

Renaissance and Reformation Renaissance et Réforme



Knoppers, Laura Lunger. Politicizing Domesticity from Henrietta Maria to Milton's Eve

Mark Albert Johnston

Volume 35, Number 3, Summer 2012

URI: <https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/1105791ar>

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.33137/rr.v35i3.19533>

[See table of contents](#)

Publisher(s)

Iter Press

ISSN

0034-429X (print)

2293-7374 (digital)

[Explore this journal](#)

Cite this review

Johnston, M. (2012). Review of [Knoppers, Laura Lunger. Politicizing Domesticity from Henrietta Maria to Milton's Eve]. *Renaissance and Reformation / Renaissance et Réforme*, 35(3), 134–137.
<https://doi.org/10.33137/rr.v35i3.19533>

of exchange — allowing, for example, analyses of the influence of Iberian patrons on the urban and artistic developments of post sixteenth-century Rome to be documented. With these intellectual frameworks in mind, the rich and well-researched data presented by the authors can, and hopefully will, be expanded to take into account the more complex networks of exchange between Hungary and Italy — and, thus, offer a wonderful companion to Farbaky and Waldman's significant text.

C. CODY BARTEET, *Western University*

Knoppers, Laura Lunger.

Politicizing Domesticity from Henrietta Maria to Milton's Eve.

New York: Cambridge University Press, 2011. Pp. x, 225. ISBN 978-1-107-00788-8 (hardcover) \$95.

In *Politicizing Domesticity*, Laura Lunger Knoppers traces the production and deployment of representations of royal domesticity through the upheavals of revolution, republic, and restoration. Focusing on the politicization of domesticity in depictions of sovereign power in England from the 1630s to the 1660s, Knoppers's project challenges the notion that public and private constitute mutually exclusive spheres, and her methodology uses the same sharply focused lens to scrutinize literary, political, and domestic texts, discourses, and images. Commencing with an interrogation of the idealized domestic bliss that scholars have long recognized as fictive in Caroline portraits of the royal couple and family, Knoppers argues that these highly crafted images demonstrate the monarchic appropriation of domesticity as a powerful tool of political propaganda that was particular to the volatile turbulence of the seventeenth century but would subsequently become a lasting hallmark of the British monarchy.

Initially, Knoppers concentrates on portraiture of the royal family, suggesting that representations of the fertile union between Charles I and Henrietta Maria may have elicited, particularly in times of increasing tension and stress, precisely the fears they were intended to allay. Knoppers provides detailed analyses of George Marcelline's depiction of the royal couple in the

frontispiece to *Epithalamium Gallo-Britanicum* (1625), Daniel Mytens's intimate portrait of the pair, Sir Anthony Van Dyck's series of paintings of the royal family — which she productively contrasts with Peter Paul Rubens's depictions of Henrietta Maria's mother, Marie de Medici — and a number of subsequent engraved miniatures and woodcuts that put into wide circulation intimate illustrations of a domesticized monarchy. While Caroline royal family portraiture (partly in an effort to assimilate the unpopular Catholic queen) effectively depicted domestic relations alongside dynastic succession, the feat would prove costly once the private lives of the king and queen became the potent fodder for early civil war propaganda.

Knoppers then demonstrates how, in 1645, Parliament capitalized on the tensions inherent in these earlier images of domestic concord by printing the king's suspicious and incriminating private correspondence, captured after the Battle of Naseby, under the title *The King's Cabinet Opened* (1645). Knoppers's primary focus here is on Parliament's careful shaping and framing of the letters: the elaborate decoding, modernizing, sorting, selecting, omitting, ordering, presenting, annotating, and supplementing to produce a text that would cast the royal couple in the worst possible light and so help turn public opinion against the king at a crucial stage in the English civil wars. Although Parliament's tactic successfully turned the politicization of the domestic against the monarchy itself, appeals to family, marriage, and domestic harmony would be deployed again at the time of the regicide to defend the image of Charles I and prove a potent weapon against the Puritan protectorate of Oliver Cromwell in the royalist counter-revolution. Knoppers next argues that an emphasis on family inflects *Eikon Basilike* (1649), a collection of Charles I's private prayers and deathbed meditations printed directly after the regicide. Considering the significance of early readers' marks in extant copies of the text, Knoppers asserts that, despite Milton's attempts to discredit the book's private musings as political propaganda, loyal readers, by embracing the text, drained it of activist political meaning and rewrote its context as martyrdom. One problem with this argument is that Knoppers's evidence relies not on political or responsive commentary, but rather on signatures that record ownership, gifting, or exchange, notes on family histories, records of celebratory occasions and the like. Since she does little to demonstrate any substantive connection between these early readers' marks and the contexts of the text in which they occur, however,

Knoppers is left to build her otherwise convincing argument here on vexingly negative evidence.

