RECEIPT BOOKS AND THE POLITICS OF FOOD IN EARLY MODERN ENGLISH WOMEN'S WRITING

by

Madeline Bassnett

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

at

Dalhousie University
Halifax, Nova Scotia
January 2008

DALHOUSIE UNIVERSITY

To comply with the Canadian Privacy Act the National Library of Canada has requested that the following pages be removed from this copy of the thesis:

Preliminary Pages
- Examiners Signature Page (pii)
- Dalhousie Library Copyright Agreement (piii)

Appendices
- Copyright Releases (if applicable)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT

In this discussion of printed and manuscript receipt books and women's literary writings, I show that a political discourse of food existed in early modern England, and that women were participants in this discourse. Over the course of the seventeenth century, receipt books communicated increasingly identifiable political perspectives, supporting or detracting from current regimes in prefatory material and even in recipes themselves. Frequently gendered, with the promotion of receipt books to women, and the establishment of women as integral to hospitable entertainment, the food discourse of receipt books is simultaneously adopted and developed by women writers of the period. The puritan advocacy of maternal nursing provided by Dorothy Leigh and Elizabeth Clinton, Countess of Lincoln, Lady Mary Wroth's promotion of a Protestant plain-style dining practice in her romance the *Urania*, the use of food and fasting in the pamphlets of sectarian women Sarah Wight and Anna Trapnel, and the focus on hospitality in the diaries and memoir of Lady Anne Clifford and Ann, Lady Fanshawe reveal that food discourse is complexly integrated with numerous other cultural, social, and political concerns. The performance of the court, the practice and guidelines of hospitality and religious belief, the influx of foreign and novel foods, interpretations of health and physiological function, and visions of national identity all come into play as women turn to food to express their own dissatisfactions with current regimes, from James I to Charles II. Although rooted in domesticity, food and its rituals become important rhetorical indicators of women's critical engagement with the political sphere.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I have been fortunate in the financial, professional, and personal support I received during the writing of this dissertation. My research has been funded by a SSHRC Doctoral Scholarship, an Isaac Walton Killam Memorial Scholarship, and the Eliza Ritchie Doctoral Scholarship for Women. I also received a travel grant from the Faculty of Graduate Studies at Dalhousie University to visit the Wellcome Library for the History and Understanding of Medicine in London, England. Edith Snook gave me the opportunity to consult receipt books at the Folger Shakespeare Library in Washington, D.C. when she hired me as a research assistant, and I have enjoyed numerous stimulating conversations about women and receipt books with her. Christina Luckyj has been a gem of a supervisor, and I am thankful that she encouraged me in my early and vaguely defined ideas about women and food. Her input, guidance, and unflagging belief in this project has helped to make it all possible. Committee members Ronald Huebert and John Baxter generously read early drafts of chapters and pushed me towards providing greater clarity. Graduate secretary Mary Beth MacIsaac organized photocopying, answered questions, and gave advice with invariable kindness and efficiency.

Family and friends have also provided invaluable inspiration and support. In particular, Sarah Bassnett, Triny Finlay, and Lilith Finkler lent sympathetic ears and offered many words of encouragement. My parents, Ann and Peter, have been quietly and steadfastly loving and supportive through everything. Randall provided food for both body and soul, and kept me going even when the end seemed much too far away. Hermione, who came into being half-way through, gives me ongoing proof that the details of daily life are worthy of investigation and wonder.

And in memory of Malpa and Nevet, who faithfully accompanied me through the thesis and so much else, but didn't quite make it to the end.

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

The Townshend family's[1] receipt book, Wellcome Western MS 744, is typical of its genre and exemplifies the rich possibilities of early modern discourses of food.[2] Written in three hands and compiled between 1636 and 1647, this vellum-bound quarto instructs its reader in a range of skills, from preserving fruit to making invisible ink, from roasting mutton to brewing a medicinal broth. Towards the end of the 99 folios comes a cluster of recipes that, although by no means unique in this respect, reflect and elucidate social and political contexts within which this book was compiled. The first receipt, "The Ladye Cromwells Jellye" – a clear jelly made from veal fat and calves feet – acknowledges the political rise of the Cromwells[3] through its detailed instructions that transform a basic dish into a rare and expensive delicacy.[4] More refined than the "Christall Gellie" receipt provided by the Jacobean writer John Murrell (*New Booke* 98-99), this jelly is strained and sweetened with white wine as well as sugar, then clarified

---

[1] The Wellcome catalogue does not provide any information about this family, and the only owner of the book to have written her name in it was a Dorcas Gwynn, thus making it risky to speculate about the family's identity.

[2] While "receipt" constitutes the correct early modern term, I will refer to receipts and recipes, receipt books, cookbooks, and recipe books interchangeably in the interests of variety.

[3] Elizabeth Cromwell would not have been referred to as lady until Oliver Cromwell became Lord Protector in 1653. This suggests that the receipt book continued to be added to after the catalogue end-date of 1647.

[4] This recipe is not found in the Restoration receipt book, *The Court and Kitchin of Elizabeth, Commonly called Joan Cromwel* (1664), which combines royalist and anti-Cromwellian polemic with recipes allegedly belonging to Elizabeth Cromwell. I will discuss this book further in chapters 4 and 5.

with egg white. After such care is taken to make this a clear jelly, its taste is enhanced with "oyle of cinamone musk an amber greease an rose water."[5] Adding the rare and expensive item, ambergris, to the somewhat more restrained recipe provided by Murrell, the manuscript receipt also suggests a more lavish hand with the ingredients. Murrell counsels that "a graine of Muske" (99), the most costly component of his recipe, should be used; the manuscript calls for as much "as shall giue it a tast to your liking" (92). If this recipe evokes the Cromwells' puritan simplicity with the ingredients of veal and calves feet, the spicing admits their adoption of court fashion and taste. A following receipt, "manus Christy with pearles," provides more evidence of the Townshends' interest in upward mobility, as it transforms the traditional sugar wafer into an expensive delicacy containing "an ounce of prepared pearles." This extravagance is tempered by the instruction to visit "the Apothecaris" to buy the pearls, which turns the preparation of this item into an almost scientific undertaking. A middle-class thriftiness is also evinced in a final warning: "take not aboue a dram of pearles to a pound of suger because of the price." A third recipe, "To make the Spanish pape," a custard-like dish, is more restrained in its ingredients, requiring only two egg yolks, a pint of sweet cream, rice flour, and the ubiquitous rosewater (93). But its title draws attention to its foreign origin at a time when the continent was often seen as a haven for royalists and Catholics. Representative of a tension between political interests and urban fashion, this last receipt confirms a preference for pleasure that overrides international disputes.

The tensions revealed in these three recipes, between puritan and courtly dining, extravagant pleasure and the science of cooking, foreign temptations and national

---

[5] Except where I have used modernized editions, I have retained early modern spelling and punctuation. I have modernized the long "s" and "vv," however, and I have not superscripted manuscript abbreviations (e.g. "ye," "wth").

politics, hint at the complexly related cultural, social, and political attitudes that might be gleaned from the reading of receipt books and which are collectively constitutive of early modern food discourse. My first objective in this dissertation is to develop a theoretical and historical understanding of this evolving and multi-layered discourse through readings of manuscript and printed receipt books by both men and women, with contextual support from dietaries, travel writings, letters, and food histories. My second objective is to ascertain how women, as primary nurturers and food providers, adopt the language of food in their religious and polemical writings, diaries and pamphlets, and their fictions. While not denying men's participation in food discourse – many of the receipt books that I use to establish the parameters of this discourse are written by men – my focus on women has ascertained that they can and do use a range of domestic and food-based knowledge, in conjunction with religious and physiological beliefs about food, to contribute to and initiate political critique. In her recent opinion piece for the *TLS*, Diane Purkiss writes that "to know the past is to know what people had for breakfast" (12). How people, and especially women, wrote about breakfast sheds a different kind of light on the past. Based on its universal necessity, food easily becomes a "sign" (Barthes 21) or a "code" (Douglas 36) of deep-rooted belief systems that includes religion and politics; the consideration of female participation in this code becomes likewise a consideration of female contribution to and development of early modern political attitudes and critique.

Women and Everyday Practice

Ann Romines has written of the tendency to view "Domestic language" as "invisible," devoid of content worth critical attention (17). This explains why, perhaps, there has been little exploration of the literary uses of food discourse in seventeenth-century women's texts. As Susan Arpad argues, domestic language is an important source of women's opinions, for traditionally female occupations "provided women with an important outlet for their creativity and a form for expressing their view of the world" (15). Even noblewomen engaged with food directly on a practical level, ordering and managing foodstuffs for the household, overseeing food preparation, and participating in the arts of confectionary, a skill on which many aristocratic women prided themselves. Gentlewoman and herbalist Grace, Lady Mildmay was "renowned" for her ability as a confectioner, for example (Hall, "Culinary" 176), and the frequent focus on dessert recipes in women's receipt books attests to the importance of sweet-making. Women engaged with food differently from men; it was not only something to be consumed and admired, but also a focus for physical, intellectual, and creative activity. As Luce Girard asserts, "Such life activities demand as much intelligence, imagination, and memory as those traditionally held superior" (151).

Food is thus part of an everyday material practice that, as scholars such as Viviana Comensoli, Ann Christensen, and Wendy Wall also elucidate, provides women with a space of power within the home. This ability to control and order one's surroundings, to articulate one's "view of the world" through material interactions with food, in turn extends to written expressions of food and feeding. The writing of the domestic, as Romines observes, in itself contributes to the destabilizing of "boundaries between public

and private spheres and between male and female spheres" (294), as what is normally kept within the boundaries of the home is publicly exposed on the page. But the practice and writing of cookery also encourages a broader destabilization that supports individual and critical expression. Michel de Certeau has observed that cookery is a "tactical practice" with no "spatial or institutional localization"; it is not owned by "the other" and is therefore open to spontaneous creative manipulation (xix). Luce Girard, in the companion volume to *The Practice of Everyday Life*, develops de Certeau's brief allusion to the freedom of cookery, noting that each cook "can create her *own style* according to how she accents a certain element of a practice" (156). No two cooks will make a recipe in an identical fashion: "other elements intervene in the preparation: a personal touch, the knowledge or ignorance of tiny secret practices … an entire *relationship to things* that the recipe does not codify" (201).

On a small scale, this particular "relationship to things" might be demonstrated by two different receipts for the same dish, suggesting that in fact the recipe can codify at least some aspects of this relationship. The rather curiously named "To make a splede Eagle of a pullet" – a dish presumably designed to inspire wonder and delight in one's guests – occurs in both a male-authored printed book and a woman's manuscript. In *The Second part of the good Hus-wiues Iewell* (1597), Thomas Dawson provides these guidelines:

> Take a good pullet and cut his throate hard by the head, and make it but a little hole, then scalde him cleane, and take out of the small hole his crop, so done, take a quill and blowe into the same hole, for to make the skinne rise from the fleshe, then break the wing bones, and the bones hard by the knee, then cut the necke

> hard by the body within the skinne, then cut off the romp within the skinne, leauing the bones at the legges, and also ye head on, so drawing the whole body out within the skinne of the hole, the bones to be laid beneath … [stuffing instructions] … take him and lay him flat in a platter, and make it after the proportion of an Eagle in euery part, hauing his head to be cleft a sunder, and laide in two partes like an Eagles head thus done, then must you put him into the Ouen, leauing in the platter a dish of butter vnderneath him, an other vpon him, because of burning, and whē it is enough then set it foorth, casting vpon him in the seruice blaunch pouder, Sinamon Ginger, and Suger. (32-3)

A corresponding recipe in Elizabeth Fowler's 1684 manuscript, Folger MS V.a.468, tells the reader:

> you must take a <erased> young pullet that is fleshy & you must keep her fasting all night then you must tak her & cut her throat & you must haue ye water scalding hott & ready against it is dead you must nott ouer scald her nor brak the skin yu must take the craw out whole you cut her throat then you take a quill and blow her untill all the skin com from the flesh and you must take out all the bones Except the legs & wings & head & you must cut of the Legs <legs> rump & leaue it hangin to the skin the flesh bones & ~~skine~~ guts must be taken out … [stuffing instructions] … Lay it in an Earthen platter & lay butter under it & lay upon top of it & slit the head in 2 and slit the ~~head~~ wings up by the sides & the leegs upon it & soe bake it & serue it to the table & ring the Iuc of an oreng upon it & garnish the dishwth oreng and the peele. (32v-33r)

Beginning with the interesting shift from male to female pullet, these two receipts are remarkably revealing of individual, and sometimes gendered, relationships to the ingredients of cookery. Fowler, writing as a practitioner, knows that she will choose her own bird for this recipe, and is concerned with preparing it even before its death. Dawson, a professional cookbook writer, spends time discussing the technique of deboning and carving, reflecting what would be traditionally a male skill in a great house, and displaying his own knowledge in the process. Because Fowler is writing as a practitioner, her recipe is simpler than Dawson's, and as a result, probably harder to follow. She is more interested in how the fowl is cooked than in the niceties of display, less insistent on its literal resemblance to an "Eagle." Her simpler choice of garnish – an orange, as opposed to Dawson's cinnamon, ginger, and sugar – might indicate changing food fashions, these two recipes having almost a century between them. But these decisions also reflect the fact that Fowler's book was designed to record daily practice rather than to reveal aristocratic fashions, as Dawson's was. Her receipt is more of a code, and relies on the applied knowledge of a reader who might follow and even improve on her instructions, as suggested by her own in-text corrections. She exposes the receipt's transition from court to the middling home, from a object for display to one meant most definitely to be cooked and eaten.

On a larger scale, the cook's individual "relationship to things" speaks to a sense of personal agency that has the potential to be transferred from the kitchen into the world (Girard 183). That daily work might carve out not only personal domestic space, but also "a unique space within an imposed order" is further elaborated by de Certeau and Girard

as they address everyday practice and its transgressive relationship to institutional structures:

> everyday practice is relative to the power relations that structure the social field as well as the field of knowledge. To appropriate information for oneself, to put it in a series, and to bend its montage to one's own taste is to take power over a certain knowledge and thereby overturn the imposing power of the ready-made and organized. … everyday practice patiently and tenaciously restores a space for play, an interval of freedom, a resistance to what is imposed … to be able to do something is to establish distance, to defend the autonomy of what comes from one's own personality. (*Vol. 2* 254-55)

In opposition to the Foucauldian notion of hegemonic state power, de Certeau's perspective allows for individual resistance and agency, both on a daily and local level. In its simplest form, this might encapsulate the decision to garnish with an orange instead of spices. In its more complex version, such creativity and analysis in the kitchen can expand beyond the boundaries of the home. As Susan Amussen has argued, the early modern model of the household as a little commonwealth "means that it is inappropriate to dismiss what happened in the family as 'private'" (2). Visions of domesticity, at a time when kings and queens spoke of themselves as husbands and wives of England, informed political language and relationships; those ruling England were expected to run an orderly national household, something that food discourse is often at pains to point out.[6] And food practices in general can scarcely be said to have existed within an atmosphere of privacy. Intimately related to the social and political art of hospitality, and linked

[6] Kevin Sharpe and Steven Zwicker also acknowledge that "the languages of what we might call the private and public spheres were interchangeable and interdependent" (9).

rhetorically to religious discourse, such practices brought women into the marketplace, into roles as hosts and managers, and as participants at tables where alliances were formed, deals were made, and favours were sought. As an item that naturally crosses boundaries, food can also become a language enabling women to assert control, state critical opinions, and create political alternatives through the creativity of the written word. An intimate knowledge of what is "right" food can easily inspire a knowledge about right living, along with its corollary: criticism of wrong living, most publicly performed by the powers "of the ready-made and organized."

Towards a Feminist Historicism

My research is indebted to the theoretical and critical groundwork laid by new historicism, cultural materialism, and feminism. New historicism and its close cousin, cultural materialism, have usefully provided critical models that combine both "historical and literary interpretation" to incorporate texts previously seen as marginal, or not worthy of historical or literary analysis (Gallagher and Greenblatt 3).[7] The literary text, in this context, is read as only one aspect of "the system of signs that constitutes a given culture" (Greenblatt 4); non-literary writing, such as receipt books, can be considered as part of this "system of signs," these works offering not only important historical context, but a

[7] For more on these critical practices see Stephen Greenblatt's *Renaissance Self-Fashioning: From More to Shakespeare*; Catherine Gallagher and Stephen Greenblatt's *Practicing New Historicism*; Don E. Wayne's "Power, politics, and the Shakespearean text: recent criticism in England and the United States"; Louis Montrose's "Renaissance Literary Studies and the Subject of History"; Jean E. Howard's "The New Historicism in Renaissance Studies"; Jonathan Dollimore and Alan Sinfield's "Culture and textuality: debating cultural materialism" and *Political Shakespeare: New essays in cultural materialism*; Jonathan Dollimore's "Shakespeare, Cultural Materialism, Feminism and Marxist Humanism"; Alan Sinfield's *Faultlines: Cultural Materialism and the Politics of Dissident Reading*; John Brannigan's *New Historicism and Cultural Materialism*; Scott Wilson's *Cultural Materialism: Theory and Practice*; and Jeremy Hawthorn's *Cunning Passages: New Historicism, Cultural Materialism and Marxism in the Contemporary Literary Debate.*

greater awareness of how early moderns thought and wrote. If historicist criticism provides a framework for my detailed attention to receipt books as a means of establishing an early modern food discourse, feminist criticism has provided models for my focus on women's writing, particularly more marginalized work such as autobiography, polemical texts, and manuscripts. By considering patterns of discourse within a gender-specific frame, I hope to investigate more deeply female intellectual development, rhetorical, and political strategies. At the same time, I agree with the spirit of historian Joan Wallach Scott's recent assessment that "to study women in isolation perpetuates the fiction that one sphere ... has little or nothing to do with the other" (32). My focus on food discourse has therefore aimed to establish women's participation in wider cultural and political discussions through attention to cookbooks, letters, and literary works written by men. Although "discourse," in the strict Foucauldian sense, refers primarily to "a kind of official language" (Brannigan 54 n.7), it has come also to encompass language tangential to systems of power. Operating in relation to, but not under control of the state, food discourse is a shifting cultural language of the domestic developed not only by women, but also by male professional writers, court observers, puritans, and poets. Cooking, like food practices in general, constitutes "a language through which that society unconsciously reveals its structure ... [or] its contradictions" (Lévi-Strauss 495); this language is available across the lines of gender, class, and political or religious alliance.

In my assertion that food discourse provides a language in which political opposition might be framed, I diverge from traditional new historicist perspectives, however. As Patricia Fumerton has pointed out in her call for a "New New Historicism,"

new historicists tend to be more concerned with "official authority, state ideology, and politics" than with the lives of those who engage with the "common" and the "everyday" (3). Although cultural materialists in particular have announced their commitment to investigating "the cultures of subordinate and marginalized groups" (Dollimore and Sinfield, *Political* vii), ultimately they too believe that "The state is the most powerful scriptor …best placed to enforce its story" (Sinfield 33). In Althusserian terms, the subject is unable to escape the "material ideological apparatus" of the state; even her most subversive ideas are dependent on this pervasive structure (169). Trapped in a cycle that refuses the existence of individual agency, the subject is always less important than the operations of state power and control that continually appropriate all modes of resistance.

Feminist critics have questioned this obsession with state power, accusing cultural materialists and new historicists of recreating "a world which is hierarchical, authoritarian, hegemonic, unsubvertable" (Neely 12), in which women are pushed to the side, or even blamed for reinforcing the patriarchal status quo.[8] But just as historicist and materialist critics focus on the traditionally male – "power and court politics" – feminist critics have tended to retreat behind the veil of biography, of the "marriage, family and gender relations" advocated by Lynda Boose (727). More recently, however, scholars such as Margaret Ezell have proposed an alliance between feminist and historicist practices; Ezell asserts that the work of "feminist historicism" should be

[8] For further examples of feminist criticism of new historicism and cultural materialism see also Lynda E. Boose's "The Family in Shakespeare Studies; or – Studies in the Family of Shakespeareans; or – The Politics of Politics"; and Linda Woodbridge's "Dark Ladies: Women, Social History, and English Renaissance Literature."

> historicist in its insistence that one must self-consciously seek to preserve and present the 'pastness' of the past and to struggle against the totalizing effect of the bland imposition of the present over it, feminist in its insistence on the very possibility of there being a significant feminine presence – not only masculine – in the past. (*Writing* 12)

This critical alliance is also alluded to by Joan Wallach Scott, who suggests that the focus on "marriage, family and gender" reflects sometimes anachronistic concerns of the present, and that women should indeed be included in discussions of the political sphere: "political structures and political ideas shape and set the boundaries of public discourse and all aspects of life[;] even those excluded from participation in politics are defined by them" (24).

As a feminist historicist, I too wish to honour the "pastness" of the past through documentary and archival research and historical specificity; I also believe that there existed a "significant feminine presence" in both domestic and political spheres. Danielle Clarke has noted that "the very category of 'women' … and its accompanying ideological assumptions, often serves to obscure ways in which women writers of the period perceived and expressed political ideas in the broadest sense" (1). Naming women "political agents" (14), even though they may have been neither radical in a modern feminist context, nor have had "visible centrality to the state or body politic" (2), Clarke is one of several scholars who have begun to investigate early modern women's involvement in the political sphere.[9] Lois Schwoerer notes that in the "conventional

---

[9] Some of these investigations include: essays in James Daybell's collection, *Women and Politics in Early Modern England, 1450-1700*, and those in the recent collection on women and their use of rhetoric as a political tool, *Rhetoric, Women and Politics in Early Modern England,* edited by Jennifer Richards and Alison Thorne; Kari Boyd McBride and John C. Ulreich's "Answerable Styles: Biblical Poetics and

definition of politics … women played a minor role," but argues that this is a very narrow view of political activity in early modern England,[10] a period that James Daybell calls "an epoch of women's political influence" (3). Schwoerer explains that

> the currently popular idea of "political culture" provides a useful conceptual framework for showing that political participation may take many forms. Among those forms are dispensing patronage, influencing decision makers and elections, petitioning, demonstrating, gift-giving, entertaining, haranguing, reporting seditious conduct, writing and disseminating ideas in printed form. This definition shifts the focus away from elite political structures (without denying their importance) and permits the inclusion of women from all classes (as well as more men). (57-8)

If women can participate politically through often food-related occupations such as gift-giving and entertaining, they do so also in their writings that depict such food related acts. As a concept linked to national and spiritual health and identity, food is frequently symbolic of political and religious interests, whether eaten, cooked, or discussed in manuscript or print.

Biblical Politics in the Poetry of Lanyer and Milton"; Elaine Beilin's "'Some Freely Spake Their Minde': Resistance in Anne Dowriche's *French Historie*," and her "Winning 'the harts of the people': The Role of the Political Subject in the *Urania*"; Linda Dove's "Mary Wroth and the Politics of the Household in 'Pamphilia to Amphilanthus'"; Danielle Clarke's *The Politics of Early Modern Women's Writing*; Katharine Gillespie's *Domesticity and Dissent in the Seventeenth Century: English Women Writers and the Public Sphere*, and "Anna Trapnel's Window on the Word: The Domestic Sphere of Public Dissent in Seventeenth-Century Non-conformity"; Catharine Gray's "Feeding on the Seed of the Woman: Dorothy Leigh and the Figure of Maternal Dissent"; N.H. Keeble's "Obedient subjects? The loyal self in some later seventeenth-century Royalist women's memoirs"; Hilda L. Smith's introduction to *Women Writers and the early modern British political tradition*; Rosalind Smith's "'I thus goe arm'd to field': *Lindamira's Complaint*," and "Lady Mary Wroth's *Pamphilia to Amphilanthus*: The Politics of Withdrawal"; Sharon Achinstein's "Women on Top in the Pamphlet Literature of the English Revolution"; Lois Schwoerer's "Women's public political voice in England: 1640-1740"; and Catherine Gallagher's "Embracing the Absolute: The Politics of the Female Subject in Seventeenth-Century England."

[10] James Daybell confirms this view in his introduction to *Women and Politics in Early Modern England, 1450-1700.*

Through an Alimentary Lens

Despite a growing interest in domesticity and early modern food practices, few critics have considered how women writers address these issues, and research has been confined almost exclusively to male-authored texts. Critical favourites for the examination of food and its discourses, not surprisingly, are constituted primarily by drama, with most attention focused on works by Shakespeare and Jonson. More broadly, the theatrical staging of feasts has been discussed as a focus for "conviviality and conflict" (Mahon 231), with the rituals of dining providing opportunities for erotic exchange, revenge, and the pursuit of appetites in general (Meads 2-13). Shakespearean scholars have frequently attended to the desire for food, seeing food as a place of transference for other desires and symbolic of an often violent longing for other material or sensual objects.[11] Ann Christensen, in particular, has discussed the gendered nature of this conflicted longing; her article addresses the "contested space" of the home and suggests that men adopt the role of cook "to wrest power from or exert power over, women, their rivals, and their subordinates" ("Playing" 329). The overturning of domestic authority that happens in *Titus Andronicus* when Titus takes over the role of cook, for example, heightens and spreads political turmoil, an indication of the importance of the household to social order and peace. Most recently, Joan Fitzpatrick's *Food in Shakespeare* develops the focus on food in the plays through early modern dietaries, establishing that Shakespeare uses food references to "engage with debates about cosmopolitanism, expanding international trade, religion, and philosophy" (10).

[11] For essays in this vein see Joseph Candido's "Dining in Ephesus: Food in *The Comedy of Errors*"; Daniel W. Ross's "'What a Number of Men Eats Timon': Consumption in *Timon of Athens*"; David Hillman's "The Gastric Epic: *Troilus and Cressida*"; and Janet Adelman's "'Anger's My Meat': Feeding, Dependency, and Aggression in *Coriolanus*."

The role of the cook as a focus for class, gender, and religious anxieties is also taken up by Huey-ling Lee. In a response to Christensen's article,[12] he suggests that male cooks were more frequently seen as protectors of community well-being than destroyers through a discussion of Massinger's *New Way to Pay Old Debts* and Jonson's *Bartholomew Fair* ("Devil").[13] Jonson's dramatic use of food has more often encouraged commentary on questions of authorship, with Jonson himself seen as the cook who feeds his spectators' insatiable appetites.[14] But Jonson's use of food also hints at political analysis. His masques that perform dining rituals for the pleasure and interest of the king, as Leah Marcus has discussed, contain nuanced criticism as well as praise; *Pleasure Reconciled to Virtue*, for instance, advocates moderation at the table in the face of increasingly luxurious dining at court (123-26). As a court poet, Jonson ladled his criticism with care, but such advice also participates in the growing distaste for the excess associated with James's court, and often overlaps with political discomfort about James's rule. Jonson typically provides social commentary, as well, in his poems that depict mealtime hospitality, positioning himself as a host in "Inviting a Friend to Dinner" in order to "attain equality with – if not superiority over – his politically superior guest" (Schoenfeldt, "Mysteries" 66). But even as a guest, Jonson turns dining to his advantage, as critics have noted in "To Penshurst" and "To Robert Wroth." Here, too, he promotes

---

[12] Both these articles come out of unpublished dissertations. Ann Caroline Christensen's "Private supper/public feast: Gender, power, and nurture in early modern England" examines the role of meals in works by Shakespeare and Jonson in an investigation of the tension between the submissive ideal of femininity and a reality in which women wielded a considerable amount of power through their control over food and its distribution. Similarly, Huey-ling Lee's "Eat, Drink, Man, Woman: Food, Eating, and Social Formations in Renaissance Culture and Drama," addresses the gender dynamics of mealtimes, appetite, and control over nourishment in the drama of Jonson, Shakespeare, Massinger, and Middleton.

