the time when the nation was preparing to celebrate the betrothal of his sister Elizabeth to Frederick, Elector Palatine. Fate would bring Charles, then Duke of York and Albany, to the throne and forever change the landscape of British politics.

William of Gloucester

At the other end of the seventeenth century Prince William, later Duke of Gloucester, was born on the 24th of July 1689. The seventh pregnancy for Anne, then Princess of Denmark, once again the nation rejoiced at the birth of a male heir. As there were no other children produced by the Prince’s uncle and aunt, the Joint Monarchs, a week after his birth Parliament approved the “Hanover clause,” ensuring the succession of a Protestant monarch should Anne die without heirs. This may have been a wise measure as William began to have frequent convulsions just weeks after his birth. Despite his resilience the Prince remained physically weak throughout his life.

Also sickly in his youth, William III was able to overcome his physical deficiencies to lead armies at a young age. Attempting to save the ‘face’ of the Monarchy, the King gave the Prince a regiment. Comprised of boys several years older, these uniformed soldiers formed two
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102 MacCleod, *The Lost Prince*, 120.
companies of musketeers. When William III was preparing to leave for war on the Continent a
year later, it was said the young Prince offered his companies “to go fight the Turk and the King
of France[!]”106 The boy-soldiers, of course, never did see the field of battle. Nevertheless, the
story attempts to place William as a healthy and capable heir.

The same marshal image was applied in portraiture. Throughout his short life, portraits
celebrated his role as either a healthy
Prince or a Knight of the Garter.
Kneller’s career, spanning William’s life
and beyond, includes commissions of the
young Prince. Often painting him with
cherubic rosy cheeks, two of Kneller’s
later works presents William as a
warrior-prince bedecked in armor.
Coincidentally, both were within the
final year of the Prince’s life. On the 30th
of July 1700, the 11-year-old Prince
William passed away at Windsor Castle
of his illness.107 Nearly a century apart,
the story of William of Gloucester is strikingly similar to that of Henry Frederick.

William’s birth, like that of Henry Frederick, signaled the continuation of the royal
bloodline and the protection of the Protestant faith in England. Although William was not as

106 Baxter, William III, 327.

107 There are various accounts as to how the Prince died. Some state it was due to smallpox, others say it
may due to ague as he had a large amount of fluid in the brain.
healthy or athletic as Henry, he nevertheless survived the dangers of infant mortality. In portraiture, however, the sickly boy became a healthy one. And at times his painters show him less as a child than a youth coming of age. This practice is common among portraits of royal princelings, dressed and posed in the manner of adults. Never did they physically look older than their age, however.\textsuperscript{108} His representation in one engraving is quite notable. A pamphlet in memoriam of Queen Anne shows her son among the other Stuart monarchs. Though never crowned, William’s premature death was another reminder of the loss of a would-be monarch.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{image.png}
\caption{House of Stuart, after 1713}
\begin{quote}
Unknown engraver, sold by Charles Price, after Sir Anthony van Dyck, and after Sir Godfrey Kneller, Bt.
Engraving, 14.3 x 10.6 in. (36.2 x 27 cm)
© National Portrait Gallery, London (NPG D19756)
\end{quote}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{108} This is certainly featured in portraits of the young Edward VI who shares a similar stance and pose as his father Henry VIII. This was certainly intended to reinforce his legitimacy and, with Henry's blood flowing through his veins, the power and strength he inherits from him.
Elizabeth of Bohemia

The eldest daughter of James I and Anne of Denmark, Elizabeth was never destined to become Queen of England. However, she was truly an embodiment of her namesake and godmother. She proved herself to be a capable public figure when, at the age of seven, she participated in her first walkabout in Coventry.\footnote{Nichols, \textit{The Progresses, Processions, and Magnificent Festivities}, 429.} After the death of her brother in 1612, Elizabeth became second-in-line after Charles. Despite Henry’s death during her wedding festivities, ceremonies went on and she was formally wed to Frederick, Elector Palatine on Valentine’s Day 1613. Their wedding was followed by three masques, one comparing the young Princess to the late Virgin Queen, while another one hoping the marriage would be fruitful and usher in “a new Protestant power on the continent.”\footnote{Parry, \textit{The Golden Age Restor’d}, 98.} Unlike her parents, Elizabeth’s marriage proved to be a happy one, with ten children surviving infancy. As an adult and wife, her letters indicate she was a well-educated, cultured consort who was fluent in several languages.\footnote{see Elizabeth Stuart, Queen of Bohemia, \textit{The Correspondence of Elizabeth Stuart, Queen of Bohemia}, ed. Nadine Akkerman, Lisa Jardine, Steve Murdoch, and Robyn Adams (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011).} Undoubtedly, Elizabeth was her mother’s daughter.

In 1619, the overwhelmingly Protestant nobility of Bohemia elected Frederick as their King. But within months of their coronation the kingdom was invaded by Habsburg troops, forcing the couple to flee the following year. Although the ‘Winter’ King and Queen would never regain their throne, their exiled court remained fashionable. Gerrit van Honthorst, a Dutch portraitist, is one of several artists Elizabeth sat for, later receiving commissions from her brother Charles I. It is now known Van Dyck also painted Elizabeth and Frederick while in The
Hague.\textsuperscript{112} Unfortunately, the portraits of are lost. However, we could only imagine how they would have looked when viewing the similar commissions during his second tour of the Low Countries and, later, Caroline England.\textsuperscript{113}