By comparison, Knoppers's central chapters far more successfully trace the dissemination of domesticized political propaganda into private spaces by examining two early modern cookery books — one purportedly divulging the recipes of the exiled widow Henrietta Maria, and the other those of the disgraced Elizabeth Cromwell — together with early readers' signatures, annotations, amendments, additions, and other signs of use and adaptation. Knoppers convincingly details how early readers' markings in *The Queen's Closet Opened* (1655) and *The Court & Kitchen of Elizabeth* (1664) provide evidence of each book's reception, employment, and role in the struggle to sway public opinion. Like other examples of early modern print culture — too often overlooked because they seem insignificant — these two cookbooks possess a powerfully inconspicuous political charge. Finally, Knoppers considers how John Milton's representations of Eve's command of the domestic spaces of Eden in *Paradise Lost* (1667) construct a pre-lapsarian female domestic marked by republican virtues, reason, and choice that stand in stark contrast to courtly flattery and corruption. The public-private divide of the last two books of Milton's epic, Knoppers notes, strikingly correlate with Milton's vision of the corruption of household privacies in Stuart propaganda.

Politicizing Domesticity powerfully demonstrates the value of considering relatively unconventional evidence. Knoppers also notes that by concentrating on how privacy produces subjectivity, literary scholars have missed its broader uses as a tool of political propaganda. It would be interesting to take this idea further back in time. Knoppers asserts that the expression of a domesticized dynastic could fully emerge only in the seventeenth century in England, and, to argue this point, contrasts the abstract and public qualities of King James's *Basilikon Doron* (1599), a book of monarchic advice addressed to his son and (then) heir, with the comparatively private and introspective prayers of Charles I in *Eikon Basiliske*. And yet, James's public dissemination of a treatise that intertwines paternal concerns with the ideals of kingly conduct, at a time when the question of his being named Elizabeth's heir had grown increasingly urgent, could be read as a rather striking early example of the royal domestic crafted into a tool of political propaganda. Even if the representations of monarchic domesticity realized their most powerful political charge only in

the dislocations and upheavals of the English Revolution, the history of their earlier deployments still remains tantalizingly unexplored.

MARK ALBERT JOHNSTON, *University of Windsor*

Landi, Sandro.

Stampa, censura e opinione pubblica in età moderna.

Bologna : Il Mulino, 2011, 168 pages, ISBN 978-88-15-23391-2 (broché) 11,50 €.

Même s'il ne concerne que partiellement, et de biais, les études consacrées à l'Humanisme, la Renaissance et la Réforme, le petit livre de Sandro Landi portant sur l'édition, la censure et l'opinion publique à l'époque moderne mérite d'être signalé. Il constitue en effet une excellente synthèse critique sur l'histoire du livre et de la communication dans leur relation avec l'histoire des idées politiques, qu'ordonne la question de la formation et du développement de l'opinion publique. Cette synthèse, rédigée dans une perspective essentiellement italienne, est d'autant plus intéressante et nécessaire qu'elle permet la rencontre de disciplines généralement séparées ou qui n'ont pas la même définition, ni surtout la même autorité, dans les différents systèmes académiques nationaux. Autant qu'à la référence aux travaux les plus récents (environ 300 titres), c'est à la dimension critique de l'entreprise que l'on sera le plus sensible, marquée par le souci d'examiner à de nouveaux frais des « lieux » du discours historique sur le livre, en les problématisant et en les périodisant.

On ne peut plus penser l'invention de l'imprimerie comme une coupure et une révolution dans une histoire de l'humanité, et la concevoir simplement en termes téléologiques de progrès. L'imprimerie a été un facteur déterminant, qui a permis l'amplification de transformations matérielles et intellectuelles déjà en œuvre dans la longue durée, portées par le livre manuscrit. Si l'époque moderne (c. 1450–1815) correspond à une phase bien définie du développement technique du livre imprimé, et si celui-ci donne également une identité particulière à l'Europe en tant que lieu exclusif de son développement (par opposition à un monde musulman marqué par un refus radical), dans le même temps, le processus de communication, même en Europe, n'est assumé que partiellement par l'imprimé. La reconstruction de la communication orale