[13] Food has been discussed as a conduit for similar tensions in *Women Beware Women* (Cole); nervousness about foreigners and their alien foods encouraging "physical and sexual degeneracy" has been observed in *Sir Thomas More* (Fitzpatrick, "Food and Foreignness" 33).

[14] See, for example, Don K. Hedrick's "Cooking for the Anthropophagi: Jonson and His Audience"; Jonas A. Barish's "Feasting and Judging in Jonsonian Comedy"; and Terrance Dunford's "Consumption of the World: Reading, Eating and Imitation in *Every Man Out of His Humor*."

himself despite his social inequality, taking on "his host's prestige" by "serving a banquet of language" intended to outshine the meal itself (74).[15]

Besides Jonson's poetry, other non-dramatic works have also inspired critical interest. Michael Schoenfeldt's readings of Spenser, Shakespeare, Herbert, and Milton influentially approach the question of food through the physiological processes of ingestion and excretion and posit the importance of appetitive control in the creation of the moral subject. Schoenfeldt's attention to the struggle with appetite and its relationship to both "morality and spirituality" (*Bodies* 117), particularly in his discussions of Herbert and Milton, has illuminated my own attempts to understand the relationship between food and religious belief. In an earlier article on Herbert, Schoenfeldt explains that

> Eating conjoins the extremes of mortal experience, from the brutal exigencies of animal hunger to the baroque elegance of table manners. Eating, moreover, figures prominently in the two central moments of Judeo-Christian history: the consumption of the forbidden fruit in the Fall, and participation in the communion meal that commemorates Christ's sacrifice. An occasion of purification and of pollution, eating demands that one confront daily the permeable boundary separating inner space from the outside world. ("Consuming" 106)

If food "traces for Herbert the inner contours of the devotional subject" (105), for Milton, it is "a central site of pre- and postlapsarian morality" (*Bodies* 131). Like others, Schoenfeldt looks most closely at Raphael's meal with Adam and Eve in Book V of

---

[15] For more discussion of issues of hospitality and dining in Jonson's poems, see for example Bruce Thomas Boeher's *The Fury of Men's Gullets: Ben Jonson and the Digestive Canal*; Raymond Williams's *The Country and the City*; David Norbrook's *Poetry and Politics in the English Renaissance*; and Don E. Wayne's *Penshurst: The Semiotics of Place and the Poetics of History*.

Paradise Lost,[16] suggesting that its extravagance is "simply an appropriate response to God's generous plenitude" (157). Post-lapsarian dining, on the other hand, provides an opportunity for appetitive control; lack of such control, Schoenfeldt asserts, indicates the inability to govern oneself, not to mention the more serious consequence of misgoverning a commonwealth (164). As these readings of Herbert, Milton, and Jonson suggest, food can indeed be seen as a conduit for political commentary, and I will return briefly to these authors in the course of my dissertation to provide further context for my discussions of women's works.

Of relevance to my work as well has been recent scholarship on domesticity. These considerations of women and the household, however, have remained focused on male-authored texts, especially domestic drama. Viviana Comensoli's *"Household Business": Domestic Plays of Early Modern England* examines emerging social tensions between patriarchal ideals and the realities of women's domestic power. Natasha Korda takes a related approach in *Shakespeare's Domestic Economies*, in which she suggests that women's roles as consumers and "keepers" of household property contribute to a transgressively individual female subjectivity and agency. Most congruent with my own interests, however, is Wendy Wall's *Staging Domesticity*, which discusses household manuals and receipt books as a way of understanding domestic "tactics" – to use de

[16] Anthony Low's "Angels and Food in *Paradise Lost*" and John E. Parish's "Milton and the Well-Fed Angel" have both discussed this feast, identifying Eve's performance of ideal hospitality and her banquet of raw food as symbolic of a lost world. Jack Goldman, in "Perspectives of Raphael's Meal in *Paradise Lost*, Book V," revisits this meal to make the rather dubious suggestion that Adam and Eve might have included meat and wine in a meal usually thought to be vegetarian (33). This appears to derive from a literal reading of the word "meat," which was often used simply as a synonym for food. Robert Appelbaum's "Eve's and Adam's 'Apple': Horticulture, Taste, and the Flesh of the Forbidden Fruit in *Paradise Lost*" moves away from Book V to discuss fruit, seduction, and the botanical identification of the apple, while Denise Gigante, in *Taste: A Literary History*, draws attention to the connection between food and God's word (22-46). Lee Sheridan Cox's "Food-Word Imagery in *Paradise Regained*" addresses a similar link between food and the word, and draws attention to Satan's illusory attempts at feeding.

Certeau's term – in a range of domestically themed plays such as Shakepeare's *Merry Wives of Windsor* and Thomas Heywood's *Woman Killed with Kindness*.[17] Wall's examination usefully discusses the discourse of national identity that emerges from domestic manuals such as Gervase Markham's *The English Housewife*. However, she does not consider these manuals within a wider political context. Markham, for example, whom she rightly observes wished to "rescue the English way of life" by minimizing the influence of continental imports and fashionable trends (37), was also a puritan supporter of Robert Devereaux, Earl of Essex, and an opponent of the policies of appeasement pursued by James I (Norbrook, "Masque" 97). Food choices, as we know from our own contemporary debates, are often highly politicized; Markham's keen defence of a nationally based, local cuisine follows a puritan agenda that consciously rejects the foreign and the continental not only as food provider, but also as political ally. Such political viewpoints would have been recognizable to early moderns used to reading through layers of biblical reference and other types of coding in an era of censorship and press control.

Apart from Wall, a number of other scholars have begun to see the receipt book as a focus for analysis on its own and in relation to other early modern literature.[18] Two

---

[17] Wall has most recently published a historical overview of food practices: *Reading Food: A Culinary History from Shakespeare to Martha Stewart* (Routledge, Sept. 2007).

[18] These include Patricia Fumerton's psychoanalytic discussion of Jacobean banquet culture in *Cultural Aesthetics* (111-67); and analyses of women's manuscript books, such as Sara Pennell's "Perfecting Practice? Women, Manuscript Recipes and Knowledge in Early Modern England"; Catherine Field's "'Many hands hands': Writing the Self in Early Modern Women's Recipe Books"; and Amy M. Charles's "Mrs. Herbert's Kitchin Booke." Food and literary historians have also written about the printed receipt book. These include: Lynette Hunter's "Books for daily life: household, husbandry, behaviour," "Cookery Books: A Cabinet of Rare Devises and Conceits," "Women and Domestic Medicine: Lady Experimenters, 1570-1620," and "'Sweet Secrets' from Occasional Receipt to Specialized Books: The Growth of a Genre"; Malcolm Thick's "A Close Look at the Composition of Sir Hugh Plat's *Delights for Ladies*"; Robert Appelbaum's "Rhetoric and Epistemology in Early Printed Recipe Collections" and *Aguecheek's Beef, Belch's Hiccup, and Other Gastronomic Interjections*; Elizabeth Tebeaux's "Women and Technical Writing, 1475-1700"; Jayne Archer's "The Queens' Arcanum: Authority and Authorship in *The Queens*

works in particular have been useful guides in my own analysis of receipt books in relation to literary works. In his unpublished dissertation, David Goldstein considers both manuscript and printed cookbooks as models for understanding the imitative and collaborative authorship of the Renaissance. His discussions of the manuscript cookbook of Ann, Lady Fanshawe, as well as of the printed books of Hugh Plat, Robert May, William Rabisha, and Hannah Woolley, have provided useful contributions to my own readings. His consideration of Fanshawe tends to be rooted in the more usual receipt book conversations about citation, authority, and memory, but his substantial analysis of the books of May and Rabisha highlights the "political allegory" (143) that might be found in the Restoration receipt book. Yet apart from these perceptive discussions, Goldstein remains focused on the male canon: brief mentions of Fanshawe's memoir and Margaret Cavendish's poetry aside, Shakespeare and Milton provide the primary foci. Robert Appelbaum also provides a model for my use of receipt books and other early modern food writing in his entertainingly titled *Aguecheek's Beef, Belch's Hiccup, and Other Gastronomic Interjections*. Advocating food as "a kind of language, a system of communication" (10), Appelbaum discusses desire, simplicity, civility, and gluttony through the analysis of printed receipt books and a range of continental and English male-authored works that includes Ovid, Erasmus, Shakespeare, and Milton. He firmly establishes the cultural and social relevance of food discourse and clearly outlines

---

Closet Opened"; Elizabeth David's "A True Gentlewoman's Delight"; Katharine Gillespie's "Elizabeth Cromwell's Kitchen Court: Republicanism and the Consort"; Laura Lunger Knoppers's "Opening the Queen's Closet: Henrietta Maria, Elizabeth Cromwell and the Politics of Cookery"; David Potter's "The Household Receipt Book of Ann, Lady Fanshawe"; Edith Snook's "'Soveraigne Receipts' and the Politics of Beauty in *The Queens Closet Opened*"; Eileen White's "Domestic English Cookery and Cookery Books, 1575-1675"; and David Goldstein's unpublished dissertation, "Recipes for Authorship: Indigestion and the Making of Originality in Early Modern England. "

techniques for reading and understanding the rhetoric of receipt books,[19] but he only briefly acknowledges the potential for receipt books to contain political commentary,[20] and, once again, does not consider female use of such rhetoric.

Although there is a growing interest in receipt books as literature and as cultural documents, as this overview suggests, women's writing has been minimally considered within the purview of food-related criticism. Aemilia Lanyer's "holy feast," which she delivers through her long poem *Salve Deus Rex Judaeorum*, has been briefly examined by Lynette McGrath and Mary Ellen Lamb. Lamb queries whether Lanyer views herself as a "lowly cook" or as a "priest" presiding over "a holy communion or mass" ("Patronage" 43), while McGrath adopts the latter perspective, suggesting that Lanyer's feast is a "Eucharistic offering" that feeds her readers the fruit of divine knowledge (234). The more secular domestic metaphors found in the poems of Margaret Cavendish, Duchess of Newcastle, in particular several of her "Nature's Cabinet" section in *Poems and Phancies*, have been discussed by Katherine Capshaw Smith and Lara Dodds. Observing Cavendish's use of domestic metaphor alongside contrasting scientific knowledge, Smith concludes that Cavendish ultimately dismisses the domestic as a language of limitation. Dodds provides a more positive reading of domesticity in these poems, suggesting that Cavendish both "appropriates and contests" the early modern construction of the domestic woman to "[transform] the language of domesticity into the basis for a writing self" (152). The domestic, in Dodd's analysis, becomes a way of challenging or enhancing scientific knowledge, providing ways of knowing that "may

---

[19] See in particular his associated article, "Rhetoric and Epistemology in Early Printed Recipe Collections."
[20] He discusses this in relation to the aforementioned *Court and Kitchin of Elizabeth*. He observantly notes that political language creeps into the recipes as well, with the recipe "To Bake a pig" in particular containing language that turns "a common, homely way of 'dressing a pig' into a caustic evocation of the wartime cruelty" (84-5).

come from those spaces that modern science has excluded" (163). Although I have chosen to focus my attention on authors other than Lanyer and Cavendish, they, like the male authors discussed above, provide broader contextual support.

Reading Receipt Books

This dissertation is to my knowledge the only work to date to consider in detail the relationship of women to food through the diaries, pamphlets, and fictions of women themselves. Although women's receipt book writing, both in manuscript and in print,[21] has been the source of investigation – most notably by David Goldstein, Catherine Field, Lynette Hunter, Sara Pennell, and Elizabeth Tebeaux – critics have been primarily interested in issues of female knowledge, selfhood, community, and authorship. The participation of these receipt books in a broader societal and political discourse is only beginning to be considered. My focus on women's literary texts is unique not only for its development of women's contributions to food discourse, but also for its combination of women's published and manuscript literary texts and non-literary manuscript writings. Margaret Ezell has argued for the importance of manuscript writing to the breadth and wealth of women's work ("Myth" 591); and indeed, despite the modern publication of many of the literary texts I have chosen, the diaries of Anne Clifford and Ann Fanshawe, and the second part of Mary Wroth's romance *Urania*, were available only in manuscript to their contemporaries. Like these literary manuscripts, many receipt books were prepared with care, with indexes, ruled borders, careful script, and decorative elements indicating the compiler's awareness of present and future readers. And like Fanshawe's

[21] Women did not publish receipt books until the 1650s, and these books were for the most part gathered by a third party and/or published posthumously. It was not until the publication of Hannah Woolley's books in the 1660s and 70s that women began to break into and take over the receipt book market.

memoir, for example, these receipt books were not private documents, and frequently were held onto and passed down within families.[22] Even those books that show less care for aesthetic appearance are obviously communally compiled, with their numerous hands, comments of approval or disapproval, and the occasional instructional addition. Like their more literary cousins, these technical writings were designed to be read and considered by others; as evidence of female creativity and exchange, these writings deserve to be read as texts within the larger field of early modern women's writing.[23]

Both manuscript and printed receipt books are integral to establishing a sense of seventeenth-century food discourse. Distinct from dietaries, which provide guidelines for a healthy diet, receipt books discuss not only what should be eaten, but what might be eaten, revealing desire and fashion as well as expectation and restriction. Cookbooks expand boundaries, in other words, incorporating contradictions, as does Gervase Markham's *English Housewife*, which includes foreign recipes and ingredients despite its concurrent insistence on the importance of the homegrown. Women's manuscript books indicate what women chose to record as important to their food knowledge; this gendered reflection has led Ezell to suggest that these books were "used by women for a much more complicated form of life record than [their] classification suggests" ("Domestic" 41). Ezell's observation reflects scholarship on the modern-day, female-authored

---

[22] Ann Fanshawe's receipt book, Wellcome Western MS 7113, the Boyle family receipts, Wellcome Western MS 1340, and the book belonging to Mary Granville and Anne (Granville) Dewes, Folger MS V.a. 430, are all examples of books passed down within families, and usually, in the case of the Granvilles and Fanshawe, from mother to daughter. However, as David Goldstein notes, this avenue of transmission is often not clearly taken, and the relationships between the various owners is very frequently obscure (117 n.9).

[23] For discussions of manuscript culture as well as its relationship to print see Arthur F. Marotti's *Manuscript, Print, and the English Renaissance Lyric*; H.R. Woudhuysen's *Sir Philip Sidney and the Circulation of Manuscripts 1558-1640*; Marotti and Bristol's introduction to *Print, Manuscript, Performance: The Changing Relations of the Media in Early Modern England*; Peter Beal's *In Praise of Scribes: Manuscripts and their Makers in Seventeenth-Century England*; Margaret Ezell's *Social Authorship and the Advent of Print*, and her recent article, "Domestic Papers: Manuscript Culture and Early Modern Women's Life Writing"; and Harold Love's *Scribal Publication in Seventeenth-Century England.*

cookbook that has argued for reading the recipe as a broad and gendered narrative disclosing aspects of female subjectivity, social and historical contexts, and even contributing to "fictions" or "idealizations" of domestic or community space (Bower 32).[24] In her analysis of American community cookbooks, Anne Bower advocates the autobiographical role of recipes, suggesting that they are a place for "silenced women making a place to express some part of who they are, … a space in which women assert their values" (47). Colleen Cotter similarly suggests the presence of a broader "cultural narrative" of the recipe that mirrors "social mores and expectations" (52, 53), while Ann Romines notes that the rituals of domesticity enable both "individual expression" and participation in "group values" (14). This personal and social narrative more importantly gives women the space in which to develop political viewpoints; as Janet Theophano has noted, "cookbooks have served as a forum for women to voice concerns about a wide range of political and social issues related to gender, race, religion, and class" (10).

Although this focus on the gendered narrative of the recipe is more applicable to manuscript books simply because the authors of early modern printed books were male until the mid-seventeenth century, it verifies that the recipe can and does express more than simply how to make a dish. Robert Appelbaum's discussion of "Rhetoric and Epistemology in Early Printed Recipe Collections" addresses this primarily male preserve in terms that echo and expand on the analyses of female-compiled manuscript and printed cookbooks outlined above. Rhetorically sophisticated, the early modern recipe contains "the language of suasion, of eliciting not only a response to the book as a commodity, but

[24] See also Susan J. Leonardi's "Recipes for Reading: Summer Pasta, Lobster a la Risholme, and Key Lime Pie"; Janet Theophano's *Eat My Words: Reading Women's Lives through the Cookbooks They Wrote*; Anne Bower's "Cooking Up Stories: Narrative Elements in Community Cookbooks"; and Colleen Cotter's "Claiming a Piece of the Pie: How the Language of Recipes Defines Community."

also a set of values, expectations, and sensory experiences. It appeals to national character, to health, to the superiority of the natural over the artificial" (3). Reflecting their historical, cultural and social "mores and expectations," printed receipt books also offer convincing models of desired and desirable "group values." Concerning themselves with the "civilizing process" (8),[25] these books were

> products of shifting patterns in the organization of households, the definition of regional and ethnic identity, the practices of gender construction, the spread of literacy, the promotion of professional medicine, and a variety of other social, cultural, and even political phenomena. (9)

As Appelbaum points out in both his article and his later monograph, the reading of the recipe can be complicated and deepened by an analysis of prefatory material which provides its own clues about the political, social, and cultural propensities of the author or publisher. Yet despite the acknowledgement by receipt book theorists of the potential for political readings of both manuscript and published works, little has been done to pursue this potential. As Kevin Sharpe and Steven Zwicker assert, "There is an important sense in which no seventeenth-century literature is not also political" (3). The rich stew-pot of allusion, implication, and authoritative example found in the receipt book is thus an ideal forum for establishing the political import of early modern food discourse.

Pleasure, Moderation, Health, and Hospitality

My research has built on many of the perspectives found in scholarship on receipt books, domesticity, and food. I have taken this research in two significantly new directions. Although other critics have provided broad overviews of printed receipt

[25] This is a concept derived from Norbert Elias's work of the same name.

books, they have, for the most part, focused on these as social and cultural documents with little or no political effect.[26] My work is the first to attempt to establish the politics of an early modern food discourse as it develops over the course of the seventeenth century. Also unique to my research is my examination of the ways in which women have contributed to and engaged with this discourse. By establishing women's use of this domestic-political language, I offer distinctly new perspectives on the women's texts I have chosen to discuss, while partaking of the growing interest in establishing women's involvement in the early modern political sphere.

I can, of course, tell only part of the story. Although food is an international concern, bringing with it political issues of colonial expansion,[27] the works I have chosen are more readily discussed in the context of England, and I place my readings of receipt books and women's discussions of food in relation to current regimes, economic situations, and religious beliefs. Many of my discussions of food and politics are admittedly London-based, and certainly many of the printed receipt books would have been aimed at a London audience. I have tried to remain aware of this lack of regional focus at a time when diet was often a very regional concern.[28] I have been able to provide a range of class perspectives, however, as I include works by noble, gentry, and middling women; receipt book authors included gentry, professional writers, and professional cooks. Finally, because of the volume of material, I have chosen to use printed and

---

[26] As I discuss in Chapter 4, critics have begun to look at the cookbooks of the 1650s in particular as having political import. Laura Lunger Knoppers's "Opening the Queen's Closet: Henrietta Maria, Elizabeth Cromwell and the Politics of Cookery," and Edith Snook's "'Soveraigne Receipts' and the Politics of Beauty in *The Queens Closet Opened*," are most notable for this perspective.

[27] This could certainly be given more attention. Kim Hall's "Culinary spaces, colonial spaces: the gendering of sugar in the seventeenth century" is unique in considering how receipt books and female practice contribute to the English colonial project.

[28] See Joan Thirsk's *Food in Early Modern England: Phases, Fads, Fashions 1500-1760*, for a particularly good discussion of the regionalism of English foods.

manuscript receipt books in distinct ways. Because printed books were often very widely read – Hugh Plat's popular *Delights for Ladies* was printed eighteen times in just over fifty years, for example – and frequently contained editorially revealing prefatory material, I have relied on these to develop a core sense of the politics of early modern food discourse, discussing them in significant detail in Chapters 2 and 4. My discussions of manuscript books are focused more particularly in Chapters 3 and 5; these have provided documentary evidence and theoretical contexts for the ways in which women wrote and thought about food.

I begin my analysis by examining late Elizabethan and Jacobean receipt books in tandem with the Jacobean discourse of breastfeeding, taken up particularly by puritan men and women. Receipt books by John Partridge, A.W., Thomas Dawson, John Murrell, Hugh Plat, and Gervase Markham initiate my examination of cookery books and their gradual development of a politicized food discourse. Looking at ideas of pleasure and national improvement, I show how these concepts are connected to both women and the nation. After a discussion of late Elizabethan books that subversively encourage women to partake of courtly pleasures in pursuit of "publique profit & vtility" (Partridge, *Treasury* A2v), I then turn to Jacobean books, whose promotion of pleasure and utility is increasingly tied up with the frequently political rhetoric of religion and scientific progress. In the second part of the chapter, I address female promotion of maternal breastfeeding as a means of establishing women's roles as primary and primal feeders. These discussions of nursing and maternal care inflect and inform women's relationships to and control over food events more generally, and have been particularly useful in alerting me to the religious rhetoric embedded in the cultural and political discourse of

food. The Protestant food discourse, found particularly in Gervase Markham's *The English Housewife*, for example, is reflected in the writings of Elizabeth Clinton, Countess of Lincoln, and puritan mother Dorothy Leigh, with their insistence on women's ability to nurture their children with both material and spiritual food. Linking women to God and the Protestant nation, and implying that nursing mothers are the true feeders of God's elect, these writers pointedly challenge James's claimed role as "nourish-Father" to the nation. As nursing mothers wrest control over nation-building back from the king through references to the book of Isaiah, they also establish a discourse of sweetness that distinguishes between the true food of Christ and the false food delivered by the devil – and James. Extending receipt book allusions to national improvement, Clinton and Leigh directly address James's political and religious visions that were increasingly open to debate and question by his opponents.

My next chapter, "The Sweetness of Simplicity: Dining in Lady Mary Wroth's *Urania*," continues to examine the oppositional discourse of food in the Jacobean era through the eyes of courtier and disaffected noblewoman Mary Wroth. The Protestant plain-style dining practice that she develops in her two-part romance is designed to reveal and counter the political consequences of uncontrolled eating habits. Taking up the discourse of sweetness established by Dorothy Leigh in particular, she participates in a wider discussion by court observers and letter-writers such as John Chamberlain and Dudley Carleton that criticizes James and his court for excessive consumption. Luxurious dining, Wroth warns, can lead to misrule, whereas restraint and moderation balances pleasure with moral behaviour and good political decision-making. Warning of the dangers inherent in uncontrolled appetites, and contrasting these with the benefits of

moderate, simple, and godly dining, Wroth develops a philosophy of the table that evokes nostalgic Elizabethan values that combine courtly grandeur with country simplicity. Combining religious interpretations of sweetness with political perspectives on health and hospitality, Wroth presents a dining practice at odds with and critical of James's lavish and wasteful rule.

The following chapter leaps over two decades to consider the increasingly overt and political food propaganda of the civil war and commonwealth periods. After a lull in receipt book publishing, the late 1640s and early to mid-1650s saw a small flourishing of manuals written almost exclusively by royalist nobility such as the Catholic Alethea Talbot, Countess of Arundel, and her sister, Elizabeth Grey, Countess of Kent, or those associated with the royals, such as the keeper of Queen Henrietta Maria's receipts, W.M., or Joseph Cooper, former cook to Charles I. Cookbooks from France, by Pierre François de la Varenne and M. Marnette, were newly available in translation as well. I argue that the generic codes of receipt books, particularly the associations with women and secrets, encouraged royalist adoption of this genre. Employing these books to claim courtly food traditions as part of royalist memory and politics, royalist writers and publishers promoted the importance of cookery and medical receipts for the restoration of national health. But food discourse was in the air, and these ideas were adopted by royalist opponents as well. In the second half of this chapter I examine the sectarian pamphlets of Sarah Wight and Anna Trapnel, whose Baptist and Fifth Monarchist writings used food and food refusal to establish differently oppositional notions of the healthy nation. Wight, whose 1647 pamphlet reveals her body undergoing trials – disease, violence, and famine – that mirror those of the nation under civil war, models recovery through the unity found

through faith in God, rather than the king, evoking beliefs expressed earlier by Leigh and Clinton in England's role as a new Jerusalem. Trapnel, whose pamphlets appear in the mid-1650s, is less of a physical symbol of the nation's destruction and recovery, using the purity engendered by her fast to criticize the food intake of Cromwell's protectorate. National health, she asserts, is to be found in the sweetness provided by the generous hospitality of God rather than through the extravagant and selfish practices of the protectorate whose profligacy she saw promoting inequity and poverty among the populace.

My closing chapter, "'Those Golden Days of Peace and Hospitality': A Restoration Politics of Dining," discusses the diaries of Lady Anne Clifford, Countess of Pembroke, Dorset, and Montgomery, and the memoirs of Ann, Lady Fanshawe, and spans almost the entire seventeenth-century, ending in 1676, the year of Clifford's death, and Fanshawe's completion of her memoir. Although I return to Jacobean politics in my discussion of Clifford, my primary focus is on Restoration politics, and I begin with a look at the values of hospitality promoted and longed for by receipt book writers of the 1660s: Robert May, William Rabisha, and Hannah Woolley. These romanticized Elizabethan concepts of generous nobility and Christian charity initially project the idyllic hopes that royalists placed in Charles II. But with the realization that Charles was more interested in his own sensual pleasures than with traditional displays of generosity, these nostalgic concepts became tools of political criticism. Anne Clifford, herself a proponent of memories of Elizabethan hospitality, initially discusses these values as a contrast to the new regime of James I, with whom she is at odds due to her lengthy inheritance suit. Following a discussion of Clifford's use of dining and hospitality in her

early diaries to garner political allies while communicating dissatisfaction under James, I then turn to her Restoration records that show her own performance of hospitality. Evoking Elizabethan values, Clifford's practices also implicitly counter those of Charles II. The implicitly political display of hospitality pursued by Clifford is revisited in the context of Ann Fanshawe's memoirs, in which discussions of food and hospitality directly attack Charles in response to his neglect of her family. Fanshawe's memories of Spanish generosity are situated against her records of an England that refuses to offer sustenance to a loyal subject. Food and its rituals become once again a means of communicating political values, now in opposition to the much anticipated Restoration monarchy.