Like the masque performed at her wedding, Elizabeth’s portraits truly invokes her namesake. Peake was commissioned in or around 1606 to create an image of the Princess. Against a dark background, the future Queen of Bohemia is shown standing whilst holding a

\begin{figure}[h]
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\caption{Princess Elizabeth (1596-1662), later Queen of Bohemia, c. 1606}
\label{fig:princess_elizabeth}
\end{figure}

\begin{flushleft}
Robert Peake the Elder (English, c. 1551-1619)
Oil on Canvas, 60.7 x 31.3 in. (154.3 x 79.4 cm)
© The Metropolitan Museum of Art (51.194.1)
\end{flushleft}

\textsuperscript{112}Susan J. Barnes, comp., \textit{Van Dyck: A Complete Catalogue of the Paintings} (New Haven: Published for the Paul Mellon Centre for Studies in British Art by Yale University Press, 2004), 239. His first venture to England in 1620 was at the behest of the leading Jacobean purveyors of art: Buckingham and Thomas Howard, Earl of Arundel. He would have painted for the King and Queen of Bohemia upon his return to the Continent. It was during this time that Van Dyck’s style and technique would vastly improve before his return to England in the 1630s.

\textsuperscript{113} Barnes, \textit{Van Dyck}, 239-416.
book in her hand. Elizabeth is dressed in the style favored by her mother who, as stated before, made little adjustments to the popular Elizabeathan dress. However, with the combination of her name, desirable pale skin and hair with a reddish tint, who could not doubt she was a relation of ‘Good Queen Bess’? Her pose is similar to an earlier portrait by the artist three years earlier, which served as a companion piece to Henry’s hunting portrait. Her rather static stance, as contrasted to Henry Frederick’s more dynamic pose in his hunting portrait, could be read as the submissive role of a future consort. Nothing more than a chess-piece in the game of international politics, Elizabeth’s chief duty was to provide children and, through them, extend the politico-dynastic links between England and the Continent.

The familial links would be of great importance in 1714. The Hanover clause was named after Sophia of Hanover, Elizabeth’s youngest daughter. Sophia died three weeks before Anne, but her son George inherited the throne as King George I. To this day, the reigning monarch of the United Kingdom, as well as some current and former reigning monarchs of Europe, can claim direct ancestry to Elizabeth of Bohemia. For all the desire to have a male heir, it would be the bloodline of a princess which succeeded Queen Anne.

Conclusion: The ‘Art’ of Majesty in the post-Stuart era

They say a picture is worth a thousand words. Portraits, however, display a fabricated and well-honed message. For the seventeenth-century Stuart monarchy, portraits display the kingship of monarchs who were gradually losing their positions as rulers by Divine Right. Images of their royal consorts hid the ambitions of Catholic agents and pseudo-rebellious Queens. And while the
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115 MacLeod et al., *The Lost Prince*, 59.
portraits of the royal children celebrated a fertile dynasty, they certainly could not foresee the unexpected deaths of infants and heirs. Royal portraiture of the Stuart Monarchy reflects an increasing desire to display the power and wealth of an institution whose power conflicted with and, eventually, was dwarfed by the power laid in the confines of Parliament. By the time George I took the throne, the Monarchy – as much as the nation – was a far cry from the one James I inherited.

The Hanoverians, like their predecessors, would reign in a period marked by great sociopolitical changes: the supremacy of the office of Prime Minister; the loss of the American colonies; the Haitian Revolution and the fight for abolitionism; and the Napoleonic wars. Paradoxically, their dynasty would also see Britain emerge as the most powerful nation in the world as Victoria of Hanover sat on the throne in a period now eponymous with her reign. The claim to an imperium would not be recognized until her reign, as she accepted the imperial title of the vast, Indian subcontinent. Victoria’s 1885, full-length state portrait by Heinrich von Angeli decisively portrays her position. Standing on a dais as she looks towards her left, the widow’s pose enhances the familiar image of Victoria as the elder stateswoman. And, despite its commission two centuries after those by Van Dyck, his influence is nevertheless felt by the rich interior, the detail to the Queen’s dress and veil, as well as the careful drapery over columns.
Despite the imperial grandeur, we must remember that Victoria remained nothing more than an ornament, an icon of British nationalism and dominance in the world. Royal ornaments were made of successive monarchs even as the Empire declined. The decline has been felt most especially in the reign of Victoria’s great-great granddaughter, Elizabeth II. Coming to a final close in 1997, with the transfer of Hong Kong to Chinese authorities, the Monarchy has gone through many metamorphoses over the past 300 years.

Besides Victoria, Queen Elizabeth II is the only other British monarch to celebrate a Diamond Jubilee. The portraitist Robert Heimans was commissioned to celebrate the occasion in 2012. Though a contemporary artist, Heimans was influenced by seventeenth-century portraiture.

In her coronation robes, the Queen stands alone in Westminster Abbey. Holding part of her ermine-lined mantle, Elizabeth stands at the exact spot in the Abbey her predecessors have crossed. Despite the symbols of majesty and tradition, however, she does not look directly at the

---

viewer but the floor. Her face almost gives a look of uncertainty over the Monarchy’s future.

As the Queen remains head of an anachronistic institution in the twenty-first century, the Monarchy is seen not as representation of absolute power but a reminder of the sociopolitical changes in early modern British history. Most especially, she is a reminder of the dramatic shifts that took place in the reign of the Stuarts. Taking its cues from the seventeenth-century Monarchy, the Windsor monarchy cannot use ‘hard’ power - the power of the sword and the military - to reinforce its relevancy. Instead, it must employ ‘soft’ power - art & culture - that is not always controlled from within. Removed of its sacrosanct nature, devolved of its absolute authority, royal portraiture certainly reflects this tradition. The art of majesty may not always be successful, and may at times not carry its desired message, but it is truly an awe-inspiring display to behold.
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