CHAPTER 2

From Marchpane to Breast Milk: Food, Pleasure, and National Improvement

In 1583, the railing puritan Philip Stubbes included a chapter on food – or more accurately, on "The Gluttonie and excesse in England" – in his *Anatomie of Abuses*, writing:

> For now adayes, if the table be not pestered from the one end to the other, as thicke as one dish can stand by another, with delicate meat of sundry sortes, one cleane different from another, & to euery dish a seuerall sawce appropriate to his kind, it is thought there vnworthy the name of a dinner … Oh what nicity, what prodigality is this? … I haue heard my father say, that in his daies one dish or two of good wholsome meat, was thought sufficient for a man of great worship to dine withall … A good peece of Beefe was thought then, good meat and able for the best, but nowe, it is thought too grosse for their tender stomackes to disgest: If this be so, I maruell how our forefathers liued … most of them fed vppon Graine, Corne, rootes, Pulse, Hearbes, weeds, and such other baggage, and yet liued longer then we, were healthfuller then we, of better complexion then we, and much stronger then we in euery respect, wherefore I cannot perswade my selfe

> otherwise, but that our nicenesse and curiousnesse in diet, hath altered our nature, distempered our bodies, and made vs subiect to millions of diseases. (152-3)[1]

Pleasure, for Stubbes, was a difficult concept. The delights of variety, novelty, and foreign innovations such as sauce spoke to him only of decadence and corruption on both physical and spiritual levels. Though he rejected courtly dining fashions, his favoured alternative – "a good peece of Beefe" – is not rendered particularly appealing. The rigours of belief, to his mind, appear to provide their own satisfactions, and he seems unable to acknowledge the attraction or even legitimacy of pleasurable experience.

Stubbes was, however, out of step with developing food discourse that promoted the pleasures of courtly dining beyond court circles. But this discourse also glanced at Stubbes's concerns, depicting a range of pleasures from the showy to the godly, encouraging excess while requiring restraint. In this chapter, I establish the range of Jacobean food discourse by analysing late Elizabethan and Jacobean receipt books alongside breastfeeding pamphlets that depict women in their most primal feeding role. Late Elizabethan receipt books initiated the promotion of pleasure to female providers of food, but they encouraged it in pursuit of "publique profit & vtility" (Partridge, *Treasury* A2v), or a sense of general national improvement. The pleasures they promoted were not only self-serving, but justifiable contributions to a smoothly-run household and a means to social recognition. These books also participated in a subtle anti-court perspective through their propagation of the secrets of courtly dining, initiating a political discourse

---

[1] The Elizabethan "Homily Against Gluttony and Drunkenness" might well have served as a reference point for Stubbes, and certainly, for Elizabethan writers in particular, such a homily would have reinforced numerous biblical and cultural precepts demanding moderation. Joan Fitzpatrick has also suggested that "tirades against excess" were particular mirrors of this homily (*Food* 3). The homilies continued to have influence in the Jacobean era as well, as James threatened to make them mandatory in response to ministers who used the pulpit to criticise the king. Here, he appears to have been drawn to the reinforcement of public order communicated by the homilies. See Jeanne Shami's *John Donne and Conformity in Crisis in the Late Jacobean Pulpit* for more on the homilies under James.

that would be more overtly adopted by Jacobean receipt books that offered discernible support for or detraction from the reigning monarch, suggesting that some pleasures might be more legitimate than others, both for the individual and the nation. As these cookbooks developed and politicized the meaning of pleasure within food discourse, discussions of maternal breastfeeding also participated in a redefinition of the relationship between feeding, pleasure, and virtue. Dorothy Leigh, author of the mother's advice book *The Mothers Blessing* (1616), and Elizabeth Clinton, Countess of Lincoln, and author of the breastfeeding pamphlet *The Covntess of Lincolns Nvrserie* (1622), depicted women's unique ability to breastfeed as godly and pleasurable as well as a political tool. Maternal nursing did not only provide pleasing food, they suggested, but also countered the displeasing food and food practices offered by James I, as these mothers put themselves forward as the legitimate feeders of a strong Protestant nation.

Restricting Pleasure

The historical concept of pleasure as defined by the receipt books, and by food discourse in general, was elastic and malleable, encompassing both the pleasures of the body and those of the soul. Ronald Huebert has suggested that early modern drama conceptualized "a new attitude towards pleasure … that strongly endorses the notion of choice" (1-2), an attitude that certainly emerges in discussions of food. Choices were not only offered, but also defined and justified within evolving religious, political, and social interests. How one chose one's pleasures, therefore, was often indicative of ideology and personal belief. That core values should be reflected by one's dietary pleasures is hinted at by Pierre Bourdieu, who locates "tastes in *food*" as "the strongest and most indelible

mark of infant learning," and which sustain a knowledge of one's "native world." This native world is "the maternal world, the world of primordial tastes and basic foods, of the archetypal relation to the archetypal cultural good, in which pleasure-giving is an integral part of pleasure and the selective disposition towards pleasure" (79). Because food – beginning with breast-milk – is part of these fundamental memories of pleasure, nourishment in turn provides a foundation for one's relationships, interactions with, and beliefs about the world.

That pleasure, food, and belief were related is also indicated by the variety of regulations that restricted early modern food consumption. As Mary Douglas observes in her examination of the modern meal, food "is about different degrees of hierarchy, inclusion and exclusion, boundaries and transactions across the boundaries" (36). These terms of inclusion and exclusion were deeply entrenched. Food legislation affected both commoners and nobility with multiple proclamations issued to govern food quality and production during times of plenty as well as famine. During the reign of Henry VIII, sumptuary laws covered food consumption as well as quality of clothing: the number of dishes that could be served at one meal to a cardinal, for example, was limited to nine, while "lords 'under the degree of an earl,' mayors of the city of London, knights of the garter and abbots could have six." The law made sure to define the size of a dish – one large bird such as a swan was equal to a dish of several smaller birds, for instance – but humble foods such as pottages avoided regulation and could presumably be eaten in great quantity if desired (Sim 6). Although sumptuary regulations covering foodstuffs were abandoned by the mid-sixteenth century, other food-specific restrictions, particularly on the consumption of meat, were tightened under Elizabeth's reign. She expanded the

number of fish days to include Wednesday as well as Friday and Saturday,[2] though primarily for reasons that had nothing to do with religious observance. Rather, the context for fish days was highly political. William Harrison, the Elizabethan clergyman whose *Description of England* formed an introductory part of Holinshed's *Chronicles*, addresses this question of fish days. Rather grumpily he reports:

> even in this season wherein we live, there is no restraint of any meat, either for religion's sake or public order, in England, but it is lawful for every man to feed upon whatsoever he is able to purchase, except it be upon those days whereon eating of flesh is especially forbidden by the laws of the realm, which order is taken only to the end our numbers of cattle may be the better increased and that abundance of fish which the sea yieldeth more generally received. Besides this there is great consideration had in the making of this law for the preservation of the navy and maintenance of convenient numbers of seafaring men, both which would otherwise greatly decay if some means were not found whereby they might be increased. (125-26)

However, godliness was still formally touted as the foremost reason for obedience to this law, and "the act of Parliament by which the Saturday fish day was reintroduced … claimed firstly that 'due and godly abstinence is a means to virtue and to subdue men's bodies to their soul and spirit'" (Wilson, *Food* 46).

James I continued the tradition of managing food distribution and regulating consumption throughout his reign. In May 1603, only two months after his accession, he issued a proclamation fixing prices so that "no persons or person of what estate or degree

---

[2] Wednesday and Saturday had been medieval fish days that had been dropped and reinstated. Saturdays were reintroduced in 1548, and Wednesday was added in 1563 (Wilson, *Food* 46).

soever he bee, doe in any wise pay more for Corne, Victuals, Horsemeate, Lodgings, or any kinde of Victuals, then after the Rate and forme aforesaid" (Larkin and Hughes 20). A similar command was issued in 1604, and in 1608 a proclamation governing the distribution of food, followed by a restriction on the making of starch because of its use of edible goods, particularly wheat, was issued. Later directives, reappearing almost every year between 1619 and 1625, prohibited the "eating of Flesh in Lent, or on Fish-dayes," which appear designed to further Elizabeth's proclamations in supporting the fisheries and ameliorating meat shortages (450).[3] But James seemed concerned about regulating public order through restricting access to foods, for as he writes in his January 1616 directive, "there is now nothing more usuall, then to make speciall choise of Friday nights for Suppers and entertainement, as Wee are certainely informed; and to marke out those dayes for Ryot and excesse" (415).

Such attempts to manage societal appetites and maintain order were also exemplified by the classification of foods by quality, which generally meant that lower classes were relegated by cost and law to poorer and rougher foods. This was partly inspired by beliefs concerning digestive abilities; the poor were thought "capable in times of dearth of surviving on coarse foods which their superiors could not eat" (Mennell 25).[4] One of the most striking examples of this distinction can be seen through the grades and colours of bread. The finest "white" bread, which was made from stone-ground flour but with the coarser bran removed, was known as manchet, and eaten by royalty and

---

[3] The Star Chamber dinner accounts, however, at least for the year 1605, reveals a good amount of fish eaten on Fridays, but a notably substantial amount of meat. On Friday, October 11th, for example, veal, mutton, marrowbones, capons, pullets, pigeons, plovers, larks, rabbits, and chickens were all on the menu (Simon 64).

[4] Hugh Plat's 1596 *Sundrie new and Artificiall remedies against Famine* gives many examples of the foods one might resort to in times of dearth. He gives multiple recipes for bread, which might be made out of turnip, pompions or pumpkin, beans, peas, beechmast, chestnuts, acorns, and vetch. He also provides instructions "*to take awaie a great part of that ranke and vnsauourie tast*" of the latter six options (A4r).

nobility.[5] Less fine grades of white bread were made by including increasing amounts of bran, and darker breads – brown or black – were made with lower-grade whole-grain wheat, with non-wheat grains such as rye or maslin (Drummond 43), or even peas and beans when there was a shortage of grain. These rougher breads were eaten solely by the lower classes, as Harrison complains: the gentry eat wheat while the poor "are enforced to content themselves with rye or barley, yea, and in time of dearth, many with bread made either of beans, peason, or oats … and some acorns" (133).

Despite, or maybe because of, such restrictions, the English were unapologetically fond of consuming vast quantities of rich, sweet foods. As an Italian traveller noted in 1614, "'English pies and puddings were literally stuffed with [dried fruits], and no one who had not seen it with his own eyes could possibly believe what an incredible number of such pies and puddings the average Englishman was capable of eating'" (qtd. Wilson, *Food* 358). The consumption of sweets reached its apogee in the banquet, or dessert course, which came into vogue most notably under Elizabeth and which receipt books certainly did their bit to promote. Hardline puritans such as Stubbes were not the only ones to disapprove. Harrison once again records his countrymen's growing lack of restraint over their dining habits with dismay. Castigating the growing desire for "delicate meats" at length (129), he also complains about the variety of dishes now common at gentry and even middle-class tables, where "cooks are for the most part musical-headed Frenchmen and strangers" (126). Such foreign effusion extended to the tableware that regularly included items of silver and Venetian glass (127). Harrison's list of banqueting

[5] Prior to the sixteenth century this bread was known as "paindemaigne" and was "often stamped with a figure of Our Saviour" (Drummond 43). Manchet, however, was baked without a stamp.

items exceeds itself in its meticulous disapproval of the foreign, the new, and items deemed useless:

> In such cases also geliffes [jellies] of all colors, mixed with a variety in the representation of sundry flowers, herbs, trees, forms of beasts, fish, fowls, and fruits, and thereunto marchpane wrought with no small curiosity, tarts of divers hues and sundry denominations, conserves of old fruits, foreign and homebred, suckets, codiniacs [quince marmalades], marmelades, marchpane, sugarbread, gingerbread, florentines, wild fowl, venison of all sorts, and sundry outlandish confections, altogether seasoned with sugar (which Pliny called *mel ex arundinibus* [honey from cane], a device not commonly or greatly used in old time but only in medicine …) do generally bear sway, besides infinite devices of our own not possible for me to remember. (129)

This list is reminiscent of the elaborate sugar banquet famously presented to Elizabeth by the earl of Hertford in 1591, which included a procession carrying a variety of sugar objects: castles, guns and soldiers, beasts, fishes, and birds.[6] Sculptured marzipan and many of the other delicacies mentioned by Harrison soon followed this favour-currying display (Strong 210).

Hertford naturally would have had professional help to provide this performance, but for a more moderately extravagant banquet, the sweets would have been prepared by women themselves. Many items, such as marmalades and preserves, could be prepared in season, boxed and set aside for the appropriate occasion. Others, such as cream-based

---

[6] Roy Strong ironically notes that the English sugar collation was "one instance in dining history where something new and unique was devised in England for the first time" (199).

desserts like white-pot or snow,[7] would have been prepared on the spot. In a pinch, some of the elaborate items could have been purchased at a confectioner's if the household was in London, but the production of sweets was a specialized skill many late-sixteenth and seventeenth-century women were eager to show off. So many, in fact, that as Lynette Hunter notes, "the French looked on the English as a nation of sweet-eaters" by the seventeenth century when "the reputation was so widespread that later writers on confectionery sometimes felt the need to defend their use of sugar" ("Sweet" 53). The falling price of sugar, particularly after the growth of sugar plantations on Bermuda in 1616 (which meant that it was "locally" produced and no longer a product of trade (Wilson, "Evolution" 30)), contributed substantially to the expansion of confectionary skills.[8] Women's enthusiasm for sweet-making is attested to by the emphasis on banquet items in women's manuscript receipt books as well as by the promotion of such items in printed, male-authored books addressed to women. But women's enjoyment of expensive luxury items was often considered part of stereotypical female weakness. Ben Jonson characteristically did not stint at portraying this alleged female foible in characters such as Lady Politic Would-Be in *Volpone*; and Wye Saltonstall provides an equally unflattering picture of "A Fine Dame" in his 1635 *Picturae Loquentes*: "For her life she is a scholler to *Epicurus*, and thinkes pleasure the onely happinesse, for to drinke choyse Wines, eate Banquetting stuffe, and play with a Parret" (F8r). Harrison also finds women foolish and greedy, with their looseness of gastronomic appetite an indication of a more

[7] White-pot was a type of bread pudding with cream, eggs, sugar and spices; snow was made by beating egg whites with cream and sugar and adding flavourings such as rosewater, lemons, or sack.
[8] Sidney Mintz discusses in detail the colonial transformation of sugar from an exclusive luxury to a common necessity.

general lack of control. The new fashion for wild boar testicles he suggests is a case in point; these were usually discarded

> till a foolish fantasy got hold of late amongst some delicate dames who have now found the means to dress them also with great cost for a dainty dish and bring them to the board … though not without note of their desire to the provocation of fleshly lust. (313)

This "dainty dish" exemplifies the dangers of pleasure, whether found in sweet or savoury fare. Fantastical and lust-inducing, this costly offering is desirable at least as much for its novelty as for its taste, and it seduces and encourages all levels of appetite. Such apparent lack of self-control justified disapproval as well as restrictive legislation designed to regulate those who were unable to regulate themselves.

Accepting Pleasure

Of course Harrison's disapproval might have had its own political agenda; at the time of his writing, it is a female-headed court that most egregiously partakes of such delicacies. His attitudes appear to participate in the "conscious anticourt dialogue" of dietaries written in the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, which was frequently communicated through the promotion of restrictive dietary rules and regulations designed to reinforce appetitive control (Albala 37). But many Elizabethan cookbook writers seemed to accept the conjunction of pleasure and appetite, and offered a competing view that actively promoted female participation in providing pleasurable foods for others to consume in the name of national improvement. John Partridge's two collections, *The Treasurie of Commodious Conceits* (1573, 1584) and *The Widdowes Treasure* (1582),

A.W.'s *A Booke of cookrye* (1591), and Thomas Dawson's *The good huswifes Iewell*, in two parts (1587 and 1597), as Wendy Wall notes, frequently highlighted "novelty and sophistication … even foreign or ostentatious culinary arts, that might catch the imagination of class conscious practitioners" (*Staging* 42). These books take a definite step away from earlier collections with clear medieval roots such as Wynkyn de Worde's *The Boke of Keruynge*. Published in 1508, this volume reworked significant aspects of John Russell's *Boke of Nurture* (*ca.* 1460-70) for the benefit of "young men" on their way up the ranks of service in a noble household (Brears 2). Stephen Mennell likewise suggests that receipt books prior to the late-sixteenth century were written "by practising cooks for the use of fellow practitioners" because of the use of English rather than Latin (65). As we will see, these later Elizabethan texts took the bold step of promoting their purchase and use by women and concurrently, as Robert Appelbaum has observed, included a focus on receipts helpful for the common household ("Rhetoric" 7).

It is John Partridge's two receipt books that first encourage women to participate in domestic and national improvement[9] through an emulation of court practice.[10] *The Treasury of Commodious Conceits* (1584)[11] appealed to women, or "huswiues," of all kinds, and the printer's poem "to all that couet the practise of good Huswiuerie, as well wiues as maides" draws attention to the class diversity of Partridge's intended female readership. Kim Hall suggests that readers of cookbooks were "upwardly mobile women" who "wished to emulate" the "status competitions and consumption patterns" of the

---

[9] Thomas Elyot's 1539 dietary, *The Castel of Helthe*, earlier acknowledged potential female readers. He closes his book with the note that he hopes to have both "ye men and women redinge this warke, and obseruinge the counsayles therin" (90v).

[10] Partridge was also a translator and poet, and the author of an anti-Catholic pamphlet, *The Ende and Confession of John Felton* (Boro).

[11] The 1573 edition contains a different introductory poem, which does not mention readership, and also includes two poems to the author missing from later editions.

gentry and nobility ("Culinary" 171), but this poem considerably widens its scope to include "Both gentles state, the Farmers wife, & craftes mans huswif Cooke" (A1v). Like all the above-mentioned Elizabethan books, this was published in octavo format with recipes in black-letter type.[12] Although black letter is difficult for modern readers, for early moderns, as Keith Thomas notes, this was a more accessible typeface, meant for "the common people." It was more likely that someone might have "Black-letter literacy … than roman-type literacy; and it did not follow that the reader fluent in one was equally at home in the other" ("Meaning" 99). Nigel Wheale suggests as well that early modern women were more commonly readers than previously assumed: "Literacy rates among wives and daughters of the major trades and professions probably compared to those for the gentry" particularly if they lived in London (31, 33). And receipts, many of which would have been familiar to female readers, might have been more easily read because their known context would have helped semi-literate readers fill in the gaps.

The middling women mentioned by Weale were likely Partridge's audience. Lynette Hunter comments that receipt books were invariably "Popular books – deemed to be so usually by the vast numbers sold, gauged by their extended life and many editions," and "tended to be relatively cheap, small-format books for the non-specialist" ("Books" 515). In his dedication to Richard Wistow, an assistant in the Barber-Surgeons Company, Partridge confirms that his circulation of "hidden secrets" is meant to spread knowledge widely, among even those who might have limited access to fine ingredients. Calling his work a "publique benefite," he acknowledges also the subversiveness of his book, which he notes,

---

[12] In the first edition, the entire book is in black letter; in later editions the prefatory material is in roman.

> I knowe wil be not only disliked of some, but altogither condemned: Not for that it is euill, but that their fine heads cannot digest, that any other beside themselues should injoy the benefite thereof, hauyng for their Maxime, that such things are of small price as are common to all men." (A2r)

In anti-court rhetoric quite different from that of Stubbes or Harrison, Partridge defends his decision to resist both puritan restriction and upper-class disapproval for reasons of "publique profit & vtility" (A2v) of which access to pleasure is a part. In his brief prefatory poem, "The Author to his Booke," he writes, "Go little booke of profit and pleasance," and mandates the housewife to "vse thy commodities … To profit hir friends for helths preseruatiō, / And also to pleasure them for recreation" (A3r). Perhaps the height of such pleasure and recreation can be found in the outrageous recipe later reprinted in Dawson's book:[13]

> To make a paste of Suger, whereof a man may make all manner of fruites, and other fine thinges with their forme, as platters, dishes, glasses, Cups & such like thinges, wherewith you may furnish a Table: & whē you haue done eat them vp. A pleasant thing for thē that sit at the Table. (A7v)

Using tragacanth gum, or gum dragon/dragnant as it was commonly known, to bind rosewater, sugar, lemon juice and egg white into a paste, the confectioner can then make it into a variety of shapes:

> so shall you forme and make what things you will, as is aforesaid, With such fine knackes as may serue a Table, taking heede there standeth no hote thing nigh vnto

[13] Dawson's almost identical version appears on pages 39v-40r in the 1597 *Second part of the good Hus-wiues Iewell.*

it. At the ende of the banquet they may eat al, and breake the platters dishes, glasses, cuppes, and all things, for this paste is very delicate & sauerous. (A8r)

Patricia Fumerton and Wendy Wall have made much of this invitation to break the edible crockery, Wall finding in these instructions a "solicit[ation of] readers to imitate the refined food fights carried out in aristocratic after dinner entertainment" (*Staging* 3).[14] But given Partridge's own definition of his readership, as well as the fact that there are only three recipes that aspire to this level of banquet display in his book, it seems more likely that such receipts would appeal to the imagination, similar to dishes described by later writers that were made primarily for visual pleasure. The concept of sugar plate that could later be broken into pieces for easy eating has an aspect of charm and delight even today with the transformation of useful, if beautiful, objects into a pleasure-inducing foodstuff. Besides, the majority of Partridge's recipes are practical rather than playful, instructing women "To coloure gloues" (C6v), and "To dryue away Lyce" (D2r). Rather than being "organized around the pleasures of acquisitiveness" as Wall suggests (44), Partridge's vision of national improvement requires the microcosm of a well-run, clean, and healthy home. As Andrew McRae notes, the early modern understanding of "improvement" applied equally to the individual and the commonwealth (37), with local innovations contributing to the health of the national household. The happiness derived from pleasurable foods might further contribute to national stability, with local satisfaction contributing to a more orderly commonwealth.

Partridge's *Widdowes Treasure* (1582) continues to promote the connection between pleasure and national profit as mediated by women, with its medicinal receipts

---

[14] See also Patricia Fumerton's *Cultural Aesthetics: Renaissance Literature and the Practice of Social Ornament* (132).

advertised as "precious and approued secrets … for the health and pleasure of Mankinde," and the more feminine cookery instructions as "sundry prettie practises and conclusions" (titlepage). His tripartite focus – on women, pleasure, and utility – sets a distinct tone for the reading of later receipt books such as those by A.W. and Thomas Dawson. Although neither author includes prefatory material identifying their intended readership, one can safely assume that it would have included women, if only because they had already been identified as potential consumers of the genre. A.W. adopts Partridge's anti-court promotion of pleasure to those outside court circles, advertising "delight" on his titlepage and promising the novelty of an "enlarged" selection of receipts. These are for the most part meat dishes of a more traditionally medieval kind, served on sippets,[15] and spiced with cloves, mace, cinnamon, and ginger. But amid these standbys of boiled and baked chickens, mutton, and beef, there are hints of true delight. A marchpane, or marzipan, receipt tells the reader to decorate the dessert with "your gold and biskets, and stick in Comfits, and so you shall make a good Marchpaine" (D7v). Other receipts are introduced with titles that situate them tantalizingly in foreign countries: "A French Puffin" and "To make [T]arts of Portingale" (E2r) combine sweet delights with innovations from abroad. Clearly designed for the non-courtly reader, A.W. acknowledges that the cook might require replacements for more expensive items. A receipt for gingerbread, for example, notes that ground rice might be used instead of sugar as a sprinkled topping for the sweet (E1r).[16] Encouraged to substitute and experiment with available materials, the cook could participate in the spread of novelty and pleasure even when financially restricted.

---

[15] Thin slices of white toast.

[16] Anne Wilson notes that the late-sixteenth-century cost of sugar was approximately one shilling a pound, or "a day's wage" for a "craftsman" (*Food* 299).

Thomas Dawson's *The good huswifes Iewell*, printed in two parts, the first in 1587 and the second in 1597, continues the spread of court secrets to women outside this milieu. As sweet items overtake meat dishes towards the latter half of the first part, he provides a helpful shopping list under the title "The names of all thinges necessary for a banquet," including

> Suger. Pepper. Saffron. Anniseedes. Sinamome. Nutmegs. Saunders. [sandalwood] Coleander. [coriander] Licoras. All kinde of Comfets. Orenges. Pomegranat. Torneseli. [turnsole[17]] Prunes Currants. Barberies cõserued. Paper white and browne Lemmans. Rosewater. Reasons. Rie flower. Ginger. Cloues and Mace. Damaske water. Dates. Cheries conserued. Sweete Orenges. Wafers. For your March-panes seasoned and unseasoned, Spinnedges. (C7v-C8r)

In his second part,[18] Dawson expands not only his repertoire of sweet items, but also his "diuers conceits in Cookerie" (titlepage), with a series of showy, costly, and uncommon recipes. He includes the instruction, "To bake porpose or Seale" (C1v), two animals that would have been available only to the very wealthy. In a perhaps more accessible but flamboyant recipe, "To boile a pike with orenges a banquet dish," he suggests arranging the fish in the following manner: "take his heade & set it at the foremost part of the dish, standing vpright with an Orenge in his mouth, and so serue him" (B7v-B8r). By including the costly import of an orange, and giving the pike some illusion of movement by standing it upright, this dish would have been devised to delight the guests visually, as much a sculptural object as an item to be consumed. This was a dish that allowed for fine

---

[17] A flower used for colouring, which gave foods a blue tint.

[18] This does appear very much to be a sequel, as he replicates recipes from the first part, as though he needs items to fill up the allotted space. He also returns to his primary interest, traditional cookery, despite having provided a significant number of these recipes in the first volume.

dining even on fish days, contributing to the health of the nation by supporting its fisheries and providing gastronomic pleasure alongside a sense of spiritual righteousness.

Jacobean Pleasures

If Elizabethan writers participated in a subtle anti-court dialogue through their willing expansion of pleasure, promoting middling women as able consumers and creators of delightful goods in spite of aristocratic disapproval, Jacobean writers focused their anti-court dialogue on the court itself, aided by direct allusions to science, national identity, and contemporary politics. And James was an effective king in terms of creating opponents. He entered England at an immediate disadvantage, being an outsider, and did little to dispel rumours of favouritism for his countrymen, dispersing his over-lavish and much-criticized generosity among other Scots in particular (Hirst, *Authority* 101). But most significantly, his pacifist foreign policy was at odds with those who wished to see England actively promoting a Protestant agenda in Europe, and his signing of a peace treaty with Spain in 1604, less than a year after his accession to the throne, was a strong statement against this more militant role. James's eldest son, Prince Henry, who embraced the Protestant ideal of a warrior for the faith, provided a convenient focus for hotter hopes, but these were shattered following Henry's death in 1612. Speculations that he had been poisoned, possibly by James or someone associated with him,[19] are indicative of the growing antagonism towards the king. With "The hope of England"

[19] Fulke Greville, for instance, insinuates Robert Carr's involvement in Henry's death, linking their falling-out to Henry's ensuing illness. Emphasizing the suspicions that arose, he records: "The hope of England, strange was the accident, and many the rumors that ensued upon his death. Some said that a French Physitian killed him, others that he was poysoned, againe others thought that he was bewitched; yet no certainty could be found, but that he dyed a naturall death" (*Five* 24). He returns to his suspicions at the end of his anti-Catholic, anti-Carr pamphlet, naming Henry as only one in a line of "so many great men" who "dye with suspition of poyson and witchcraft" during Carr's reign as James's favourite (70).

gone (Greville, *Five* 24), Protestant attention repositioned itself around James's daughter, Elizabeth, who was shortly promised to Frederick V, Count Palatine of the Rhine and elector of the Holy Roman empire. The couple, married in February of 1613, were an ideal focus for Protestants on the rebound. Frederick had been approved as a match by Henry before he died; he was a Calvinist prince; and his position as elector held out the promise of the spread of Protestantism to previously Catholic areas of Europe. This focus eventually crystallized opposition to James in the 1620s. In 1618 a revolt in Bohemia resulted in Frederick being offered the crown, which he accepted despite James's lack of enthusiasm. In 1620 Spain invaded parts of the Lower Palatinate, and Frederick's forces were defeated outside Prague. He and Elizabeth fled to The Hague in 1621 to become rulers in exile, but James steadfastly refused to support his daughter and son-in-law, attaching conditions they could not accept – that Frederick should give up his claims to Bohemia and submit to the Archduke Ferdinand's authority – in return for support for the Palatinate (W.B. Patterson 305-6). Moreover, he continued to pursue a Spanish match for his son Charles; the perception that James was not promoting the interests of Protestant England, and even opposed them through perceived pro-Catholic policies, reached its height.

The receipt books of John Murrell, a writer about whom we know very little apart from these publications, tend more unusually towards supporting James. If Murrell participates in the spread of pleasures beyond the court, he also celebrates the pursuit of excess, fashion, and novelty through politicized allusions to James's court, and for which the court was infamous. London chronicler John Chamberlain encapsulates this perception, recording James's reported comment, "what do you tell me of the fashion? I

will make yt a fashion," (1.250 Jan 5, 1608). But even Murrell lets uncertainty seep in, increasingly justifying pleasure through the language of science and experimentation. Certainly validating his own expertise, this language also caters to those less fond of courtly excess and its attendant political associations by justifying extravagance through implied improvement. As William Eamon has discussed, claims by receipt books to expose secrets had their basis in medieval traditions. But the interest in secrets also spread an interest in empirical experimentation that could lead to "material gain or [be] used for the betterment of humanity" (4). The new and the foreign, in other words, might not simply be created and consumed to sate the appetites, but to improve the state of the nation. Although Wall suggests that household manuals and receipt books look "only perfunctorily at shared allegiance to the crown or opposition to foreigners" and "insist that English citizens are bound by the seemingly primal scene of the home, with its vexed cultural and economic concerns" (*Staging* 10), I argue here that cookbooks look much more deeply at state politics, creating a national vision that situates England within a larger European context.[20]

Murrell's first book, *A New Booke of Cookerie* (1615), was clearly a success, being reprinted only two years later, perhaps to take advantage of the anticipated buzz surrounding his *Daily Exercise for Ladies and Gentlewomen* (1617). It overtly promotes itself as a source of fashionable, new, and pleasurable dishes. Titlepage hyperbole advertises the book as containing the "newest and most commendable Fashion for

[20] Recent scholars such as Richard Helgerson and Claire McEachern have questioned earlier assumptions that nationhood was a nineteenth-century concept (McEachern 5), finding its roots in England's Reformation and the growth of a shared vernacular (Helgerson 2). While the English nation may have been a community, to rephrase Benedict Anderson, in the process of being imagined, McEachern has pointed out that a widespread belief in such a community is of less importance than the emerging signs of interest in creating a sense of national "homogeneity" (16-17). Receipt books and other sources of food discourse participate in creating this "ideology of social unity" by using foodstuff to define and redefine membership in a larger whole that in turn might characterize itself in the light of a continental other.

Dressing" to "beautifie and adorne" the table. Evoking the dinner party with terms such as "made-Dishes," "seruice," and "to beautifie," Murrell implies, like Dawson, that food is not meant merely for nourishment or health, or even the public good, but for visual enjoyment and to display one's taste before one's fashionable friends, a more personal act of improvement. These recipes are good enough for the "Nobleman," but are offered to the "Gentleman" as well, the latter class most likely the primary audience for his book. And indeed, he addresses his book to the "Gentlewoman" Mris. Francis Herbert (A2r). With a public focus on a London-based court culture, Murrell's 1615 promise of "the most exquisite *London* Cookerie" might have been very appealing to gentry trying to keep up with the latest urban fashions. In his 1617 edition, however, the urban is abandoned for the national, as it is "exquisite English Cookerie" that is now on view (titlepage). As the recipes in both editions are exactly the same, this could be a belated response to the 1614 proclamation ordering the nobility to return to the country due to enclosure riots (Norbrook, *Poetry* 166), acknowledging the diffusion of London cookery to the countryside and its ensuing representation of "England" rather than a distinct urban milieu. As Joan Thirsk has observed, "Londoners lived in their own distinctive food world that was unknown elsewhere" (*Food* 230), even though it became easier to get ingredients outside London as the century wore on (86-8).[21]

Murrell's second book, *A Daily Exercise*, pursues more pointedly the idea that pleasure might contribute to national improvement, while castigating those puritan forces resistant to the idea and overtly supporting courtly fashions. This duodecimo volume is

[21] For instance, Thirsk discusses the accounts of the Shuttleworth family of Lancashire who only acquired a taste for sugar in 1608-9 during an extended period in London. Before this, they had relied exclusively on honey (86).

almost completely devoted to the sweet delights of banquet fare with the exception of a few medicinal recipes at the end. Murrell justifies this emphasis in the following manner:

> the pleasure of *Man* consisting in nothing more, than in euery thing; that is, in change: *varietie* standing more aloofe from *sacietie*, than *vniformitie* … Wee alter our *Fashions* and outward *Habits* daily; the *whitest Ruffe* being not long since thought the purest wearing; then the *blew*; and now the *yealow*: So, our *Cookery, Pastry, Distillations, Conserues,* and *Preserues*, are farre otherwise now, than not long since they were; Daily *Practise* and *Obseruation* finding out eyther what to adde on or detract from olde *Formes* … or to make new much more pleasing and profitable. These are all, (or at least, the most) of the newest Straine; approued and beloued of those that try them. (A3v-A4r)

In this rhetorically dense and anti-puritan excerpt, advocating pleasure, variety and change, Murrell compares the development of English cuisine to the contested fashion of the ruff. Stubbes, predictably, has nothing good to say about the "great Ruffes in England," seeing them as indications of particularly egregious pride in times of want (92-4). The advent of yellow starch multiplied puritan criticisms of this aristocratic fashion, as Ann Rosalind Jones and Peter Stallybrass explain:

> In the Jacobean fashion of yellow starch, radical Protestants detected a new form of the antichrist's livery. If starch itself decomposed the body politic by turning food into luxury fashion, the yellow with which it began to be dyed was attacked as a stain that 'transnatured' men into women, the godly into papists, the English into the foreign. (59)

James, as we have seen, was also concerned about the waste of food to create fashion, but he eventually chose to manage the manufacture of starch by creating a state monopoly, providing licences to starch makers as early as 1607. As Larkin and Hughes point out, "This was a fiscal project from the outset. … with the King to get one-fourth of all revenue collected" (165 n.2).[22] If starch was associated with the court, yellow dye also became a courtly symbol while being simultaneously a symbol of iniquity after the execution of Anne Turner in 1615 for the murder of Sir Thomas Overbury. Turner was seen as the inventor, or at least the importer, of yellow starch and a promoter of the fashion in England (Jones and Stallybrass 64). Famously, she was forced to wear the ruff to her execution as an enduring symbol of her pride and guilt. The style did not go out of fashion until the 1620s, but court critics began to associate it with Robert Carr, then Viscount Rochester, and his Catholic wife Frances Howard, who received a pardon for Overbury's murder from James in 1616 (74). Murrell's support of such a fashion statement aligns him with James's court and its political policies while at the same time suggesting a rational context for following emerging fashions. What is new, he argues, is not necessarily a frivolous whim, but rather a deliberate choice based on the best evidence at hand.

In his 1621 *Delightful Daily Exercise for Ladies and Gentlewomen*, despite the addition of the moniker "delightful," Murrell combines pleasure more extensively with the language of empirical science, promoting enjoyment by justifying its contribution to "a generall good" (A4v). While these receipts, too, are deemed new, or at least "neuer

[22] This was revoked by parliament in 1610 because of the Catholic earl of Northampton's control over the starch monopoly which hiked prices and made Northampton rich (Jones and Stallybrass 69). However, licensing of starch-makers resumed some time before 1620, as indicated in James's 1620 proclamation on starch (Larkin and Hughes 473).

before in Print," the publisher also designates them "secrete misteries" and the "purest" (titlepage). While the promise of disclosed secrets might well have sold books (Eamon 11), Murrell suggests that the practice of these secrets takes work. Coming from his own "practise" developed during his "trauels … in France, Italy, the Low-Countries, and diuers other places" (A4r), such foreign "Art and Mistery" (A4v) is both spectacular and instructive, as is demonstrated in the following receipt for a marchpane:

> *To make a March-paine to Ice it, garnish, and guild it according to Art.*
>
> … [roll out the paste, then] worke in the middle a Tower or Castle, then pricke about it long Comfits sticking between them some small Lyons, or small birds … [after icing it with sugar and egg white] set it into a warme Ouen againe, and in a quarter of an houre it will looke all ouer like yce, then take it forth againe, then take the white of an egge being beaten to froth, and with your pensell wet the toppes of your Comfits, and here and there a spot on your tower, then take leafe gold and cut it in square peeces like a diamond on your gold cushion, then dip your pencell in the white of an egge, and touch your gold at one corner with it, & it will sticke to it, and lay vpon euery place where you wet, a Diamond of your cut gold and serue it for your vse all the yeere. (D8v-D10r)

This detailed receipt, which requires considerable control and dexterity on the part of the female artist, acknowledges that there is more to the banquet than the display of uncontrolled consumption. Although banquet-goers might succumb to their appetites, these foodstuffs are the result of skill and mastery, trial and error, practice and control. In other words, Murrell is interested in the notion of civility, which as Anna Bryson points out, assumes participation in a larger social and political context:

> civility with its associations of citizenship and conduct moulded by consciousness of membership of an extensive community, underpins formulations of manners which relate individual contact to an awareness of a whole social world, larger than the household, which is sustained by that conduct. (71)

Promoting civility through cookery, Murrell extends Elizabethan arguments for the expansion of pleasure, implying that such pursuits might put England on the world stage, competing with the best of Europe in knowledge and sophistication.

Protestant Pleasures

While Murrell justifies pleasure and his implicit support for the monarch by couching his instructions for luxury in increasingly scientific language that also promises national improvement, two other cookery writers of the period, Hugh Plat and Gervase Markham, reveal themselves as political Protestants whose books actively communicate a critical perspective on James's gastronomically excessive yet militarily passive regime. Both Plat and Markham have identifiable links to Robert Devereux, Earl of Essex, with Plat dedicating his *Iewell House of Art and Nature* to him in 1594. And as David Norbrook points out, Markham, who had also "sought Essex's patronage," had even been "accused of complicity in his rebellion" ("Masque" 96). Politically, Devereux was seen as a successor to Philip Sidney after Sidney bequeathed "one of his two 'best' swords" to him, "symbolically transferring to Essex his twin roles as Leicester's right-hand man and knightly champion of England's participation in the defence of international protestantism" (Hammer).

Most of Plat's works were first published under Elizabeth, with the exception of the 1608 *Floraes Paradise*; but this book and the frequently reprinted *Delightes for Ladies*[23] both contain hints of Plat's political interests that span the reigns of Elizabeth and James. Plat, the son of a London brewer, gentleman, polymath, and inventor, also put his mind to military improvements, created receipts for those suffering from famine, and promoted English self-sufficiency. Plat not only advocates improvement through change but also publicizes his own political agenda for a strong, nationally identified, and implicitly Protestant England. The book that partakes most avidly of the language of pleasure, *Delightes for Ladies*, appears at first simply to celebrate the banquet and all things sweet.[24] Clearly aimed at the female reader, *Delightes* was published as a pocket-sized duodecimo, with "The Arte of preseruing *conseruing, candying, &c.*" being the first and longest section of a four-part book (19-53). Most commonly discussed is his opening poem, "Epistle to the reader," which recounts previous publications and asserts his new interest in providing recipes for women. Linking sweetness to femininity – "Of musked sugar I intend to wright, / Of Leach, of Sucket, and Quidinea, / Affording to each Ladie, her delight" (4) – he ends with a flirtatious flourish, his "wearied Muse" resting her, or perhaps his in this case, head "in Ladies laps awhile" (5). Kim Hall has suggested that the epistle "explicitly equates this project with the feminine and the foreign"; she in turn relates both subjects to sugar and sweetness ("Culinary" 168). This, she observes, ties women to the growth and development of "colonial trade practices" as their participation in the economy of pleasure raises demand for foreign and costly imports (169). But Plat

[23] Reprinted eighteen times between 1602 and 1656.
[24] Malcolm Thick discusses the sources for many of Plat's recipes in "A Close Look at the Composition of Sir Hugh Plat's *Delights for Ladies*."

also turns his poem to political critique in which the female love for sweetness becomes a metaphor for effeminate foreign policy:

> Empaling now adieu: tush, marchpane wals,
>
> Are strong enough and best befits our age:
>
> Let pearcing bullets turne to sugar bals,
>
> The Spanish feare is husht and all their rage. (4)

Transforming the weapons of war into sugary treats, he initially appears to celebrate this pleasure-inducing transformation. But this gendered change, coming only a year after Essex's execution in 1601, draws attention to Elizabeth's decisive move away from martial engagement with Spain. As Linda Levy Peck suggests, "some contemporaries warned that luxury consumption challenged the boundaries of gender roles, fostered effeminacy, and thereby undermined martial spirit and the political and social order" (*Consuming* 22). Rather than simply "succumbing to the frivolity of the age" (Wall, *Staging* 48), Plat seems to be working both sides of the equation, paradoxically promoting luxuries while also drawing attention to their distance from "martial spirit." Notably, the poem continues to make its statement in later editions, including the 1603, 1608, and 1609 reprints. It might well have been excusable for Elizabeth, as an elderly woman, to have ended her reign on an effeminate foreign policy, but for James to adopt such a policy, while becoming known for his extravagant entertainment of ambassadors, was much less so. As Stephen Orgel points out, James's pacifism became quickly galling "to a nation longing for glory after the decline of Elizabeth's last years" (123). Plat's insinuating poem did not prevent him from being knighted by James in 1605, however,

perhaps because these damning lines were hidden in a book designed for the female reader.

If Plat's *Delightes* only alludes to his national and political interests, others of his works expand these concerns more overtly. Plat was highly interested in the military, for instance, with many of his inventions aimed at improving the life of the troops and supporting wounded soldiers. He includes a series of illustrated advertisements at the end of *The Iewell House of Art and Nature* for "new inuentions, which the Author will bee readie to disclose vpon reasonable considerations." The first, for "*A new kinde of fire*," promises to give the tenth part of any profits from this creation to "maimed souldiers" and the sick, and also suggests it will help to create employment for said soldiers as well as for the poor (69-70). A later item, "*A wholesome, lasting, and fresh victuall for the Nauie*" consisting of a corn-based wafer,[25] demonstrates his interest in using his knowledge of food in support of his nation's military and colonial endeavours (74). Some of these advertisements are promoted more extensively in his 1603 pamphlet, *A new, cheape and delicate Fire of Cole-balles ... Also a speedie way for the winning of any Breach*, which discusses the way to make this "new kinde of fire" in great detail, again encouraging its use to assist injured military men. And in 1607, Plat returns to his military theme with a broadsheet providing *Certaine Philosophical Preparations of Foode and Beuerage for Sea-men*, promoting, among other things, "*Macaroni*" as a long-lasting food to be taken on voyages. Once again, it is England's expanding sense of its place in the world that provides impetus for such improving receipts.

[25] He claims, somewhat disingenuously, that "it will be pleasing enough to the Marriner, and I haue had the same sundrie times serued in at mine owne table to the good contentment of my friends" (74).

Floraes Paradise pursues a different type of national improvement, which, as in Gervase Markham's *English Housewife*, emphasises the superiority of English techniques, soil, and even wines. Properly followed, Plat's alchemical instructions might create a garden that "wil receiue any Indian plant, and make all vegetables to prosper in the highest degree, & to beare their fruites in England, as naturally as they doe in Spaine, Italie, or elswhere" (3-4).[26] Wendy Wall points out that Markham was less concerned with naturalizing foreign plants than he was with maintaining English difference ("Husbandry" 775).[27] But Plat's version of English self-sufficiency, which celebrates the pleasures of the countryside and its natural fertility, might also free the country from trade with untrustworthy Catholic countries. Such a perspective is reiterated in his short digression on wine-making at the end of his book, in which he writes: "my purpose at this time, is onely to bring English wines, both white and claret, in some request amongst us" (O6v). Comparing English wines favourably to French, which he notes are plagued by "slovenly, & vnwolsom pressing out" (O7r), Plat suggests that the homegrown is, if not better, then just as good, and evokes the names of "Lady *Arabella*, the Countesse of *Cumberland*, the Lady *Anne Clifford*, the Lady *Hastings*, the Lady *Candish*" and others as approving the English varietal (O8r). Relying on powerful female patrons and evoking old landed aristocracy in support of his interest in national control of production, Plat

---

[26] Linda Levy Peck includes the art of gardening and acquisition of plants as part of the developing consumer culture of the Jacobean period. Giving the example of "John Tradescant, gardener to Robert Cecil, Earl of Salisbury," she observes that he "brought plants from the Low Countries, France, and Russia. His purchases included anemones, currants, and cherry trees from C. Helin of Harlem … orange trees from Paris, quince from Brussels … apricots from the gardener to the Archduke of the Netherlands" (*Consuming* 225).

[27] Timothy Bright, whose *Treatise: wherein is declared the sufficiencie of English Medicines*, was published in 1580, was perhaps a model for Markham; this tract is written as 'a defence of our natiue medicines, with disproofe of those of foreigne nations" (A2r). He does, however, suggest that one might try growing foreign plants on English soils (which will in turn alter the plants enough to make them helpful, rather than harmful to the English) with the coda that unsuccessful transplants should simply be forgotten (19-21).

raises a suspicion of what Alistair Bellany has called "the oppositional 'ideal' of corrupt court and virtuous country" (10).

If Plat insinuates political effeminacy through pleasurable foodstuffs, while at the same time alluding to women's involvement in promoting national self-sufficiency, Gervase Markham constructs puritan pleasures through the image of a virtuous English housewife. Of all the receipt writers under discussion, Markham appears to have been most overtly opposed to James's rule; besides his active support of Essex, David Norbrook attributes to him a "huge poem," "The Newe Metamorphosis" that remained unpublished, but according to Norbrook, grew "increasingly bitter and satirical in tone under James's reign; he finally concluded his poem with a description of the wedding of Frederick and Elizabeth" ("Masque" 97). This was not the only poem penned by Markham to have been inspired by political Protestantism; he wrote a series of poems in the 1590s identified with Essex and his followers. In the early seventeenth century, as he began his career as a professional writer of husbandry manuals, he also found time to provide a "prose completion" to Sidney's *Arcadia* in two volumes, published in 1607 and 1613 respectively (Steggle).

Markham's discourse of food explicitly ties together the housewife and the nation in a series of instructions designed to create good Protestant households with a firm footing in England. His popular *English Housewife,* first published in 1615 as part of the husbandry manual *Countrey Contentments*, promoted the ideal of the self-sufficient householder and his wife who grew their own herbs, fruits, and vegetables, managed a dairy, and maintained a brewery on their estate. Although Markham is inconsistent in his selection of ingredients – many of them would have been imported, and he includes

recipes that he identifies as continental – his recurrent references to the *English* housewife suggest a concerted construction of a national image. Roland Barthes's observation that food tends to adopt "the characteristics of an institution" and becomes correspondingly associated with institutional functions, seems relevant here (21). Markham makes food and its production and management representative of national well-being; the quality, presentation, and construction of foodstuffs are incontrovertibly linked to national and religious identity. As Wendy Wall has pointed out, Markham "argues powerfully for the necessity of a discourse of English husbandry, both to increase land production and to display English know-how and national difference to the continent" ("Husbandry" 772). But although Wall writes eloquently of Markham's contribution to a concept of national identity, she overlooks the religious and thus politically critical dimensions of his work. Ultimately tying Markham's nationalism to developing print culture, she sees his manuals as designed

> to cleanse English practices and books from foreign influence and then secondarily to 'set down' Englishness in print for both native and continental readers. ... He glosses over differences within English regional practices and within the resources available to different classes of agricultural workers and instead institutes a fault line based on nationality. (772)

The purpose and effect of this cleansing can only be considered if Markham's religious and political aspirations are taken into account. If they are not obvious in his husbandry manuals, they certainly are revealed in his *English Housewife*, which immediately defines the concepts of pleasure and the nation through the activities of the virtuous puritan housewife. The introductory titlepage list of the housewife's "*inward*

and outward virtues," namely, "*her skill in physic, cookery, banqueting-stuff, distillation, perfumes, wool, hemp, flax, dairies, brewing, baking, and all other things belonging to a household*" are defined more fully in his first two chapters, and firmly linked to a puritan concept of godliness:

> our English housewife ... hath her most general employments within the house; where from the general example of her virtues, and the most approved skill of her knowledges, those of her family may both learn to serve God, and sustain man in that godly and profitable sort which is required of every true Christian. (5)

Notably, Markham emphasises the serving of God rather than the monarch or state interests. As his editor Michael Best suggests, Markham "stresses the importance of religion by putting it first among the virtues he discusses." Best also adds that "he would no doubt have thoroughly approved of the typical day spent by Lady Margaret Hoby" (xxiii). Hoby, whose diary reveals an associative link between her puritan spiritual practices and her dining habits, was involved in Protestant nation-building in part through her marriage to Thomas Hoby, known for his pursuit and prosecution of Catholic recusants. In clearing his neighbourhood of the Catholic "menace," Hoby not only created and controlled his own fiefdom, but also put into practice an aggressively Protestant vision of England. In the meantime, Margaret Hoby provided her household with an example of godly housewifery as she arranged her day through prayer and self-examination and instructed her servants accordingly.[28] Markham's housewife likewise uses her "inward virtues" such as godliness, constancy, and temperance to assist her household towards its godly and profitable goals. Faith itself nourishes her family with

[28] For example, on Wednesday 22 August, 1599, she records herself and her spiritual counsellor, Mr. Rhodes, going to the kitchen to have "som speech with the poore and Ignorant of the som princeples of religion" (9).

spiritual education; Markham imagines the housewife "giving by her example an incitement and spur unto all her family to pursue the same steps, and to utter forth by the instruction of her life those virtuous fruits of good living" (5). As did the virgin Mary, so the housewife provides the "fruit of obedience" (Leigh 28) from which others might feed and learn. And although Markham, like other male writers, makes sure to resituate this female instruction under the governance of the preacher and the husband, he continues to emphasise the importance of the housewife's own role in spreading godliness and good citizenship among her household through her words and works.

Markham makes nourishment into metaphor when he discusses the instructional fruit of faith, but he also discusses literal nourishment when he defines the housewife's ideal diet:

> Let her diet be wholesome and cleanly, prepared at due hours, and cooked with care and diligence; let it be rather to satisfy nature than our affections, and apter to kill hunger than revive new appetites; let it proceed more from the provision of her own yard, than the furniture of the markets, and let it be rather esteemed for the familiar acquaintance she hath with it, than for the strangeness and rarity it bringeth from other countries. (8)

Like other puritan writers, he stresses the importance of simple and recognizable food, closer to nature than to artifice and fashion. What the housewife eats, he suggests, reflects and affects her very being; the closer food is to its original, and presumably, God-given state, the more pure it is, as are its effects on the one who ingests it. Recalling breastfeeding manuals that provide similar justifications for maternal nursing – it is natural and familiar, and provides "wholesome and cleanly" food as opposed to the

suspect nourishment from the wet nurse – this is food that provides a controlled, godly pleasure that does not, as he says, "revive new appetites." As with nursing, what women ingest contributes to the nature of what they can feed to others; by caring for their bodies and souls through nourishing food, women can pass on appropriate care to their households, communities, and dinner guests.

But even Markham, whose initial insistence on the housewife's virtue and use of home-grown products might indicate otherwise, includes a substantial section on "*banqueting stuff and conceited dishes*" for her edification – and no doubt to display his own breadth of knowledge. Marmalades, leaches, gingerbreads, sugar plate, cakes, marchpane, conserves and wafers are all covered by his recipes and deemed a necessity. As he explains, "for albeit they are not of general use, yet in their true times they are so needful for adornation that whosoever is ignorant therein is lame, and but the half part of a complete housewife" (110). Completing his instructions with a section on the "*Ordering of banquets*" he advises, "you shall first send forth a dish made for show only, as beast, bird, fish, or fowl, according to invention … no two dishes of one kind going or standing together, and this will not only appear delicate to the eye, but invite the appetite with the much variety thereof" (121). Like Dawson or Murrell, he too promotes the allure of the visual and the waste of an uneaten dish, while unlike Stubbes, he accepts the realities of his time and acknowledges that godliness might in fact include pleasurable experience. But the pleasure that extends from a woman's virtue, he implies, represents no less a performance of her faith than does her ingestion of "wholesome and cleanly" foods that permit her virtue to flourish and be transmitted through feeding, whether through showy banquet items, or simpler homegrown meats and vegetables.

Nursing the Elect

Markham's puritan housewife, with her contribution to a strong Protestant England through her godly conduct and use of local foods that educate her family through nourishment, finds another guise in puritan breastfeeding pamphlets that encourage local ingestion of another sort. Reworking humanist arguments for maternal nursing that, like Erasmus's colloquy on "The New Mother," stressed the significance of breastfeeding to early childhood education, early seventeenth-century puritans such as William Gouge, Robert Cleaver and John Dod, and William Perkins developed Erasmus's arguments for their sectarian and political ends. Erasmus's claim that "You haven't fulfilled the duty of a childbearer unless you've first formed the delicate little body of your son, then fashioned his equally pliable mind through good education" (170) becomes only a first step for these authors arguing for the importance of breastfeeding as part of Protestant moral and religious development.

The Protestant mother, like Markham's housewife, is increasingly positioned in discussions of nursing as a role model and teacher of virtues to her children (Morgan 143),[29] with her ability to feed at the centre of such instruction. Feeding is godly because it fulfills God's intentions; William Gouge, for example, emphasises "Gods providence in causing a womans breasts to yeeld forth such milke" and compares maternal nursing to God's "*sincere milk of the word*" (507). Like the English housewife, whose virtuous performance increases her own virtues, the nursing mother becomes more worthy through the act of feeding these new and possibly elect members of the Protestant church. In the words of the anonymous author of the 1616 parenting manual, *Office of Christian*

[29] This is confirmed by the Bishop of Carlisle, Edward Rainbowe, in his sermon at Anne Clifford's funeral. He observes that "the particular and regular inclinations in the Children are commonly formed by the woman; and if she be indeed intelligent and Wise, none can do it better" (28).

Parents, "*She shall bee saued by bearing of children, if they continue in the faith*" (51). Extending anti-court dialogues identified in many of the period's receipt books, the nursing mother becomes not only a sign of Protestant virtue by delivering the godly pleasures of breast milk, but a sign of the new covenant placed in opposition to a court seen as increasingly corrupt and pro-Catholic. Through a web of biblical allusion, or a "[code] of communication" masking criticism (Patterson, *Censorship* 11), Elizabeth Clinton, author of *The Covntess of Lincolnes Nvrserie*,[30] suggests that the nation is better served by the godly mother than the corrupt father that is James.[31] Although Clinton's text is published later than Dorothy Leigh's *Mothers Blessing*, I will discuss her writings first, as they reveal more concisely the biblical authority on which breastfeeding proponents rest their case. Leigh, as we will see, upholds the nursing mother through biblical authority, and goes a step further, not only suggesting that James fails to nourish his nation, but also attacking courtly dining habits, distinguishing the pleasures of the corrupt from the pleasures of the godly.

Nursing, writes Elizabeth Clinton, is not only a duty, but a means of reaping godly rewards: "God hath adorned you with fayre tokens of his loue," she assures her audience in her dedication (A2v). These tokens – the ability to breastfeed – also provide godly pleasures to the child, as love and sweetness are transmitted through the mother to her infant: "doe goe on with that loving act of a loving mother; in giving the sweete milke

---

[30]Apart from biographical discussions, critical work on Clinton and her pamphlet is practically non-existent, apart from Marilyn Luecke's "The Reproduction of Culture and the Culture of Reproduction in Elizabeth Clinton's *The Countess of Lincolnes Nurserie*." Luecke discusses Clinton's use of breastfeeding primarily as a method of re-situating her "wifely disobedience" as "maternal authority" (252).

[31] Three years after the publication of her pamphlet, her son Theophilus "brought a suit in chancery" against his mother "in her capacity as guardian of her three younger sons" (Travitsky). It is tempting to speculate whether this was a response to the criticism of James implicit in her argument for maternal breastfeeding. It would be ironic if this were the case; as Catharine Grey notes in her article on Dorothy Leigh, Theophilus found himself supporting parliament in the civil war (573).

of your owne breasts, to your owne childe" (A2r). This "loving act" and "sweete milke" are also reminiscent of terminology used to describe God's care for the devout. *Herberts Child-bearing Woman*, a 1648 tract written to soothe the worried new mother, provides an explicit connection between the nursing mother and the church, explaining:

> I have (by Gods grace) two good breasts; some women have but one, or but the use of one: none have three, unles they be monsters. There are on earth Churches or Sects of these three sorts. Our English Church hath two full breasts, the Old Testament and the New; whence her children suck the sincere milk of Gods word, and grow by it in all spirituall graces. Old Hierusalem hath but one, the Law of God given unto her by *Moses:* therefore Jewes are like starv'd children, for want of sufficient food; since the Law makes nothing perfect, and is now but a hard and drie breast. New Rome hath three, both Testaments and mens traditions and decrees. And this being strouted out above the two others, her children daily swill from it an unwholsome liquor, which breeds ill bloud and grosse substance. *Good God let never my Child take that teat: but grant she draw those two faire breasts: which are in the warme, white and pure bosome of thy reformed Church.* (54-55)

The good English mother who nurses her child is thus not simply a mother, but also a synecdochal sign of the true church: the mother is both part of the church and a metaphor for the church itself. And while the two terms are also distinct, this equation provides an undercurrent of association in breastfeeding and advice texts of the period, establishing without question that the English child is a site of national and religious concern.

A similar association is made by *The Office of Christian Parents*, which overtly uses breastfeeding to promote the Protestant political agenda. The author uses the

standard arguments – breast milk is natural, homegrown, and God-given – to promote breastfeeding:

> Nature seemeth to me to speaketh aloud, that the mother which breedeth the infant in her wombe, hath therewithall, in the same body prepared two breasts full of milke, as it were two bottles to feed it being borne, which is most kindly for that child, and hath no other vse to serue vnto … shall a woman thinke scorne of that which nature hath giuen her? (47)

In opposition to the idyllic and "pleasant" image of the nursing mother tumbling amid her babes (50), this author, like others, invokes the dangerous prospect of the wet nurse whose breasts might spread both moral and physical diseases to the innocent offspring.[32] But Herbert's similar equation of "two full breasts" to the "English Church" suggests that this anonymous author might also be using the mother in part as a sign for the church. In giving away the child to a wet nurse, the mother removes it from its natural godly nourishment, and leaves it open to spiritual contamination at the breasts of another. The properly-fed child, then, is one fed on the milk of the Protestant church in order to become a defender of the Protestant state and a bulwark against the monster of Catholicism.

If Clinton is less direct about the relationship between the mother and the church, she does make much of the connection between the mother and God, thus justifying the mother's role as both feeder and educator who prepares the child to drink the milk of

---

[32] The emphasis on maternal breastmilk does not necessarily appear to be reproduced in medicinal recipes, however. Sarah Longe includes a receipt in her 1610 manuscript (Folger MS V.a.425) "For the Megrim, or swimming in the head," that requires breastmilk, presumably from other women. The instructions read: "Twenty ground Ivy leaves, and one primrose roote, cleane washed, and scraped, stamp these together small, with a sponefull of womans milke, If the medicine be for a man it must be the milke wch a Girle sucks on, if for a woman it must be the milke wch a boy sucks, straine out the Juice, and of that substance take out one drop in a spone, and sett a quill upon it, and holding one Nostrill with yor finger snuffe it up with the other, and after 3 dayes doe the like to the other nostrill, and then noe more for a weeke" (37).

God's word.[33] In asserting her own authority as a godly mother, Clinton makes certain to imply that her teachings, like preaching, are directed from above:

> Because it hath pleased God to blesse me with many children, and so caused me to obserue many things falling out to mothers, and to their children; I thought good to open my minde concerning a speciall matter belonging to all childe-bearing women … and to manifest my minde the better, even to write of this matter, so farre as God shall please to direct me. (1)

Implying that her words *are* God's words, Clinton reclaims the mother's role as feeder and instructor, but she also rejects the familial model of kingship that places the husband in an authoritative role.[34] While male-authored manuals commonly assume that the husband has the last word, Clinton positions the decision to breastfeed as one made by a woman in partnership with God, holding up her daughter-in-law Bridget Fiennes as one who "passed by all excuses, and … doe goe on with that loving act of a loving mother" (A2r). The only male figures Clinton mentions as worthy of consultation are "syncere, and faithfull Preachers" (20). Giving herself as an example of someone misled by secular authorities, she explains her decision not to nurse her children: "it was not for want of will in my selfe, but *partly I was ouerruled by anothers authority*, and *partly deceiued by somes ill counsell, & partly I had not so well considered of my duty in this motherly office*" (15-16). She may to some extent be distancing herself from the advice and "authority" of her recently deceased husband (Martin 149), and she later emphasizes the

---

[33] For biblical context see 1 Peter 2:2.

[34] Clinton's arguments are certainly puritan in tone, although given the range of puritan expression in the period, I am wary of identifying her definitively as a puritan equivalent to Dorothy Leigh, for instance. Luecke notes, however, that Clinton's daughter was "among those Puritan 'pilgrims' who founded the Massachusetts colony as a refuge for the 'godly.' … in 1629. Also aboard ship were John Cotton, the Clinton family pastor; Thomas Dudley, the Clintons' steward; and Dudley's daughter, poet Anne Bradstreet" (242 n.14).

inadequacy of a husband's opinion by instructing women to "inquire not of such as refuse to doe this" (20). Robert Cleaver's instruction to "regard their husbands will, as the Lords will" (235) is notably nowhere to be found. Critics such as Mary Beth Rose have read allusions to a husband's control solely in relation to gender hierarchies within the family,[35] but I would suggest in this case that the rejection of the husband's authority is equally a rejection of the king's, whose "ill counsell" likewise undermines God's direction.

For breastfeeding, like any feeding, might be construed as a political act. This is particularly true when the monarch has claimed himself as a feeder, or "nourish-father to the Church" (*Basilikon Doron* 43).[36] The contextual importance of his self-appointment is brought to light in the *Office of Christian Parents*, where Isaiah 49:23 is identified as the source of this concept. Beginning his book with a reference to parents as "Nourse-fathers and Nourse-mothers to the Church" (1), he concludes his section on breastfeeding with another reference to Isaiah:

> nursing is a worthy work, becomming the greatest personage whatsoeuer: and therefore Kings and Queenes who maintaine the faith, and protect the Church of God, are entitled with this honourable name of Nurse-fathers and Nursing-mothers, to carrie as it were in their bosome the people of God, as a nurse beareth the sucking child. (52-3)

The Geneva bible's interpretative framework clarifies Isaiah as pivotal to the salvation of the "Gentiles," being read as a prophecy of Christ's coming and proof of the doctrine of

---

[35] See Mary Beth Rose's "Where are the Mothers in Shakespeare? Options for Gender Representation in the English Renaissance."

[36] Curtis Perry, in particular, discusses James's use of maternal iconography in his *The Making of Jacobean Culture: James I and the renegotiation of Elizabethan literary practice* (116-29).

election.[37] As "nourish-father," James attempts to position himself as the founder of the promised new Jerusalem with a claim to the divine privilege of feeding – and controlling – his people.[38] Peace, glory, and God's grace flows from the milk of the divine, uniting God and the chosen nation:

> Reioyce ye with Ierusalém, and be glad with her, … That ye may sucke & be satisfied with the breasts of her cōsolation: that ye may milke out & be delited with the brightnes of her glorie. For thus saith the Lord, Beholde, I wil extend peace ouer her like a flood & the glorie of ye Gentiles like a flowing streame: then shall ye sucke, ye shal be borne vpō *her* sides, and be ioyful vpō *her* knees. As one whome a mother comforteth, so wil I comforte you, and ye shalbe comforted in Ierusalém. (*Geneva* ŁXVI:10-13)

James, too, wished to be considered a comforter and extender of peace, uniting England and Scotland and, with luck, even "secur[ing] the religious peace of Christendom" (W.B. Patterson 37). But his abandonment of Frederick and Elizabeth in pursuit of such peace was deemed a weakness that distanced England from God and its position as a new Jerusalem. Clinton reacts strongly to the idea of abandonment of one's children, again evoking what Patrick Collinson has called the "prophetic mode," or the increasingly politicized equation of England with Israel used in response particularly to James's pursuit of a Catholic match for Charles (21). Clinton's pamphlet, published the same year as James's *Directions to Preachers* (1622), a failed attempt to quell dissent from the

---

[37] See especially the later chapters of Isaiah, XLIX-LXVI (300r-305v).
[38] James further defines his fatherly role in *The Trew Law of Free Monarchies* as "the nourishing, education, and vertuous gouernment of his children" (55).

pulpit,[39] thus partakes of this broader and public discussion of foreign policy by preachers, warning those who refuse to provide nourishment:

> being euen at liberty, and in peace, with all plenty, [those who] shall deny to giue sucke to their owne children, they goe against nature: and shew that God hath not done so much for thē as to worke any good, no not in their nature, but left them more sauage then the Dragons, and as cruell to their little ones as the Ostriches. (8)

Alluding to Lamentations 4:3 – "Euen the dragons drawe out the breasts, & giue sucke to their yong, *but* the daughter of my people *is become* cruel like ye ostriches in the wildernes" (*Geneva* 332v) – this passage contradicts the promises in Isaiah, as here God abandons Jerusalem, removing his nourishment from a people who have transgressed. The Geneva bible's note to "dragons" confirms this abandonment, explaining "Thogh the dragons be cruel, yet thei pitie their yong and nourish them, wc thing Ierusalém doeth not" (332v n.c). James has refused to feed his offspring, and appears to be creating not the land of plenty depicted in Isaiah, but, quite literally, the land of dearth and destruction shown in Lamentations. For the years 1621-23 saw spectacularly bad crop failures, particularly in the North (Thirsk, *Food* 61), where the countess had her seat in Lincolnshire. Letter writer John Chamberlain writes on October 27th 1621 that "All manner of corne rises daylie and we are in feare of want, as well by reason of the yll harvest whereby much graine in many parts is lost for lacke of ripening, as for the bad yeild and yll season to sow for the next yeare" (2.404). These events would have certainly

[39] Jeanne Shami observes that on the contrary, "some preachers grew less rather than more circumspect" in their opposition, "directing specific criticisms against Spain, or more generally harking back to known Catholic conspiracies of universal monarchy" (42).

provided "proof" to disaffected subjects that England was experiencing already the effects of James's misrule.

The nursing mother on the other hand, is truthful, honest and virtuous, and therefore well-fitted to bring up a Christian child:

> I pray you, who that iudges aright; doth not hold the suckling of her owne childe the part of a true mother, of an honest mother, of a iust mother, of a syncere mother, of a mother worthy of loue, of a mother deseruing good report, of a vertuous mother, of a mother winning praise for it? (6-7)

Indeed, it is breastfeeding, she suggests, that allows women more recognition in the eyes of God, as it is through their exemplary acts, representative of the true church and the covenant of the godly, that the child might find a place, and help restore England to the privileges promised by Isaiah. Clinton revisits these promises in a final section that evokes divine law and asserts the national importance of breastfeeding:

> if it be vnlawfull to trample vnder feete a cluster of grapes, in which a little wine is found; then how vnlawfull is it to destroye and drie vp those breasts, in which your owne child (and perhaps one of Gods very elect, to whom to be a noursing father, is a Kings honour; and to whom to be a noursing mother, is a Queens honour) might finde food of syncere milke, euen from Gods immediate prouidence, vntill it were fitter for stronger meat? (17)

As Catharine Gray notes, the evocation of Isaiah designates "maternal nursing as a powerful, vocational act, equal to the king's authority over the church" (573). Feeding, an act that falls under the particular sway of women, is ultimately a public as well as a private duty. The formative role involved in bringing up "one of Gods very elect" is one

that implies an active participation in building a Protestant nation and necessarily includes women in this very political function. By suckling her child, the mother shows that she is one of God's "*new borne Babes*, by your earnest desire after his word; & the syncere doctrine thereof." Ultimately, this is a source of "pleasure, and profit" as the mother gains "grace and goodnesse" as she assists in building a nation of children who will return England to the status of a new Jerusalem, a home for the elect, a source of Protestant strength, and fed by God's word (20).

Feeding a Godly Nation

Dorothy Leigh's *The Mothers Blessing* (1616), a popular puritan tract ostensibly written as motherly advice, equally depicts food and feeding as conduits among women, God, and the nation. Leigh quickly introduces the connection between food and nation in the short poem following her two dedications: the first to Princess Elizabeth, and the second to her sons. Her dedication to Elizabeth also gives her text a national and political context, as it places Leigh firmly on the side of "militant Protestant opposition to James's policies of peace" (Gray 577). After her blatant statement of alliance, Leigh's moralizing poem that depicts the lives of the "labourous Bee" and the idle bee might be read as more than a simple ditty. The bee who labours and collects food for the winter "layes it vp, / to doe her Country good, / And for to serue her selfe at need / when winter doth begin" (18). The idle bee, in contrast, dies of starvation before the winter is out. As Susan Frye and Karen Robertson have observed, the bee was a common symbol among early modern women,[40] denoting among other things, "their service and connection to a larger unity"

[40] Charles Butler's *The Feminine Monarchie* (1609) appears to be the first English writer to identify that "the males heer beare no sway at al, this being an *Amazonian or feminine kingdome*" (a3v). His discovery

(4).[41] But the bee and its hive were also symbols of the commonwealth; Linda Dove observes this image in William Gouge's *Of Domesticall Dvties* as serving double duty for both the family and the state (148). Like Gouge, Leigh uses her bee as a symbol for the family's contribution to a greater collectivity: the bee who stores food and survives assists the country as a whole – she might live to gather and perhaps breed another year. The lazy bee, on the other hand, gives nothing to the collective, even removing herself from participating in it by starving herself to death. Leigh clearly positions herself in her ensuing text as a labouring bee who, like Clinton, provides food of both breast milk and words for her sons and country. That this food is enjoyable is without doubt – it is "A sweet and pleasant wholsome food" according to her poem (18) – for it derives ultimately from God.

Leigh's initial suggestion that food is tied to national concerns is developed over the ensuing forty-five chapters of her text. Although Leigh at first situates her book alongside other puritan books of advice on the family and childrearing, claiming in the title of her first chapter that "*The occasion of writing this Booke, was the consideration of the care of Parents for their Children*" (21), she eventually departs from the domestic implications inherent in such a statement, discussing the qualifications of preachers, for instance, and promoting such politically charged beliefs as sabbatarianism.[42] Yet these two concerns, as Catharine Gray has noted, were not incompatible, as the home modelled a microcosm of the good and godly governance puritans hoped they would receive from

---

might well deliver implicit political commentary, as by this time Elizabeth's reign was beginning to be seen as a golden age by political Protestants.

[41] The bee metaphor is also rooted in classical humanism, as Ann Moss has discussed (12, 105).

[42] That a woman could discuss such political concerns might not have been uncommon, at least among puritans. Diane Willen suggests that "the need to follow Puritan strategies in their daily life allowed godly women to transcend significant restrictions traditionally imposed on gender" (580).

the state (581). Gray, in particular, has developed a convincing political analysis of Leigh's work, finding in her text a "critical answer" to James's *Basilikon Doron* (564) with maternal feeding being an emblem of the "overflow of the domestic into the public" (573).[43] As early as chapter 3, Leigh also turns to Isaiah as a context through which to discuss nursing, beginning by paraphrasing Isaiah 49:15: "*Can a mother forget the child of her wombe?*" (23). In its biblical context, the original passage – "Can a woman forget her childe, and not haue compassion on the sonne of her wōbe? thogh they shulde forget, yet wil I not forget thee" (*Geneva* 300r) – refers to God's renewed covenant with Israel. While the prophet suggests the fallibility of woman in contrast to God's protection of his people, Leigh notably reclaims the honour of the maternal role. It seems that this too could be a response to James. His accusing statement that corrupt nobles gained their corruption by "drinking [it] in with their verie nourse-milke" (*Basilikon Doron* 44-5) traces the nobles' "iniquitie" back to their mothers while at the same time replacing maternal nourishment with his own. Leigh realigns mothers with godliness and suggests, as we will see later, that one is in greater danger of corruption from the worldly temptations of the court than from maternal milk.

In referring to the biblical book on the founding of a new Jerusalem, Leigh also ties maternal feeding to the rebuilding of the nation, extending the link made in receipt books between pleasing foods and national improvement. The maternal role, she claims, is imperative for national success. Following her initial question, she continues by

[43] Leigh's other critics, Valerie Wayne, Sylvia Brown, and Kristen Poole ("fittest closet"), to name a few, also acknowledge the political nature of Leigh's text, but remain more convinced of the primary domesticity of the maternal role. Others, such as Lloyd Davis and Martha J. Craig, are almost exclusively concerned with issues of female authorship. Gray's groundbreaking assertion of Leigh's text as indelibly political, however, both supports and concurs with my own findings.

expanding on this passage and bringing it round once again to Isaiah 49:23 in her final allusion to the nourishment sucked from a mother's breasts:

> As if he should say, Is it possible, that shee, which hath carried her child within her, so neere her hart, and brought it forth into this world with so much bitter paine, so many grones and cries, can forget it? nay rather, will shee not labour now till Christ be formed in it? will shee not blesse it euery time it suckes on her brests, when shee feeleth the bloud come from her heart to nourish it? (23)

By not forgetting her child while simultaneously ensuring that the child does not forget the God who has made a covenant with his people, Leigh carves out a position for the mother that stands solidly between the nation and its religion. Provider of her heart's blood to her child, an image that alludes to the Christ-like self-sacrifice posited by Clinton, she is also the "nourse-Mother" to the church who lays the foundation for a godly and successful nation.

That Leigh's nursing is of a spiritual type is something she does not let the reader forget. She reminds the reader that it is holy food that s/he should seek, and repeatedly cites John 6:27 as proof throughout her text: "*Labour not for the meate that perisheth, but for the meate that endureth to euerlasting life*" (22). One of her goals, it seems, is to reveal that women are intimately involved in providing the "meate that endureth" for the soul. She does this by placing women at the side of Christ as suppliers of the truly nourishing food. Although she refers to this relationship within the passage above, she later augments and explains the workings of this relationship in a far more complex way. Not surprisingly, she begins with a contrast between Eve and Mary, Eve's shame of feeding Adam the "poysoned fruit of disobedience" redeemed by Mary's delivery of

Christ, the "fruit of obedience" on which humanity might feed and likewise be redeemed. In this contrast, too, Leigh emphasises the truth of the food provided by a mother. Eve, childless in Eden, feeds Adam a fruit foreign to her own body; Mary both nourishes her child's body with breast milk (although Leigh does not specifically mention this act) and provides spiritual food for humanity by bearing this child: "except they feed of the seed of the woman, they haue no life" (28). Once again, it is the feeding ability of the mother that is integral to the development of a people's spiritual well-being; she is the storehouse that sustains the country through the winter.

If Leigh initially associates false food with Eve, she more damningly develops an image of the devil as an anti-mother who feeds his children with "poysonous baits" in a travesty of a true fisher of souls. God, as she contrasts in the preceding paragraph, is "our Father, our Maker, and gouernour, and our feeder," while mother's milk, as Gouge and Clinton remind us, prepares the child for this sweet milk of the word. Although Satan provides "sweet bait" (60) for willing sinners, he soon becomes the devourer, as he "draweth them out of the sweete streame, the water of life, and throweth them into a panne of boyling liquor" (60-1). Inverting the convenant between God and humanity, the devil feeds not to sustain others but to sustain himself; the sweetness he pretends to offer is as fleeting as the rest of his food and only a seductive ruse that ultimately removes the willing from the eternal sweetness of faith.[44]

---

[44] Although Caroline Walker Bynum writes about a medieval Catholic context, her comments on the importance of the eucharist provide some context for this later and different emphasis on feeding as a means to receiving God: "Eating was also an occasion for union with one's fellows and one's God, a commensality given particular intensity by the prototypical meal, the eucharist, which seemed to hover in the background of any banquet ... *to eat* was a powerful verb. It meant to consume, to assimilate, to become God" (3).

In case her meaning is too abstruse for readers to follow, Leigh returns to the subject of devilish food a few pages later and outlines more materially the definition of the "meat that perisheth." The devil's baits, she states, are made from worldly things, even things provided by God. And part of the challenge is the governance of appetites; if one appetite is left to grow in an uncontrolled manner, they all might fall into excess. "Meat is ordained of God for the nourishment of man; and yet how manie doth Sathan take with the sinne of gluttonie … Drinke is verie lawfull; yet how manie doth Satan take with the sinne of drunkennesse?" she asks, and goes on to warn, "bee continuallie carefull, lest thou art ouercome with surfetting and drunkennesse, and cares of this world; for thou mayest surfet and bee drunken with anie thing thou takest care for in this world" (64). Leigh admits the ease with which one might be led away from the food provided by God to that provided by Satan; food here appears interchangeable with desire, as the desire to be filled takes multiple forms that go well beyond the act of eating. As for Eve, or the idle bee, the lure of temporal – and temporary – pleasure is too much for many mortals who think only of themselves rather than of the collective good. Mothers, side-by-side with Christ, offer their own bodies as food, thereby protecting their offspring from the fatal poisons provided by Satan: "But if you take nothing but at my hands (saith Christ) Sathans poison shall neuer hurt you" (65).

Leigh continues this discussion in terms that recall the performance of the feast, transforming the devil from an anti-mother into a member of the court: "if you beginne to bee your owne caruers, Sathan will so sawce it with sweet poison, that hee will deceiue the wisest worlding in the world" (65).[45] Leigh's disapproval of dining excess, though

[45] The carver, Peter Brears explains in his introduction to *The Boke of Keruynge*, was also in charge of sauces and was at the top end of the ranks of service (2-3).

mentioned in passing, is in line with that of other puritan writers such as Stubbes, whose *Anatomie of Abuses* was published about 30 years earlier than Leigh's text. Both Leigh and Stubbes refer to such excess through disapproval of dining practices peculiar to gentry and royalty. Stubbes, we might recall, bemoans the multitude of dishes piled on the tables of the wealthy, each with "a seuerall sawce appropriate to his kind," and the "delicate confections of spiceries" so common at the sweet-laden banquet course (152). Leigh, with her reference to carvers and sauces, also evokes the households of the very wealthy. Only the nobility would employ a man in the skilled position of carver, and James's court had quickly gained a reputation for excess with his fondness for masques, banquets, and foreign-influenced foods. Sauces, too, were commonly associated with continental, and especially French, fashion. Stubbes, of course, insists that a true Englishman should be happy with "A good peece of Beefe" (153), this nationally-identified food having no need for sauces or other flavourings. While Leigh is not so forthright, her condemnation of gluttony might easily be read as a condemnation of James's court, particularly in light of her dedication to Princess Elizabeth. Satan, a source of foreign, and thus implicitly Catholic food practices, has already infiltrated the court, shifting it away from the true national and Protestant interests that Leigh upholds with her counsels for moderation in feeding the body and her emphasis on the true sweetness of feeding the soul.

Satan, however, not only provides foreign and courtly food, he also provides poisoned food. Leigh's reference to Satan as a poisoner also pegs him as foreign and Catholic; culturally poisoners were frequently associated with Italy.[46] But by 1616, there

[46] Rodrigo Lopez, the Spanish-Jewish physician accused of attempting to poison Elizabeth, was in relatively recent memory, and the mythos of the Italian poisoner in particular was perpetuated in several

were also homegrown examples of poisoners: Robert Carr and Frances Howard along with several accomplices were charged with poisoning Sir Thomas Overbury before his death in 1613. The trial and investigation into Overbury's death in the Tower began in the autumn of 1615, and readers of Leigh's tract in the years shortly following the Overbury scandal would have unavoidably associated poisoners with this highly politicized event. Importantly, this scandal also implicated James after he granted a pardon to both Carr and Howard in 1616 (having allowed their accomplices to take full blame). These passages that position the devil as a server of courtly foods not only appear to criticize the dining excesses of James and his court, but also to evoke James's shameful support of alleged poisoners. What is more, the Howards were a Catholic family; his pardon of Frances in particular appeared to emphasise his support for Catholics and his turn away from militant Protestant interests. Like Fulke Greville, who damns James through his association with alleged poisoners, even implying his involvement in the death of Henry, the Protestant "hope of England" (*Five* 24), Leigh seems to imply that James does not only dine with poisoners but also participates in feeding poison to his people.

Christ and the mother, on the other hand, both of whom provide their children with their own "hart bloud" (73), are potential feeders of "the meat that endureth." Each feeds his and her body to the child; each lives on to feed more supplicants. Leigh, like Clinton, further augments the role of the mother by referring back to Peter's allusion to the infant suckling on the milk of the word. Mothers and God collaborate in their feeding abilities to help humanity win, as she says in the final paragraph of her text, "these two great combates made between the diuell & the deare children of God" (76). Her

---

early modern plays, including Thomas Middleton's *The Revenger's Tragedy* and John Webster's *The White Devil* and *The Duchess of Malfi*, to name a few.

instructions for prayer, faith, and godliness delivered through the politicized metaphors of feeding and ingestion are designed for all these children, not simply her own; her sweet dish of God's word is meant to refresh and renew a nation addicted to the devilish poison of sauces.

Dorothy Leigh's redefinition of godly pleasures includes not only the act of virtuous feeding, but also, like Markham's, virtuous eating. Although she does not specifically discuss banquet items, she does distinguish between acceptable and unacceptable forms of sweetness, one providing nourishment for the soul and the other filling the yawning appetites of the corrupt body. Her food, like Elizabeth Clinton's, is designed to provide godly pleasures in aid of national improvement; in these instances, improvement comes with highly specific religious and political requirements that directly respond to James's policies and rhetoric. Entering the broader field of food discourse in which concepts of pleasure and improvement find an increasingly political focus, these breastfeeding advocates firmly establish women as feeders and political commentators, turning domestic duties to public purpose.

CHAPTER 3

The Sweetness of Simplicity: Dining in Lady Mary Wroth's *Urania*

Belief in the power of sweet foods to affect body and soul, though also dependent on biblical context, derives its immediate strength from humoural physiology. As Ken Albala has written in his lucid overview of Renaissance dietaries: "You become what you eat. Just as you can acquire a taste for something, an aliment can be so thoroughly absorbed into the system that it alters the human fabric" (51). Based on the work of Galen, the second-century Greek physician who linked the four humours – black bile, yellow bile, blood, and phlegm – to elemental properties – hot, cold, moist and dry – and to human temperament – melancholic, choleric, sanguine, phlegmatic – humoural physiology assumed that what one ate affected personality and ability to reason. Dietaries, as Albala explains, were particularly interested in using food to adjust and regulate constitutional imbalances (50). What one ingested and how one digested was of fundamental importance, since this ultimately influenced the production of the spirits, a combination of blood and air that "vitalize[d]" the humours in the blood (63). Distributed through the arteries, these vital spirits circulated to the brain, where they were turned into animal spirits that "travel[led] through the nervous system and [were] the messengers of all voluntary acts prompted by the brain." As Albala elaborates:

> a fault in any stage of the digestive process will ultimately affect the quality of these spirits, [so] it is easy to understand why Renaissance dieticians drew such a direct connection between diet and thoughts. … Inappropriate foods or faulty digestion clouds the thoughts and obfuscates the intellect, drawing the unfortunate thinker into confusion and possibly sin. (63)

That this belief, despite the incursion of Paracelsian and alchemical theories which rejected humoural theory for a belief in chemical cures, was still current in the first half of the seventeenth century is confirmed by Lady Mary Wroth, who draws attention to the importance of diet in forming, destroying, or restructuring characters' identities in her two-part romance, the *Urania*. As Michael Schoenfeldt remarks in his work on digestion and inwardness, "acts of ingestion and excretion [were] very literal acts of self-fashioning" (*Bodies* 11). Yet Wroth importantly demonstrates that such acts did not merely fashion the self, but could also have political consequences when the eater in question was of royal blood.

The most immediate example of diet's political impact occurs in Wroth's story of Nereana, the proud princess of Stalamine, who sets off to find Steriamus with whom she has fallen in love, and gets lost in the woods during a fit of conceited anger. She then endures an enforced period of purgation in the wilderness designed eventually to rid her of vices and positively transform her ability to rule:

> So long was shee in that place, as famine, cold, and want wrought kindnesse in her … Now berries and such poore food was her richest fare, and those esteem'd, since they held her life with her: thus was truth revenged of ignorance, shee continuing thus. (1.2.200-1)

Poor Nereana suffers similar deprivations for over one hundred pages; following the countless adventures of others, we return to see her

> still remaining in Cicely, now growne as humble, as before proud, and ashamed as before scorning, living in a Cave alone, and feeding on hearbs, roots, and milke of Goats which fed on those rocks: playing the milke-mayd better then before the Princesse. (334)

While her meagre diet is only one part of her punishment, Wroth draws attention to it as a primary force of transformation. Plain as it is, this diet might well be rife with political implications in and of itself, as Jonathan Bate observes in a different though analogous context in his introduction to *Titus Andronicus*:

> One of Tacitus' ways of condemning imperial rule was by means of the contrasting image of wholesome, pastoral Germans who fed on berries, roots, goatsmilk, curds and whey, as Aaron plans to have his baby fed among the Goths. Tacitism was a code for political disaffection and even republicanism in certain circles in the 1590s, such as that which gathered around the Earl of Essex. (21)

The connection between Essex and Philip Sidney, Wroth's uncle with whom she aligned herself textually and politically, itself suggests the possibility that Wroth was alluding to this earlier code as a method of indicating her own political disaffection. For Wroth emphasises diet as a significant influence on Nereana's transformation, revealing how a pre-emptive return to "her greatnes" returns her also to "wonted accustomed humours" (335).[1] When Perissus, king of Sicily, takes pity on her, he inadvertently unleashes her

---

[1] Several critics have discussed the episode of Nereana, but they consider her in the light of gender politics only, and thus miss the wider political ramifications of her experience. Anne Shaver, in "A New Woman of Romance" sees her as an example "of the way in which women in Wroth's world have to choose between a kingdom and a man … between love and independence" (71-2); Helen Hackett discusses Nereana as a

simmering pride and comes to deduce that "she had beene with good feeding growne into her fury againe, and fullnesse had renewed her madnesse" (336). Despite some regrets, he abandons her and she is eventually returned to her penitential state by her sister, who locks her in a tower and feeds her "neately, and poorely to keepe downe her fancy" (338). In the end, her experience is a happy one, for deprivation leads eventually to personal reformation and subsequent restoration as ruler, with, as Elaine Beilin has noted, her subjects' consent ("Winning" 14). Such dietary restraint is reminiscent of Queen Elizabeth's dining habits, who was known to be "in her diet very temperate, as eating but a few kinds of meat ... the wine she drank was mingled with water ... Precise hours of refection she observed not, as never eating but when her appetite required it" (Robinson 2.192-3).[2] Nereana's new understanding of similarly controlled and moderate habits likewise makes her fit for ruling over both herself and others. As Wroth explains:

> she by her poore living, and neglect being now invested in so staid an habitation of gravity, as she was fit for the honour they recalld her to ... she deservd their due restoring her, prooving an excellent Governess, and brave Lady, being able to overrule her old passions, and by them to judge how to favor, licence, and curb others, and this experience, though late, is most profitable to Princes. (1.3.496)

Nereana's trial usefully tracks the changes that might be wrought by dietary restraint along with their political consequences, and Wroth proceeds to develop a political philosophy of dining, exploring it most extensively in her manuscript sequel.[3] In

---

"countertype" to the melancholic but self-controlled Pamphilia ("'Yet Tell Me'" 53); and Naomi Miller similarly looks at her through the lens of female subjectivity, seeing "the disintegration of Nereana's discourse parallel[ling] the deconstruction of her subjectivity through her subjection to desire" (*Changing* 136).

[2] This report comes from a letter by "an unknown contemporary" (191).

[3] Part 1, the published text, was likely written between 1618 and 1620, and was entered in the Stationers' Register on July 13, 1621 (Roberts, "Critical" xvii). The second part, which existed only in manuscript in

constructing what I call her Protestant plain-style dining practice, Wroth not only establishes positive dietary patterns but also juxtaposes them with meals that have negative results due to excessive and salacious ingestion. In this, I will argue, she enters a broader cultural discourse of criticism that took James's court to task for its unceasing love of lavish entertainments. Such criticism, of course, was intimately connected to a more general dis-ease with James's policies of perceived appeasement of Catholic powers, particularly Spain. There is growing acknowledgement that Wroth and her romance were aligned with the Protestant and protesting faction at the Stuart court that looked both backwards to the alleged golden age under Queen Elizabeth, and forwards to a spread of continental Protestantism under the auspices of Frederick and Elizabeth. In this light, dietary philosophy might also be read as political commentary, for, as the tale of Nereana demonstrates, "good feeding" can lend itself to misrule and arrogance, while restraint engenders moderation and good judgement. Following a discussion of the politics of the *Urania*, I will then situate Wroth's dietary discourse among that of her contemporaries. Letters and recollections by writers such as John Chamberlain and Dudley Carleton express dismay over James's dining habits while tying these habits to a more general suspicion of misrule. Wroth's eventual celebration of sweetness and simplicity partakes of this wider discourse, becoming an oppositional observance of

---

the Newberry Library until publication of the contemporary edition in 1999, has been harder to date, but was probably written over several years in the 1620s. Roberts suggests that Wroth might have left off working on the romance by 1626, when William Herbert named his nephew Philip as his heir, rather than his illegitimate son born to Wroth. The second part, which includes a second generation of characters, is also interested in the fate of illegitimate children. Amphilanthus's (generally seen as a foil for Herbert) acknowledgement of the young knight Faire Designe has often been understood as Wroth's wish for Herbert's similar recognition of her son William (see also Mary Ellen Lamb's "Biopolitics" 125 for a discussion of these correspondences). If this is true, then Herbert's refusal might have put an end to this literary rendition of wish-fulfillment. Wroth would most likely have left off writing by the end of the decade, however, as Herbert died in 1630 and her dedicatee, Susan Herbert, Countess of Montgomery, died in 1629 of smallpox (xviii).

godliness, virtue, and personal moderation, reinstating qualities believed to be increasingly abandoned under James's rule.

The Politics of the Urania

Food and its rituals have been considered only in passing, if at all, by Mary Wroth scholars. The bulk of criticism on the first and second parts of *The Countess of Montgomery's Urania* and Wroth's work in general has been most interested in exploring Wroth's depiction of female subjectivity, desire, and relationships, and is heavily inflected with biographical reference.[4] In recent years, however, inspired by Josephine

---

[4] Wroth's *Urania* has generated its own cottage industry. Work on aspects of subjectivity include: Naomi Miller's *Changing the Subject: Mary Wroth and Figurations of Gender in Early Modern England*, and "Engendering Discourse: Women's Voices in Wroth's *Urania* and Shakespeare's Plays"; Nona Fienberg's "Mary Wroth's Poetics of the Self"; Carolyn Ruth Swift's "Feminine Identity in Lady Mary Wroth's Romance *Urania*"; Anne Shaver's "New Woman of Romance"; Barbara Lewalski's *Writing Women in Jacobean England*; Helen Hackett's "The Torture of Limena: Sex and Violence in Lady Mary Wroth's *Urania*," and "'A book, and solitariness': Melancholia, Gender and Literary Subjectivity in Mary Wroth's *Urania*"; Jacqueline T. Miller's "Ladies of the Oddest Passion: Early Modern Women and the Arts of Discretion," and "The Passion Signified: Imitation and the Construction of Emotions in Sidney and Wroth"; Heather L. Weidemann's "Theatricality and Female Identity in Mary Wroth's *Urania*"; Kathryn Pratt's "'Wounds still curelesse': Estates of Loss in Mary Wroth's *Urania*"; and Wendy Wall's *The Imprint of Gender: Authorship and Publication in the English Renaissance*. Subjectivity and its relationship to geography, the land, and the natural world is covered by Sheila T. Cavanagh's *Cherished Torment: The Emotional Geography of Lady Mary Wroth's* Urania; and Sylvia Bowerbank's *Speaking for Nature: Women and Ecologies of Early Modern England*. Akiko Kusunoki considers subjectivity and male violence in "Female Selfhood and Male Violence in English Renaissance Drama: A View from Mary Wroth's *Urania*." Race and its relationship to identity formation is discussed by Kim F. Hall in "'I rather would wish to be a black-moor': Beauty, race, and rank in Lady Mary Wroth's *Urania*," and *Things of Darkness: Economies of Race and Gender in Early Modern England*. Subjectivity and female community is discussed in Naomi J. Miller's "'Not Much to Be Marked': Narrative of the Woman's Part in Lady Mary Wroth's *Urania*"; and Sheila T. Cavanagh's "Mystical Sororities: The Power of Supernatural Female Narratives in Lady Mary Wroth's *Urania*." The pastoral and its relationship to self-fashioning is explored in Amelia Zurcher Sandy's "Pastoral, Temperance, and the Unitary Self in Wroth's *Urania*." Studies on the female reader/writer include: Mary Ellen Lamb's "Women Readers in Mary Wroth's *Urania*"; Paula Harms Payne's "Finding a Poetic Voice of Her Own: Lady Mary Wroth's *Urania* and *Pamphilia to Amphilanthus*"; Helen Hackett's *Women and Romance Fiction in the English Renaissance*, and "'Yet Tell Me Some Such Fiction: Lady Mary Wroth's *Urania* and the 'Femininity' of Romance"; and Edith Snook's *Women, Reading, and the Cultural Politics of Early Modern England*. Biographical criticism includes: Margaret P. Hannay's "'Your vertuous and learned Aunt': The Countess of Pembroke as a Mentor to Mary Wroth"; Gary Waller's "Mary Wroth and the Sidney Family Romance: Gender Construction in Early Modern England," and *The Sidney Family Romance: Mary Wroth, William Herbert, and the Early Modern Construction of Gender*; Maureen Quilligan's "Lady Mary Wroth: Female Authority and the Family Romance"; Mary Ellen Lamb's "The Biopolitics of Romance in Mary Wroth's *The Countess of*

Roberts's discussion of the romance's political context ("Critical" xxxix-liv), critics have begun to reconsider the *Urania* as a political text. While not denying the romance's multidimensionality, with its revelations of female desire and subjectivity and its commentary on rhetoric, writing and reading, my interest is in this former concern, as Wroth's dietary philosophy adds layers to her oppositional stance towards the policies and practices of James I.

It is and was not uncommon for the generic romance to be viewed in political terms, despite its reputation as light and salacious reading for women. But as Helen Hackett has argued, this latter association was often more rhetorical than real, with allusions to female readers designed to raise voyeuristic anticipation in male readers who were frequently the intended audience (*Women* 11, 19). Despite dismissal as a "low" (and thus effeminate) form of literature by some (Hackett 20), romance, as Paul Salzman has observed, was more accurately a "'high' mode of Elizabethan fiction … exemplified in Sidney's *Arcadia*" (*English* 3). And clearly, the romance could be a sophisticated Jacobean mode as well, for the *Arcadia*, written by Mary Wroth's uncle, was not only reissued in 1621, the same year that Part 1 of the *Urania* was published, but also provided a significant model for Wroth.[5] Beginning with the shepherdess Urania, who remains absent in the *Arcadia* and is brought immediately to life as a main character in Wroth's

---

Montgomery's Urania," and *Gender and Authorship in the Sidney Circle*; Jennifer Lee Carrell's "A Pack of Lies in a Looking Glass: Lady Mary Wroth's *Urania* and the Magic Mirror of Romance"; and Marion Wynne-Davies's "'So Much Worth': Autobiographical Narratives in the Work of Lady Mary Wroth." Constancy, marriage, and male/female relationships are addressed in: Josephine Roberts's "'The Knott Never to Bee Untide': The Controversy Regarding Marriage in Mary Wroth's *Urania*"; Anne Shaver's "Agency and Marriage in the Fictions of Lady Mary Wroth and Margaret Cavendish, Duchess of Newcastle"; Elaine Beilin's *Redeeming Eve: Women Writers of the English Renaissance*; Gavin Alexander's "Constant Works: A Framework for Reading Mary Wroth"; and Maureen Quilligan's "The Constant Subject: Instability and Female Authority in Wroth's *Urania* Poems."

[5] Other sources have been identified as Jorge de Montemayor's *Diana*, Ariosto's *Orlando Furioso*, Spenser's *Faerie Queene*, *Amadis de Gaule*, Honoré d'Urfé's *Astrée*, Cervantes's *Don Quixote*, Ben Jonson's masques of "Blackness" and "Beauty," and Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, *Heriodes*, and *Ars Amatoria* (Roberts, "Critical" xx-xxxi).

work, Sidney's text gives Wroth opportunities to respond to, borrow from, and manipulate episodes and characters. Christina Luckyj suggests that the *Urania* in fact "advertised itself as modelled on ... [the] *Arcadia*" through its titlepage that identifies Wroth as the niece of Philip and Mary Sidney. Sidney's work was readily accepted as a political text, both in its own time and in the 1620s. Fulke Greville's *Life of the Renowned Sir Philip Sidney*, for example, written in 1610-12 and circulated in manuscript before being published in 1652 (Perry 185), stated that the *Arcadia* was intended to "represent the growth, state, and declination of Princes, change of Government, and lawes: vicissitudes of sedition, faction, succession" (Greville, *Life* 18). Greville naturally had his own agenda for such judgement; as Annabel Patterson elaborates, Greville's *Life* was intended as "a eulogy of Elizabeth" and was "addressed to Jacobean 'visions' and failures, particularly the pro-Spanish policies and pacifism of James himself" ("'Under" 265). But Sidney's criticisms were also firmly based in his own time, as his commitment to a "militant international Protestantism" often put him at cross-purposes with Elizabeth, particularly during the French marriage controversy of the 1570s and Elizabeth's ensuing turn to censorship to deal with her critics (266). By the 1620s, however, Sidney and his reissued *Arcadia* could again be read in the light of the current political situation, and "became associated with a nostalgia for Elizabethan heroic values, which were utilized in protest against King James" (Salzman, "Strang[e]" 113).[6]

---

[6] It is likely that Wroth's Spenserian references in particular evoked similar feelings of nostalgia, and it is perhaps not by accident that Wroth overtly mirrors Spenser's House of Busirane episode in Part 1, Book 4, which takes place partly in England. Part 2 also recalls Spenser's more fantastical characters, as the heroes strive with numerous giants and the odd winged griffin. For more discussion of Spenser's influence on Wroth, see Jacqueline T. Miller's "Lady Mary Wroth in the House of Busirane"; Shannon Miller's "'Mirrours More Then One': Edmund Spenser and Female Authority in the Seventeenth Century"; Josephine A. Roberts's "Radigund Revisited: Perspectives on Women Rulers in Lady Mary Wroth's *Urania*"; and Sheila Cavanagh's "Romancing the Epic: Lady Mary Wroth's *Urania* and Literary Traditions."

If Sidney influenced Wroth's narrative framework, then it is likely that his work would also have licensed her political analyses; as Hackett observes, "Like her uncle, Wroth not only drew on personal material for her plots and characters, but also depicted and commented on topical political controversies" (*Women* 162).

Salzman identifies the *Urania* as combining both pastoral and chivalric styles ("Strang[e]" 122), with each mode used "to interrogate each other's assumptions" (123) in a complex literary, cultural, and political intervention.[7] Not only does it represent a "female intervention in the masculine world of secular literature" (116), but it anticipates Barclay's *Argenis* (1621)[8] and its "detailed account of French political history." Wroth's "careful elaboration of the dynastic policies throughout the 'Europe' of *Urania*, as well as within the court society of England" cannot be divorced from her familiarity with the ongoing political negotiations of this court milieu (116). Her analysis of gender, the private world of women and passion, and her *roman à clef* revelations thus intersect with, rather than remain discrete from "the public world of politics" (119). Here, Salzman recognizes the implicit connection between personal and political attachments; Wroth's seemingly unending recitation of stories involving hopeful or spurned lovers that exists particularly in Part 1 is inseparable from the desires inherent in political negotiations, especially when characters might be identified as real-life members of court circles. Wroth's clever combination of two worlds – her own and the fantasy world of a romance located primarily in the Mediterranean, and in Part 2, in Asia and North Africa as well –

---

[7] Salzman's earlier analysis of the *Urania*, in his *English Prose Fiction*, establishes it primarily as a *roman à clef* more interested in the personal than the political and particularly valuable for its depiction and investigation of the lives of women. He does, however, suggest that "it represents a new engagement with the minutiae of contemporary life, which makes it possible for the later political romances" to develop, most notably over the civil war period, that take John Barclay's overtly political *Argenis* as a model (141).

[8] This was written in Latin. Ben Jonson's translation, commissioned by James, is recorded as being published in 1623 (Patterson, *Censorship* 166).

would have encouraged readers to apply and compare the events of the romance to their own seventeenth-century contexts. As Salzman notes, the *Urania* ensured her political voice, "especially given the nature of the political context in 1621, and given her own allegiances within the Sidney/Herbert grouping at court" (124).

In 1621, opposition to James's steadfast pacifism – that led both to his refusal to support his son-in-law Frederick's claims to the throne of Bohemia against his Catholic rival Ferdinand and to his pro-Spanish policies, which included his pursuit of a Spanish match for his son Charles – came to a head. The 1621 Parliament, in a direct attack that demonstrated the widespread discontent with James's policies, called for "war with Spain, a Protestant marriage for the prince, and a stronger enforcement of the laws against recusants" (Patterson, *Censorship* 310). Wroth, lineally connected to this Protestant opposition, made a point of reaffirming her Sidney connections on her titlepage.[9] Her cousin and lover, William Herbert, Earl of Pembroke, despite his proximity to the king as Lord Chamberlain, was also strongly associated with the Protestant faction at court, and used his position and influence in pursuit of his own political interests. James, who viewed himself as a Caesar[10] bringing unity and peace to the British Isles, continued to resist his growing and increasingly vocal opposition. And Wroth makes it clear that she herself was hardly in favour of James's pacifism. In a text ridden with wars, conquests, and small scale vengeance, she trumpets the idea that war is at times the correct and Christian response. In Part 2, most notably, Pamphilia writes a

---

[9] The titlepage reads as follows: *The Countesse of Mountgomeries URANIA. Written by the right honorable the Lady MARY WROATH. Daughter to the right Noble Robert Earle of Leicester. And Neece to the ever famous and renowned Sr. Phillips Sidney knight. And to ye most exelēt Lady Mary Countesse of Pembroke late deceased.*

[10] Jonathan Goldberg draws attention to James's Roman self-styling in his influential *James I and the Politics of Literature* (46). Linda Levy Peck also observes this, noting that James "sought to make London a new Rome" (*Consuming* 202).

letter justifying her call for war against the Sultan of Persia, who wishes to possess both Pamphilia and her domain.[11] Often seen as representative of Wroth herself, Pamphilia also reflects the two heroic Elizabeths. Wroth recalls Elizabethan iconography to evoke the queen: Elaine Beilin notes that Pamphilia's dress on occasion "resembles the elaborate glory and careful symbolism of Elizabeth's portraits" (*Redeeming* 219) and that her qualities of bravery and constancy recall the projected image of the former queen (223-38). But this particular depiction of the embattled princess might also suggest the exiled Jacobean Elizabeth. Like James's daughter, who defiantly never abandoned her claim to the palatinate even after her husband's death – in 1635 her sons were still seeking support from England (Norbrook, "Masque" 100) – Pamphilia writes that she would

> rather hasard my lyfe in warr, which will, I hope, bring mee a braver and more Christianlike conclusion, that I may end my sad days in honor, who have ever lived in that blessing, yett having hope in the just justnes of my cause, I presume to implore the help of my best and neerest friends to assist mee, which if graunted, I make noe question butt to obtaine hapy liberty. (2.1.155)

This suggestion that just wars protect and maintain proper rule against usurping forces seems easily transferable to the position of Frederick and Elizabeth, who indeed lost what many saw as their just claim to the throne of Bohemia, with the attendant "Christianlike

---

[11] Wroth's romance appears to exemplify the conflicted relationship of early modern England to the Ottoman Empire. On the one hand, Pamphilia's marriage to the Christian king of Tartaria and symbol of the East, Rodomandro, evokes Elizabeth's recognition of "alliance with the Ottomans, both to counter the power of Catholic Spain … and to gain access to the Levant trade" (McJannet 5), and recalls the "idealized" view of "the Turks" who "held up a reproachful mirror to Christian eyes and embodied virtues seen as lacking in the west." On the other hand, the dastardly Sultan evokes what Linda McJannet identifies as "the anti-Turkish polemic of Wycliffe and Luther, which attacked Catholicism by equating Rome and Constantinople, the western and eastern seats of the Antichrist" (34). In other words, it is possible that the Sultan is doing double duty as both Muslim and Catholic invader.

conclusion" of a greater Protestant foothold in Europe against Catholic forces. Wroth's use of code words such as "honor," and "braver and more Christianlike," in light of the political turmoil of the 1620s, appears nothing less than a slap in the face to James, who abandoned his kin for an alliance with Spain and the very Catholicism that had sent Frederick and Elizabeth packing. Pamphilia's counterpart, Amphilanthus, likewise might be seen as a double not only for Herbert, but also for Frederick, as Amphilanthus achieves the position of Holy Roman emperor that many hoped for the elector palatine, and whose ability to "boldly and successfully [forge] an international alliance" in this role as emperor stands in contrast to James's less successful policies.[12] And although Wroth does not define the type of Christianity followed by her heroes,[13] her referential templates would suggest that they are of the defiantly Protestant persuasion.

It is in light of such topical concerns about alliance, war, and peace, that the political overtones of Wroth's *Urania* have been brought to light. Josephine Roberts notes that Wroth's depiction of the Holy Roman emperor evokes "one of the most powerful political fantasies of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Europe – the revival of the Holy Roman empire in the West" ("Critical" xxxix). But Wroth's empire-building ambitions do not stop there. Sheila Cavanagh has observed in several of her articles on the *Urania* that Part 2 involves the spread of Christianity into "Tartaria,"[14] an area that includes India and China, through the marriage alliance between Pamphilia and the

---

[12] Josephine Roberts suggests that Wroth's characters "shadow" early modern individuals, by which she means that contemporaries are not directly rendered, but instead are reflected and refracted among multiple characters, who in turn might embody multiple allusions ("Critical" lxx).

[13] Jeanne Shami notes that "The names of sectarian religious controversy used in current scholarship were already freighted with their own historical baggage in Donne's time. Consequently, after the Reformation, churchmen of all stripes claimed to prefer the name of Christian to that of Calvinist, Lutheran, or any other religion named after men" (16). Rather than being an inclusive, non-sectarian term, therefore, Wroth's use of "Christian" likely claimed it for her own sectarian uses.

[14] Bernadette Andrea also draws attention to the "imperialist" (339) pursuits of the characters in the *Urania* in her article, "Pamphilia's Cabinet: Gendered Authorship and Empire in Lady Mary Wroth's *Urania*."

Christian King of Tartaria, Rodomandro.[15] Such political marriages have also inspired commentators to acknowledge that Wroth's interest in love and constancy does have its political ramifications. Kim Hall reminds us in *Things of Darkness* that the term "marriage" was used politically by James, who described his longed-for British unity as "a marriage" (121); the marriages of his children were also highly political events, inspiring both fervent support in the case of Princess Elizabeth's Protestant marriage, and fervent protest in response to the intended Catholic marriage for Charles. And both Queen Elizabeth and King James used the marriage metaphor to refer to their own relationships with their country, James styling himself as England's husband, and Elizabeth as its wife.[16] But love also constituted an aspect of political rhetoric.[17] Curtis Perry observes that in Elizabethan pastoral "Dissatisfaction is often recast as love-sickness" (55); and Stephen Orgel suggests that Elizabeth claimed love for her own purposes, making "The language of love … a crucial part of her power" ("Jonson" 120). Helen Hackett recalls a foundational politicization of love in the *Book of the Courtier* (*Women* 25), and Blair Worden's description of the tyranny of love that "breeds both

---

[15] See Cavanagh's "Prisoners of Love: Cross-Cultural and Supernatural Desires in Lady Mary Wroth's *Urania*," and "'The Great Cham': East Meets West in Lady Mary Wroth's *Urania*." Cavanagh also suggests, however, that Wroth might be seen to support James's vision of a "pan-Christian world" in "'She is but Enchanted': Christianity and the Occult in Lady Mary Wroth's *Urania*" (70-1). It is true, as Cavanagh points out, that Wroth does not overtly identify Christians by any particular denomination, but Cavanagh's assumption that this constitutes an "erasure of the kinds of divisions between Protestants and Catholics that contributed to the Thirty Years War" (71) seems unlikely (see note 13 above).

[16] Elizabeth's role as wife to her country has often been seen as similar to Pamphilia's position, as Pamphilia refuses marriage throughout Part 1 and only reluctantly marries Rodomandro in Part 2, claiming both constancy to the roving Amphilanthus and to her country of Pamphilia. See Elaine Beilin's "Winning 'the harts of the people': The Role of the Political Subject in the *Urania*" for a comparison of Elizabeth and Pamphilia's "marriages" (3-9); see also Marion Wynne-Davies's "The Queen's Masque: Renaissance Women and the Seventeenth-Century Court Masque" for a discussion of Pamphilia's marriages, first to her country, and later to Rodomandro (93-9).

[17] Linda Dove observes Mary Wroth's political use of love and the figure of Cupid in *Pamphilia to Amphilanthus*, the sonnet sequence appended to the *Urania*. Cupid, Dove argues, is a tyrannical figure meant to signify James; Cupid's "reformation," which Dove locates in the corona sequence (141) "challenges King James's absolute authority," with the "idealized love match … work[ing] as a model of good government" (143).

private and public disorder" in the *Arcadia* (305) might equally be applied to the *Urania*, in which Pamphilia and Amphilanthus, along with many other rulers, are challenged to maintain constant rule in light of their passions for and disappointments about each other.[18] Jennifer Wallace Hall's unpublished dissertation usefully draws attention to the political nature of constancy itself, tying it to Justus Lipsius's neostoic concept as expressed in *De Constantia*. Personal constancy, in this instance, leads to, and is necessary for political constancy, both types implying loyalty, stability, and attunement to reason (179-236), and, it might be added, control over one's appetites. Pamphilia, the image of constancy, while sometimes overcome by her passions and melancholia, struggles with these emotions in her quest to become a ruler of herself and her country, eventually, it could be argued, succeeding and becoming a powerful monarch who expands her rule into the East through marriage even as she learns how to maintain a bond with the government of the West in her simultaneous relationship with Amphilanthus. Once again, Pamphilia is everything James is not: a female ruler who unites the East and West through reasoned, constant rule that includes strong loyalty to her friends and kin, and a corresponding willingness to go to war to protect both them and herself.

While today's critics are discovering the politics of Wroth's romance, there is also evidence that the *Urania*'s original reception was politicized, in part by Wroth herself. Much has been written on the hostile exchange of letters between Wroth and Sir Edward Denny after the latter believed himself to have been slanderously depicted in her

---

[18] Ellis Hanson's "Sodomy and Kingcraft in *Urania* and *Antony and Cleopatra*" draws attention to an episode in Part 1 involving a Duke and the king of Morea that appears to allude to James's relationship with Robert Carr, another example of the "public and private disorder" engendered by love (135-51). Josephine Roberts suggests instead that the relationship depicted is that between Carr and Thomas Overbury ("Critical" lxvii-lxviii).

published text in a short episode concerning Sirelius, who marries a young woman who later comes under suspicion for adultery.[19] The woman's father, in whom Denny saw himself, is described unflatteringly as "a phantastical thing, vaine as Courtiers, rash as mad-men, and ignorant as women" (1.4.516) just before he almost kills his daughter for her alleged transgression. Wroth's story is similar to events involving Denny, his daughter Honora, and her husband Lord James Hay, a Scottish favourite of James and infamous for his outrageous dining habits. A vituperative exchange of poems and letters between Denny and Wroth reveals Wroth's assertiveness as she matches her opponent word for word even as she denies Denny's allegations. But Denny also expresses concern for his public reputation, complaining that it is "but small recompence to be the onely chosen foole for a May-game, before all the World and especially before a Wise King and Prince, with all the nobility" (Roberts, *Poems* 238). This was perhaps not simply paranoia, for the scandal was significant enough to be recorded by John Chamberlain:

> The other paper are certain bitter verses of the Lord Dennies upon the Lady Marie Wroth, for that in her booke of Urania she doth palpablie and grossely play upon him and his late daughter the Lady Hayes, besides many others she makes bold with, and they say takes great libertie or rather licence to traduce whom she please, and thincks she daunces in a net: I have seen an aunswer of hers to these rimes, but I thought yt not worth the writing out. (2.427)

---

[19] Paul Salzman appears to have first drawn attention to the exchange in his "Contemporary References in Mary Wroth's *Urania*," and the controversy has been further discussed in Josephine Roberts's "Labyrinths of Desire: Lady Mary Wroth's Reconstruction of Romance"; Daniel Juan Gil's "The Currency of the Beloved and the Authority of Lady Mary Wroth"; Barbara Lewalski's *Writing Women*; and most notably, for its reconstruction of events, by Rosalind Smith in "Lady Mary Wroth's *Pamphilia to Amphilanthus*: The Politics of Withdrawal." Josephine Roberts reprints the correspondence between Denny and Wroth, and Wroth and Buckingham, in *The Poems of Lady Mary Wroth* (233-45).

Amid Denny's invective, however, he also recognizes that Wroth has influence at court, signing his February 26, 1621/2 letter "your most wellwishing frend Edward Denny who for the great honor I bear somme of your noble allies and my deerly honored frends doe forbeare to write what I might" (Roberts, *Poems* 239). He makes a similar comment in a final undated letter in which he writes, "your Ladyship bidds mee speake what I can or will, for your noble allies will not thanke mee for forbearing you, nor spare mee when tyme shall serve for what I have don" (241).[20] Contemporary critics have speculated that Wroth had lost her clout at court, with Mary Ellen Lamb, for example, attributing Wroth's alleged fall from favour to her relationship with William Herbert, and suggesting that the *Urania* was a way to "demonstrate her worthiness of an aristocratic identity" ("Biopolitics" 111). But Barbara Lewalski, more logically, suggests that any "disgrace" suffered by Wroth was temporary. As Lewalski notes, Wroth participated in the funeral procession for Queen Anne in 1619, continued to be protected by the court from creditors, and in 1621 "received a present of deer from the King's forest as a mark of royal favour" (249).[21] And Denny's letters certainly affirm that Wroth was not without her "noble allies," one of them no doubt being the powerful Herbert. If Wroth was distanced from court affairs, it more likely reflected the general absence of women from court following Queen Anne's death.

Traditionally, Wroth's exchange with Denny has also been interpreted as occurring before her letter to the king's favourite, George Villiers, Duke of Buckingham, that implies that she wished to withdraw her books from circulation, "never purposing to

---

[20] Denny did have his own allies; Hay, for example, continued to look out for Denny at court even after Honora's death following a miscarriage (Schreiber).

[21] By 1621, Wroth was living primarily at her country house, Loughton Hall, which she inherited from her husband Robert Wroth (d. 1614).

have had them published" (Roberts, *Poems* 236). This reading again presents Wroth as a marginalized woman capitulating to controversies surrounding her book. But as Rosalind Smith has pointed out, the Denny exchange actually follows Wroth's letter to Buckingham, the latter dated December 15, 1621, and the first of the former, February 15, 1621/2 ("Lady" 410). In fact, the *Urania* had not been entered in the Stationers' Register until July of 1621, making it impossible for Denny to have read a published version of the text in early February of that year. Smith suggests convincingly that Wroth's letter to Buckingham is actually "an insurance policy, amounting to preemptively enlisting the protection of the favorite of the king … no evidence exists to suggest that Wroth's letter to Buckingham seeking the text's withdrawal from sale resulted in the text's suppression" (411). Barbara Lewalski, too, notes that Wroth's letter has the tone of a "pro forma disclaimer" in which she "indicates with some pride that she expects real difficulty in getting people to relinquish their copies … There is no record of any formal procedures to stop sales or recall the book" (249). The *Urania*'s appearance, as Josephine Roberts observes, also implies purposeful printing, as there is proof of corrections made during the printing process and the text's lavish presentation and titlepage itself implies intent ("Labyrinths" 184). Wroth's efforts to gain Buckingham's support for her book, particularly notable given the rivalry between himself and William Herbert, suggests instead an awareness on Wroth's part of its potentially mixed reception. Smith speculates whether such a reception might have developed from readers' comprehension of Wroth's political stance as an "ambitious, Protestant, female courtier in the Jacobean court" ("'I thus" 74), and one who includes herself in "a Sidneian textual tradition inseparable from a contemporary Protestant religious and political agenda

advocated by the radical Spenserians" ("Lady" 417). It certainly reveals Wroth as capable of playing the political game as well as any courtier, resourcefully seeking protection for her book and gathering "noble allies" before protests could occur.

Dining with James: Contemporary Critiques

Dining among nobility and royalty was a significant cultural and political event, as both Wroth's fiction and James's practice make clear. Most importantly, it was a public event of sorts, as the meal provided an opportunity to see and be seen as well as to judge and criticize, with not only the dinner, but also the host and other attendees subject to reportage. The ritual of public dining was one particularly favoured by James, although generally avoided by Queen Elizabeth, who had preferred to dine privately in the Privy Chamber. She did retain an outward performance which consisted of a rather outlandish enactment of the presentation and tasting of dishes for the invisible queen, and accompanied, as described by the traveller Paul Hentzner, by "twelve trumpets and two kettled drums" which "made the hall ring for half an hour together" (Hentzner qtd. Strong 205). Through this ceremony, Elizabeth continued a continental tradition formalized in England by Henry VIII, which was designed "to celebrate the divinity of royalty" (Strong 202). While Elizabeth was interested in maintaining only the trappings of this spectacle, James, with his renewed emphasis on divine right, fully participated in it, making public dining a weekly event, a practice continued by Charles I (207). Strange as Elizabeth's ritual might have been, it seems to have been intended for the observer, the primary participant being absent and thus unable to receive the adulation and submission of the spectators. James, on the other hand, embraced this foreign fashion and made himself its

physical centrepiece. Contemporary responses to James's public rituals and other types of over-lavish hospitality confirm that people were both watching such performances and responding to them. As Linda Levy Peck observes, "Court culture, rather than being closed and inward looking, was open to the gaze of the onlooker and directly connected to the wider world of London consumption" (*Consuming* 113). Exclamation and disapproval arose from the alimentary discourse of letters that touched on the dynamics of appetite, power, and foreign affairs. Wroth's philosophy of dining thus entered an established discussion that linked dinnertime to the politics of the Jacobean court.

That dining was a public function is established firmly by Wroth, as her many mealtimes allow both for self-revelation and unwanted surveillance. Love alliances are initiated over a plate of food, and disappointments are consciously hidden from fellow diners. But it is not only friends and rivals who watch others at table, as a satirical report by Philarchos, brother to Pamphilia, makes clear. Received fawningly by the king of Lycia, he is led to a "sumptious chamber" in preparation for musical entertainment and alimentary display:

> Then came meat in, served in with winde instruments, which though loud yett were they sweete, as all was rare in that place: thes parts beeing indeed above all others most adicted to sumptiousnes, and this prince, of any, most ambitious of curiosities and magnificent entertainments. Noe thing that ever could bee counted rare, missd, for all curious food and the handling of itt. Butt after, as to shutt up all in delicacie, came a banquett of such beauti and richnes [as] if the Gods had after some great warr com thither to bee reconsiled and this the triumphant feast for the peace making. I was never, you knowe, a good complementer, and therfor

> the more unfitt for this princes conversation, especially for a continuance. This Lord beeing the rarest and the Very perfect patterne to bee imitated, hee beeing the most excellent in that excelling part of courtship and faculty of cerimony every way, that his court, and especially him self in itt, ore above itt, seemed a rich treasure of curiosities and unanswerable compliments, I was truly ravished with itt. Butt beeing my part to speake, I sayd I had seene most part of the Christian world, yett till then never saw the curiosities of them. This mass of Eloquence accepted my few words, and soe wee had musick againe. (2.1.121-2)

Initially, Philarchos appears to laud the richness with which he is received. But his hyperbolic description, particularly of his host's self-aggrandizing conversation and pretence at "cerimony," belies his praise. He recognizes, in the words of Marxist theorist Henri LeFebvre, writing about the growth of bourgeois culture, that "The bizarre is … both a stimulant and a tranquillizer … it is a pseudo renewal, obtained by artificially deforming things" (119). Far distant from the homegrown foods of Gervase Markham's housewife, none of the prince's entertainments comes with the grace of nature; all are luxurious contrivances, achieved by ambition and pursued through addiction. He includes rarities simply that he may be seen to provide them; his delicate banquet might be pleasing, but appears more accurately to indicate "The quality of being addicted to pleasure or sensuous delights; voluptuousness, luxuriousness" (*OED delicacy* 1.). Such show without substance is exemplified by a recipe for casting images of "Rabbets, Pigeons, or any other little birde or beast" in sugar paste, with the marvellous result that "By this meanes a banquet may bee presented in the forme of a supper, being a verie rare and strange deuise" (Plat, *Delightes* 23-4). In a similarly empty performance, instead of

facilitating conversation with his guest as a good host should, the princely "mass of Eloquence" is more interested in displaying his "excelling part of courtship" and "rich treasure of curiosities," such curiosity no doubt implying not only rarity, but also "Undue niceness or fastidiousness" (*OED curiosity* I.4.a.). Philarchos, "never … a good complementer" places himself in contrast to this overreacher, suggesting that he embodies a natural nobility free from the self-important performance of his host.

Such excess was equally associated with James's reputation, and commentators could be as damning as Philarchos in their descriptions of inappropriately luxurious dinners and entertainments. Curtis Perry, among others, suggests that James's generosity was necessary for the maintenance of loyalty, but that its initial utility became cause for resentment because, like the king of Lycia, he never toned things down (115). As Pierre Bourdieu notes in his influential sociological discussion of the development of taste,

> the style of meal that people like to offer is no doubt a very good indicator of the image they wish to give or avoid giving to others and, as such, it is the systematic expression of a system of factors including, in addition to the indicators of the position occupied in the economic and cultural hierarchies, economic trajectory, social … and cultural trajectory. (79)

And James certainly made an image, however unwanted, for himself through the "novelty and scale of [his] giving." This became a point of comparison for those who looked back to the good old days of Elizabeth's reign, as she tended towards "stinginess" that might later be interpreted as good financial planning, even as James's reign could be designated as personally and politically corrupt (Perry 115). His extravagances were not limited to dining, and the court "patronized luxury craftsmen … sponsored luxury manufacturers"

and encouraged "the development of London, international trade, and the creation of new colonies which offered the raw materials for luxury goods" (Peck, *Consuming* 351). But the public nature of dining invited remarks; and although we are now reliant primarily on private correspondence for such records, the frequency of such remarks suggests the widespread nature of these attitudes. As Wroth makes clear, a host's display of power makes him vulnerable to comment at the same time.

The 1606 feast for the Danish King Christian IV was certainly one of the most notorious extravagances of James's realm, and contemporary and modern commentators note its unleashing of drunken excess in courtiers both male and female.[22] The classic report of the feast comes from the courtier Sir John Harington in a letter to Secretary Barlow in July of 1606:

> One day, a great feast was held, and, after dinner, the representation of Solomon his Temple and the coming of the Queen of Sheba was made, or (as I may better say) was meant to have been made ... The Lady who did play the Queens part, did carry most precious gifts to both their Majesties; but, forgetting the steppes arising to the canopy, overset her caskets into his Danish Majesties lap, and fell at his feet, tho I rather think it was in his face ... His Majesty then got up and woud dance with the Queen of Sheba; but he fell down and humbled himself before her, and was carried to an inner chamber and laid on a bed of state; which was not a little defiled with the presents of the Queen which had been bestowed on his garments; such as wine, cream, jelly, beverage, cakes, spices, and other good matters. The entertainment and show went forward, and most of the presenters

[22] Neville Davies has discussed Christian's visit in particular detail, suggesting that Christian and James were models for Shakespeare's Antony and Octavius in *Antony and Cleopatra*.

> went backward, or fell down; wine did so occupy their upper chambers. Now did appear, in rich dress, Hope, Faith, and Charity. Hope did assay to speak, but wine renderd her endeavours feeble that she withdrew … Charity … then returned to Hope and Faith, who were both sick and spewing in the lower hall. (119-120)

This amusing picture of debauchery, however, is soon transformed into an expression of political dismay. Prefacing his account with the comment, "In good sooth, the parliament did kindly to provide his Majestie so seasonably with money, for there hath been no lack of good livinge; shews, sights, and banquetings, from morn to eve" (199), Harington begins, much like Philarchos, with sarcastic praise that eventually devolves fully into criticism. For he finishes his letter by exposing James's use of parliamentary funds wreaking "devastation" on national morality and financial well-being:

> I have much marvalled at these strange pageantries, and they do bring to my remembrance what passed of this sort in our Queens days … but I neer did see such lack of good order, discretion, and sobriety, as I have now done … we are going on, hereabouts, as if the devil was contriving every man shoud blow himself up, by wild riot, excess, and devastation of time and temperance. (120)

Such collapse of morality, as Alastair Bellany observes, was

> already inherently political … the portrayal of the court as an image of virtue, a fountain of manners, was a central component in royal and other Jacobean writings about court life. Kings, poets and playwrights routinely linked court virtue to good government and argued that the moral order at court helped shape the moral order in the country. (137-8)

Unfortunately, observations like Harington's added to the "constant tension" between this ideal and the "parallel assumptions about the inherent corruption of court life" (138). Lack of control in the gastronomic realm implied a weakness in all areas of rational judgement; as Wroth suggests in her tale of Nereana, it was only with good self-government that one could become a truly noble ruler.

Courtiers and court observers would note much beyond the events of 1606. The English diplomat and ambassador to Venice and The Hague, Dudley Carleton, made several observations about James's early dining habits with particular reference to the international politics that went hand-in-hand with the meal. In gossipy exchanges of letters with man-about-town John Chamberlain, Carleton notes the entertainment of ambassadors as a significant occasion for an elaborate dinner. Like many of these observers, his understated description provides ironic contrast with the hyperbolic performance of the king. He begins with not much good to say about the Scots in general, writing on July 4, 1603, shortly after James's coronation: "We were much troubled here at first with certain wrangling Scots who, wheresoever they came, could have meat, drink, and lodging by strong hand" (35). Although this does not appear to be a direct criticism of James, Carleton reveals the English distrust of the Scots, who are portrayed as slaves to their appetites, uncivil, and possibly violent besides.[23] Later in that letter, he more overtly separates James from his countrymen, describing a public feast:

> the king … dined in public with his fellow knights, at which sight every man was well pleased save some Scottish kirkmen who said it sented to[o] mikle of the

[23] See Joan Fitzpatrick's *Food in Shakespeare* for further discussion of the English view of the Scots and Scotland as "a land and people with a barbaric history and innate savagery" (45-6).

> Pape. The French ambassador came to the dinner with great formality, to excuse his master's absence from the feast, to whom the king drank a health. (35-6)

James's conscious performance here alienates Scottish observers, but there is a sense in Carleton's letter that this dinner is designed to impress the French, and perhaps the Scots "kirkmen" are not so wrong in their criticisms after all. For James's love of performance quickly drained the coffers; as Carleton observes on the 15th of January 1603/4: "The valuation of the king's present, which he hath made to ambassadors since coming into England comes to £25,000" (56). Such generosities continue, and Carleton records on August 10, 1604 the visit of the constable of Castile who is in England to finalize the peace treaty with Spain:

> He is not defrayed till his coming hither, but here he is like to have amends for all. For both [the king's] lodgings he shall use, at Somerset House and the banqueting house at Whitehall where he shall be feasted, is furnished as if it were for the king his master, and great care is taken that no curiosities for diet shall be wanting. (61)

Such momentous political negotiations require a careful and bountiful reception of the ambassador, not the least of which concerns his dietary needs. Feasted and treated as king, and provided with "curiosities" peculiar to Spain, this ambassador's appetite is fed in part as persuasion, and Carleton implies that he is elevated beyond his natural station. But Carleton's observation of such elevation suggests his disapproval as well; is this peace, and the wooing of this unreliable ally, worth the expense?

Other commentators, such as Francis Osborne and John Chamberlain, dwell more specifically on James's appetites and love of splendour and sumptuousness; he does not merely cater to the desires of foreign dignitaries. Osborne, Master of the Horse to

William Herbert during James's reign, published a damning memorial of these years in 1658. Rather than blaming Charles for the civil wars, he places full responsibility on James: "He, like *Adam*, by bringing the Crown into so great a Necessity through a profuse prodigality, became the original of his Son's *fall*" (468). James's misdemeanours are many and varied, and give Osborne plenty of grist for his republican mill. His memorials of Queen Elizabeth, on the other hand, written at the same time, remember her as an even-handed and "beloved Princess" (466). He takes James to task particularly for "his partiality used towards the *Scots*, which hung like Horse-leeches on him" (532), and heaps great scorn on James Hay, Earl of Carlisle, sometime son-in-law of Edward Denny, and long a favourite of the king, for introducing in 1617 (Marcus 121) the extravagance of the

> *Ante-Suppers*, not heard of in our Fore-fathers time, and ... unpractised by the most luxurious Tyrants. The manner of which was, to have the board covered at the first entrance of the Ghests with dishes as high as a tall man could well reach, filled with the choicest and dearest viands Sea or Land could afford: And all this once seen, and having feasted the eyes of the Invited, was in a manner thrown away, and fresh set on to the same height ... I cannot forget one of the attendants of the King, that at a Feast, made by this Monster in excess, eat to his single share a whole Pie reckoned to my Lord at ten Pounds, being composed of Amber-greece, Magesterial of Pearl, Musk, &c. ... And after such Suppers huge Banquets no less profuse, a Waiter returning his Servant home with a Cloak-bag full of dried Sweet-meats and Confects, valued to his Lordship at more then ten shillings

> the pound. I am cloid with the repetition of this excess, no less than scandalized at the continuance of it. (533)[24]

Such an outrageous performance of waste is made even more striking by the king's continued support of Carlisle, who "lay always under the comfortable aspect of King *James* his favour" (534). Not only wasteful, this style of dining encourages the extreme indulgence of appetite, as demonstrated by the tale about the attendant who after his great pie "almost poisoned his whole Family, flying himself like the Satyr from his own stink" (533).[25] In contrast, Osborne describes Queen Elizabeth's hospitality as an example of true generosity:

> *Hospitality*, *Charity*, and *Splendor*, were dilated over the whole *Court*; where; upon the least acquaintance, all strangers from the Noble-man to the Peasant, were invited to one *Table* or other … And by this Generosity the ordinary sort of people were so endeared, as I have known some brag of their entertainment at Court twenty years after. (438)

Unlike James, Elizabeth included the "ordinary sort" in her generosity, understanding the importance of food in achieving the loyalty of all her subjects. With the reputation neither of exclusivity nor waste, her hospitality was shared among her countrymen in a demonstration of fair governance.

---

[24] A similar expression of disgust can also be found in a description by Horatio Busino, chaplain to the Venetian Ambassador, in January of 1618, who reports on banquet behaviour: " the parties concerned pounce on the prey like so many harpies […] The story ended at half past two in the morning and half disgusted and weary we returned home. Should your lordships writhe on reading or listening to this document you may imagine the weariness I feel in relating it" (Ashton 242).

[25] This is probably not quite what George Herbert had in mind when he wrote "The Odour, 2. *Cor.* 2": "How sweetly doth *My Master* sound! *My Master*! / As Amber-grease leaves a rich scent / Unto the taster: / So do these words a sweet content, / An oriental fragrancy, *My Master*" (ll. 1-5).

Although Osborne's objectivity might be questioned, the heart of his observations is confirmed by Chamberlain. James's desire to impress through splendour is attested to in a letter written to Dudley Carleton on January 5, 1608, where Chamberlain records:

> Yesterday [James] dined in the presence in great pompe, with two rich cupboards of plate the one gold, the other that of the house of Burgundie pawned to Quene Elizabeth by the States of Brabant: and hath seldome ben seen abrode, beeing exceeding massie, fayre and sumptuous. I could learn no reason of this extraordinarie braverie, but that he wold shew himself in glory to certain Scottes that were never here before, as they say there be many lately come, and that the court is full of new and straunge faces. (1.250)

Once again, Chamberlain notes James's alignment with the Scots and his desire to instil awe. "Extraordinarie braverie" is a descriptor that Philarchos might well have used in relation to the king of Lycia, with both monarchs interested more in show than substance. Carlisle's pie, of course, is a perfect symbol of such interest, and the waste, both financial and material that Osborne observes, is also remarked upon by Chamberlain who frequently records the cost of these courtly dinners. On February 22, 1617, for instance, he responds to the feasting of the French ambassador with the comment that "this feasting begins to grow to an excessive rate the very provision of cates for this supper arising to more then 600 [li] wherin we are too apish to imitate the French monkeys in such monstrous waste" (2.55-6). Not only is this dinner excessive, but it is French in its excess, a comment that may well allude to the growing perception of James as crypto-Catholic.

Such foreign-tinged excess, moreover, was not restrained to diplomatic entertainments. On January 10, 1618, regarding a dinner given by George Villiers, Chamberlain disapprovingly writes,

> You may guesse at the rest of the cheere by this scantling, that there were saide to be 17 dousen of feasants, and twelve partriches in a dish thoroughout, which me thincks was rather spoyle then largesse: yet for all the plenty of presents the supper cost 600 li. Sir Thomas Edmonds undertooke the providing and managing of all so that yt was much after the French. The King was excedingly pleased, and could not be satisfied with commending the meat and the master. (2.127)

Importantly in this excerpt, James is seen to give his full consent and approval to the dinner; after all, Villiers at this point is a favourite scarcely divisible from the king. Again, the sheer volume of food is commented on, initially in the ironic tone of understatement, but Chamberlain goes on carefully to distinguish "spoyle" from "largesse," acknowledging the necessity of the latter, and implicitly questioning the wisdom, and indeed Englishness, of the former. James's extravagant dining practices, with the implication of uncontrolled appetites and the corresponding likelihood of passion's rule rather than reason's, once again permits Chamberlain's insinuation of political mismanagement and misalliance.

Sweetness, Pleasure, and Danger

As letter writers criticize a king who stages increasingly lavish banquets in a suspiciously French style, Mary Wroth, over the course of the two parts of the *Urania*, develops a contrasting example of a Protestant plain-style dining practice. Wroth's

fictional dinners reveal what she values: a suitable finesse tempered with the true sweetness of the simple countryside. Yet what she suggests is not merely a good country meal; her interest in the sweetness of hospitality and dining is spiritual at heart, evoking also the sweetness associated with God and his words. True sweetness is godly, and the restrained, refined manner of eating that Wroth advocates is arguably meant not only to provide sweetness for the diners but also to model the sweetness of divine moderation that Dorothy Leigh alludes to. This response to the example provided by James is thus both religious and political, with the implication that moderate dining engenders thoughtful rule guided by proper Christian principles.

"Sweetness" was a term often used in relation to faith, and naturally lent itself to metaphors of food and ingestion. Sweet foods were also considered particularly nourishing, as Ken Albala observes:

> Sweetness indicates heat and moisture, which is a sure sign that a food will be nourishing. … The pleasant flavor of sweet things denotes their similarity to our substance in the powerful attraction they have to our body and ultimately the ease of conversion into it. However, because sugar and honey, theoretically the most nourishing of foods, are prone to combustion and extremely sweet fruits are prone to corruption, many authors did not include sweet foods in specific dietary recommendations. (82)

In nutritional terms, sweetness walked the line between the ideal and the dangerous, a practical application of the terms of faith, in which one might be swayed from divine sweetness by the temporal and damaging sweetness of the devil. The balancing act needed to welcome God's sweetness without tipping the scales of ingestion might be

elaborated by George Herbert, whose interest in sweetness in *The Temple* is such that Michael Schoenfeldt identifies it as "one of his favorite words." Schoenfeldt notes that Herbert uses the term to indicate both a "concern with health" and cleanliness, which might apply to the body and spirit (*Bodies* 99), and to "the sweetness of the divine repast," which, he notes, Herbert uses to "criticize terrestrial excess" (120). Herbert grapples with conflicting implications of sweetness in his poem "The Banquet" (177-78), which turns this sweet meal into communion. "O what sweetness from the bowl / Fills my soul, / Such as it is, and makes divine!" (ll. 7-9) he writes, but in a typical turn that acknowledges the conflict felt by humanity, he continues:

> Or hath sweetness in the bread
>
> Made a head
>
> To subdue the smell of sin;
>
> Flowers, and gums, and powders giving
>
> All their living,
>
> Lest the enemy should win? (ll. 13-18)

Schoenfeldt has suggested that "The nervous splendors of the Jacobean court supplied Herbert with an appropriate vehicle for divine glory. Divine power, in turn, provided the leverage for a profound critique of the social hierarchy" (*Prayer* 112). In this stanza, Herbert appears to allude to the courtly banquet, implying that the allure of sweetness can obscure sinful behaviour, its spectacle of waste being a symbol of the devil's success. But he reaffirms the contrastingly unearthly sweetness of divinity in the following stanza, noting that "Doubtless, neither star nor flower / Hath the power / Such a sweetness to impart" (ll. 19-21). In this case, although the sweet tastes of earth remain only a

foreshadowing of that to be found in heaven, they are a means of experiencing and evoking divine grace. But Herbert returns to the court once again in his third-last stanza, in which he turns his lowly status into advantage in accepting God's nutritional gifts:

> Having rais'd me to look up,
>
> In a cup
>
> Sweetly he doth meet my taste.
>
> But I still being low and short,
>
> Far from court,
>
> Wine becomes a wing at last. (ll. 37-42)

Wine, which Albala notes was seen as "the substance most easily converted into human blood and assimilated into the body and thus is the quickest to nourish" (74), is the method by which Herbert finds "What I seek, for what I sue" (l. 46). This symbol of Christ's blood is also a potential means of physiological transformation as it unites the human body with divine substance. Yet notably, it is Herbert's distance from court that assists his proper ingestion of wine; he does not lose sight of the appropriate goal of eating and drinking that invokes divine rather than earthly pleasures.

References to sweetness of course derive from biblical usage, which also allude to its dangerous doubleness. The Psalms frequently associate God with sweetness, for example. His judgements are described as "More to be desired … than gold, yea, than much fine gold : sweeter also than honey and the honeycomb" (*KJV*, Psalms 19:10); his words[26] likewise are "sweet … unto my taste! *yea, sweeter* than honey to my mouth!" (Psalms 119:103); and the wisdom that extends from knowing and accepting God is similarly filled with sweetness: "My son, eat thou honey, because *it is* good; and the

[26] The Geneva bible translates "words" as "promises."

honeycomb, *which is* sweet to thy taste : So *shall* the knowledge of wisdom *be* unto thy soul" (Proverbs 24:13-14). But the reader is warned also of the deceit that might lie behind offerings of sweet foods. Psalm 141, for example, pleads: "Incline not my heart to *any* evil thing, to practise wicked works with men that work iniquity: and let me not eat of their dainties" (4). And Proverb 23 provides a more direct warning, advising,

> When thou sittest to eat with a ruler, consider diligently what *is* before thee: And put a knife to thy throat if thou *be* a man given to appetite. Be not desirous of his dainties: for they *are* deceitful meat. … Eat thou not the bread of *him that hath* an evil eye, neither desire thou his dainty meats: For as he thinketh in his heart, so *is* he: Eat and drink, saith he to thee; but his heart *is* not with thee. The morsel *which* thou hast eaten shalt thou vomit up, and lose thy sweet words. (1-3, 6-8)

While sharing another's food is an act of intimacy in any era, at a time when ingestion and identity are intimately linked, the eating of foods provided under false pretences would logically infect unwitting diners, distracting them from their previously clear and intended paths. Ingesting evil can cause evil to grow, in other words; to be seduced by food implies the opening up of all other appetites and a corresponding spiritual descent.

But the psalms and proverbs were not the only source for understanding sweetness, as the meditations of Grace Mildmay (1552-1620) reveal. Born into a gentry family in Wiltshire, she is best known for her extensive medical knowledge and correspondingly voluminous legacy of medical receipts.[27] Her meditations, however, discuss the spiritual side of health, often referring to the Song of Solomon. She uses

---

[27] According to Linda Pollock, Mildmay left at least 270 receipts, many of which were later transcribed into a bound volume by her daughter. These included both medical and alchemical recipes, some of which are attributed to other individuals (98). Mildmay's receipts are remarkable for their specificity, both in their use of ingredients and in their description of disease. Unfortunately, only a few of her recipes have been reproduced in a modern edition.

metaphors of sweetness frequently, alluding to the "fruit" to be garnered from the "good things" that God gives, for example (87). Christ, too, is described as a source of food: "the precious box of balm and sweet ointment was broken when Christ was crucified upon the cross and poured out upon us from all his blessed parts, that every one of us might receive the sweetness and fruitfulness thereof" (88). And in a meditation on "The spiritual feast," which quotes directly from the Song of Solomon, she begins with the intake of foods, reciting, "I gathered my myrrh with my spice, I ate my honeycomb with my honey, I have drunk my wine with my milk" (75).[28] Eating was thus a primary way of relating to the divine, with sweet foodstuffs in particular transmitting qualities associated with God. This connection between food and the spirit is mirrored even in manuscript receipt books: those attributed to Dorothy Philippes (1616) and Elizabeth Fowler (1684) mingle sermons with cookery instructions. Another receipt book, compiled by Martha Hodges (*c.*1675-1725), contains hymns, religious poems, and a transcription of Psalm 51. That of Ann and Hester de la Bere begins with a long sermon whose title is full of food invocations: "The Land of Promise Flowing With Milke & Hony Containing A feast of fatt things A rare Cabinat of rich iewells In the Discourse of the precious promises Hebr. 6" (1). Although attached to the sermon that follows, this title could well serve double duty for the cookbook itself that gives women the ability to make this "feast of fatt things."

Some banquet items were also evocative of the divine through both sweetness and nomenclature, the sugar confection manus Christi, for example, being a "banquet

[28] See the Song of Solomon 5:1 (*KJV*).

favorite" (Fumerton, *Cultural* 135).[29] The 1627 receipt book attributed to Elizabeth Bulkeley, Wellcome Western MS 169,[30] provides a useful example of the importance of sugarcraft, and functions almost as a meditation in itself:

> There are six thinges wch are spetially to be noted in preserveinge, the first is to knowe when to clarifie your suger, secondly to knowe when your suger is making serruppe, therdly to knowe when it is in a full seruppe, ffourthly to knowe when it is boiled to a manuus [*sic*] Cristus height [to make the manus Christi sugar wafer] ffifthly to knowe when it is boyled to a candie height, and lastly to knowe when it is boyled to a casting height, and then to knowe what heighte to take your serrupe for every severall fruite, wch these six receits next followeing will direct you, both howe to knowe the boyling of your suger for preservinge, candinge, or makeinge of drie paste, of any fruites what soever, for the meaninge of your clarified suger, wch is heerin sett downe, is that, if you meane to preserve your fruites wth powder suger, then you must clarify it wth the white of an egge, to take away the drosse from it, but if you preserve with hard suger you neede not to clarify it, but dissolve it into faire water, and soe boyle it into his height as you please. (24r)

---

[29] Thomas Dawson's recipe for manus Christi reads as follows: "Take sixe spoonefull of Rosewater, one graine of Amber greece, and 4. graines of Pearle beaten verie fine, put these three together in a Saucer and couer it close, and let it stande couered one houre, then take foure ounces of verie fine Suger, and beate it small, and search it through a fine search, then take a litle earthen pot glased, and put into it a spoonefull of Suger, and a quarter of a spoonefull of Rosewater, and let the Suger and Rose water boyle together softely, till it doe rise and fall againe three times. Then take fine Rie flower, and sifte on a smooth borde, and with a spoone take of the Suger, and the Rose water, and first make it all into a round Cake, and then after into litle cakes, and when they be halfe colde, wet them ouer with the same rose water, and then laye on your golde, and so shal you make very good Manus Christi" (*good huswifes* 23r-v).

[30] This vellum-bound quarto is signed twice by Bulkeley, but the book contains multiple hands, few clearly identifiable as hers. The square italic hand that records the sugar instructions does not appear to be Bulkeley's, and continues for only four folios before disappearing.

The making of the six stages of sugar is further complicated by its eventual use ("preservinge, candinge, or makeinge of drie paste") and its original state (powder or hard). Grace Mildmay was likely versed in these details of sugarcraft, as she was well known as a sweet-maker; as Rachel Weigall reports, quoting from an unnamed source concerning a visit by James I in 1603, the dinner was

> most sumptuously furnished. The tables were newly furnished with costly banquets, wherein everything that was most delicate for the taste proved more delicate by the art that made it beautiful to the eye, the lady of the house being one of the most excellent confectioners. (133)

Dispensing a temporal imitation of godly sweetness, these banqueting pleasures should ideally invoke the "divine repast" (Schoenfeldt, *Bodies* 120) of wine, milk, and honey. And with the concurrent belief in sugar's properties as a medicine – its warming properties good for digestion, as well as for colds (Wilson, "Introduction" 3) – it might also look after guests' physical well-being.[31] But this sweetness might, as it no doubt did when James dined at the Mildmays', play a part in achieving political influence, power and friendship having its own sweet rewards. Certainly a later visit, in 1612, must have paid off politically, as it was then that James first met his great favourite, George Villiers (Weigall 133).

[31] Lynette Hunter notes that "By the mid-sixteenth century, if not considerably earlier, the housewife of the gentry was expected to know some basic uses of sugar-cookery as part of her medicinal knowledge" ("'Sweet" 40). By the seventeenth century, the skill of banquet preparation had exceeded the basic, however, as sugar became equally important as a symbol of status and expertise.

Dining Plain-Style with Mary Wroth

Wroth develops and contrasts the godliness of true sweetness with the seductiveness of false sweetness, providing templates for achieving a taste of the divine while warning about the dangers of seduction and human appetite. Mirroring William Vaughan's[32] instructions – "Let not the sugred baites of Sardonicall sinne allure your palates for the ouerthrow of your soules Palaces … Remember that long life relyes most on the restrayned throat; that sweetest health stands on the sparing hand" (3) – Wroth develops her dining philosophies most strikingly in the manuscript continuation of her romance. In this second part, Wroth attends more overtly to the political side of life, as her characters engage in wars both defensive and offensive, make marriages of political alliance, and consolidate their rule against the invading Sophy of Persia. But Wroth provides a holistic response to James's policies of non-engagement, attending not only to the practical side of governance, but also to the alimentary practice that sustains the work of a ruler.

Wroth provides several examples of the seductive potential inherent in sweet foods. Two notable instances involve the character of Selarinus, who bears the brunt of two wily seductresses. Son of Albanian royalty, he becomes king of Epirus, and spends much of Part 2 absent from his throne and in mourning for his recently deceased wife Philistella. In Part 1, however, he is unmarried but in love with Philistella when he is captured by Olixia, queen of Epirus. Desiring his love, she woos him with richness that of course includes food:

---

[32] Vaughan, interestingly, was also a supporter of Essex (Norbrook, *Poetry* 221), and later an advocate of colonial expansion, his later edition of *Directions for Health* intended to assist "*the rising Fortunes of our* Plantation in New-found-land, *whereby Iustice may shine in that incompassed* Climate" (A3v).

> Supper was servd unto him, with all servicable duty, infinite rich, and sumptuous fare, glorious plate, and nothing wanting, that so proud a woman could to satisfie that humour, thinke of; to gloryfie her selfe, and obleige him. (1.2.307)

Fine as this supper is, it is a gift of egotistical self-display designed to put Selarinus in her power; by accepting her food and hospitality, however forced, the young prince also allows her control over his body, though he struggles and eventually succeeds in remaining true to his inner self and Philistella. When the queen visits him later that night, he uncomfortably acknowledges himself her "Vassall at command," which pleases her no end, and she orders a lovers' banquet of fruit and wine to celebrate: "her maids … brought a marveilous lovely banket of severall sorts of fruites, both preserves, and other as that time afforded, and the delicatest wines Greece did know" (308). Exemplifying Vaughan's dismissive comment that "All Fruit for the most part are taken more for wantonnesse, then for any nutritive or necessary good" (95),[33] this queen supplies only the image and performance of love, and her self-serving sweetness, Selarinus realizes, is a test of the purity of his true love. After a walk in the garden, he finds clarity "under a faire shade of Oranges" and cries, "'I see my wrong … avoid temptations poore distressed Selarinus, and proud lascivious Queen, forbeare thy shame, and mine'" (309).[34]

Selarinus undergoes a similar test in Part 2, when he is captured by a spirit pretending to be the princess of Tartaria. Having escaped in the first book, he is recaptured in the second when the spirit takes advantage of his loneliness and desire.

---

[33] James enjoyed fruit, and was apparently known to be "a greedy eater of cherries, demolishing a whole bowl at one go" (Thirsk, *Food* 296).

[34] This episode appears in part designed to give Selarinus a throne of his own. Following his escape, the queen dies of pique, and it conveniently comes to light that Epirus had once belonged to Albania, at which point Selarinus reclaims the crown.

Transporting him to an island, which causes him some concern, she quickly erases all his fears with the food of lust:

> a many little things (like the discription of Faries) … furnisht that table with most exquisitt food and fruicts as ever hee had seene. Then the Lady came, satt downe with him, giving him all the kinde entertainement that cowld bee; then gave him a golden bole of curious wine (whereof she dranck haulf). And presently a sleepines and forgettfullnes tooke them both, soe as to bed they must needs goe. This was dunn, and in the midst of the night after hee had slept Very well, having forgott all things butt his love to the Lady, which increased soe Violently as hee was allmost wild for want of her sight, …When straict appeer'd the Lady with … six Fary ladds, each of them bringing in ther left hands delicate fruict; the last, a great glass of wine, which she, sitting downe on the bed side, presented to him. But hee, seeing the faireis gon, told her her mantle would soone bee layd of if itt pleased her, and his bed wowld bee a farr more easy seate. (2.2.304-5)

The spirit, perhaps because of Selarinus's susceptibility due to his grief over Philistella, is more successful than the queen of Epirus, and her banquet takes full control of his appetites. Inverting the purpose of wine and fruit as divine foods, seen most clearly in the Song of Solomon, Selarinus instead is robbed of his identity, reduced to the enchantress's sex-slave, and before long becomes the father of her two children. Her dainties remake Selarinus in the image she wishes, and he becomes blind to anything but her desires.

These tools of sweetness are primarily associated with women, both in receipt books and in Wroth's romance. Although country lads and lasses and the occasional dwarf might become purveyors of fruit, women remain the primary providers, whether

their intent is seductive or honest. Sarah Longe's manuscript receipt book provides a metonymical demonstration of the link between women and sweetness, as her recipes for biscuits, cakes, and preserves are occasionally separated by more overt symbols of the feminine. Recipes for "sore nipples" (11) and the prevention of miscarriage (21, 22, 23) remind the reader of the female body behind the text as the art of the banquet is juxtaposed with an interest in another sort of creation. This interpolation further evokes the attention to health so often referred to in cookery books; healthcare is also primarily women's work, as they attend to both the physical and spiritual health of their households. Despite Selarinus's evil seductresses, Wroth exemplifies this combined concern through significant examples of women who attend to their guests' full range of well-being, linking sweetness and virtue with healing hospitality.

The most striking embodiment of these qualities is provided by the lady of Robollo, whose story notably comes right on the heels of Philarchos's mocking report of his dinner with the king of Lycia. Once attached to the Morean court, a standard of good rule and hospitality for all, the lady's parents are given an island by the king and queen as part of their marriage gift, which the lady now inhabits. Born into such virtue, the lady also displays her own, telling the story of her first and only love. When he dies before their marriage, she pledges eternal loyalty to him, choosing to remain in a "strict and mayden state" for the rest of her life (2.1.151). Chaste and true on all levels, the lady reigns over an island which she describes as a haven for travellers:

> This is of all places in this part of the Christian world most frequented by strangers and passengers by reason of the sweetnes, privatenes, safenes, and espe[c]ially for the excelent, sweetly tasting waters heerein. (156)

Identifying her home with Christianity, the lady defines it twice also in terms of sweetness, both a quality of the place itself and of the water that might be ingested there. Curtis Perry suggests that Elizabethan pastoral evoked "praise for conventional Elizabethan virtues: by linking virtue to beauty and endowing the two with an active civilizing effect" and thereby "reinforcing" the connection between "power and virtue" (54). The pastoral world of the lady likewise evokes these aspects of virtue, beauty, power and civilization. In stark contrast to the island that houses Selarinus and his captor, her island is a place of spiritual and physical healing, a place for travellers to rest and rediscover themselves in this Christian context that provides a hint of Edenic sweetness:

> By this, they were arived att the Castle. Indeed, a most sweet place, curiously built, and with as much curiositie kept; the gardens, Orchards, and all places soe neat, soe fine, and most finely inricht with all sorts of flowers for every mounth and fruicts for all seasons, as itt seem'd a little Paradice to invite the Gods to come and banquett in. … Then they came into a faire hall, rarely and richly built, and with the richnes fine; for often richnes is soe burdened with grossnes and heavy waight of richnes as itt is confused in itt self and brought to the first beegining, dull earthe, butt this was nott soe. (151)

Wroth takes the opportunity here to suggest the meaning of true richness in an implicit contrast that assumes its fair naturalness in response to the "grossnes and heavy waight" of staged richness provided by those who wish only to reflect themselves, perhaps similarly to James's 1608 display of "extraordinarie braverie." The lady of Robollo is a female version of Philip Sidney's Kalendar in the *Arcadia*, who equally models the virtues of simple and honest hospitality:

> Kalendar knew that provision is the foundation of hospitality and thrift the fuel of magnificence. The house itself was built of fair and strong stone, not affecting so much any extraordinary kind of fineness as an honourable representing of a firm stateliness. The lights, doors and stairs rather directed to the use of the guest than to the eye of the artificer; and yet as the one chiefly heeded, so the other not neglected; each place handsome without curiosity and homely without loathsomeness; not so dainty as not to be trod on, nor yet slubbered up with good fellowship; all more lasting than beautiful but that the consideration of the exceeding lastingness made the eye believe it was exceeding beautiful. The servants, not so many in number as cleanly in apparel and serviceable in behaviour, testifying even in their countenances that their master took as well care to be served as of them that did serve. (71).

Such natural hospitality is also displayed during the meal provided by Wroth's lady, and although her servants are rude countrymen, they embody an honesty and truth that shines through initially brusque service:

> Supper time came, the meat serv'd in, in very good order butt after that Country manner: excellent fare, as daintily drest, butt brought in by thos clownes according to ther fashion: harty butt nott curious att all, soe farr from courtlines as scarce sivile demeaner was amongst them, yett duitfull to their lady as knowing obedience. And that was the heigth of ther knowledg, ther clenlines for curiositie, and goodnes for cerimony, soe as now Steriamus beegan to bee well-pleased. After supper, ther was Very fine musick, the Lady keeping Greeke musitians

> about her; then a delicate banquett, and that dunn, the thrise Noble Steriamus was conducted to his lodging. (153)

As at the house of Kalendar, cleanliness and goodness are valued instead of curiosity and ceremony, the latter two being favoured by the foolish king of Lycia, as we have seen. Indeed, it is the simplicity of the country, and the implication that the island provides all nourishment from its orchards, gardens, and cordial-like water, that Wroth implies is most valuable. Reminiscent of Markham and Plat, who encourage local production of foodstuffs for nationalist reasons, Wroth's interest in orchards also engages with seventeenth-century conversations that promote widespread planting of fruit trees to minimize food shortages and high prices.[35] The lady correspondingly provides enough food, but not too much; the body is not overloaded with "bizarre combinations of culinary fashion … goading the banquet-goer into gluttony" (Albala 111). Unlike his unfortunate brother Selarinus, Steriamus is pleased in body and soul, as his virtuous host feeds his appetite in an equally virtuous manner.

If the feminine polarities of sweetness constitute sexual seduction and virtuous governance, masculine varieties appear also to reflect the misuse of power and its contrastingly virtuous embodiment. While men turn to sweet foods less frequently, they do take advantage of mealtimes for assistance in seduction, and numerous adulterous alliances are pursued over dinner. Dettareus, for instance, courtier to the Dalmatian king, describes the king's pursuit of his daughter Bellamira despite her already-wedded state:

> But this King still loving her, and as a lover seeking all meanes to gaine his mind, never spared feastings, and all occasions, to draw company to the Court; yet all

[35] This is the primary concern of Arthur Standish's *The Commons Complaint* (1611), pages 22-28. Other encouragements to plant orchards can be found in N.F.'s *The Frviterers Secrets* (1604), and John Taverner's *Certaine Experiments Concerning Fish and Frvite* (1600).

> was because she must be there, otherwise were none in his opinion present: her husband also was extreamely favoured by him in outward show, and his house often visited by his Majesty. He saw it: but seeing his wives vertue spotlesse, over-lookt the temptations … Much adoe there was, all eyes beheld it, all spake of it, all admired her. I discerning this, at last gave over the Court, scorning to bee used in the slights, which were for her dishonour, and mine in hers: … No country sports faild to give delight, I oft-times with her, and her loving husband; they oft with mee. (1.2.176)

The king, less reliant on the seduction of sweetness, still relies on the insidious gift of food and feasts in his attempts to win Bellamira as his mistress. The delicacies he offers provide another kind of sweetness for both Bellamira and her family: "the poisonous sugar of flattery" (Sidney 398), or the sweetness of favouritism and the attendant seduction of power. Like Selarinus, Bellamira, her husband, and her father are equally at risk of losing sight of the honourable path; it is not until they leave for the country and the simpler, more natural and transparent sports therein that they are assured of safety by refusing to participate in the king's courtly games and shows of affection.

Other instances abound of food's use as a form of entrapment,[36] revealing its potential deceptiveness and its ability to turn the proper relation of appetite and reason on its head. A most striking example, which uses food to trigger disorder in a country already subject to misrule, comes at the beginning of Part 2 (1.14-21). In this episode, narrated by the duke of Saxony, Emperor Amphilanthus makes an official visit to the kingdom of Dacia, a country whose misogynist attitudes are interestingly reminiscent of those seen at James's own court. For despite the king's welcome, as he gives "all the

[36] This, of course, is a typical dramatic trope, with *Titus Andronicus* providing an obvious example.

Royall entertainment that might bee, ore could bee imagined," there is something wrong with the kingdom: "the country is a strict place, and a hard hand is held over the woemen, the men having an naturall knowing unworthines about them, which procures too much hatefull Jealousy." When the women are given some liberties, in this instance, being permitted to attend the court during Amphilanthus's visit, "itt is butt as if a triall of their fashions … soe as their libertie is butt the forerunner of a lastinger punishment and perpetuall suffring" (14). Such suspicion of and control over the female half of the kingdom indicates a deeper imbalance which plays itself out over the course of the emperor's stay in the country, and indeed explodes after a riotous farewell dinner fuelled with far too much drink, the sweetness of wine spawning a sour violence through misuse.

Dacia is strangely reflective of James's court that, after Anne's death, concentrated on excluding and dismissing women. Josephine Roberts mentions a report provided by the French ambassador Beaumont concerning James's treatment of women, as well as women's corresponding dismissal of their king:

> He piques himself on great contempt for women. They are obliged to kneel before him when they are presented, he exorts them openly to virtue, and scoffs with great levity at men who pay them honour. You may easily conceive that the English ladies do not spare him but hold him in abhorrence and tear him to pieces with their tongues, each according to her humour. (xv-xvi)

More immediately, James had taken it upon himself in the years following Anne's death to condemn what he saw as women's forwardness, with the wearing of masculine-style clothing at the top of his list of concerns.[37] Chamberlain notes that

[37] This concern in particular led to the publication of anti-crossdressing pamphlets such as *Hic Mulier* and its response, *Haec Vir*, in 1620.

> Our pulpits ring continually of the insolence and impudence of women: and to helpe the matter forward the players have likewise taken them to taske, and so to the ballades and ballad-singers, so that they can come no where but theyre eares tingle: and yf all this will not serve the King threatens to fall upon theyre husbands, parents, or frends that have or shold have powre over them and make them pay for yt. (2.289)

Wroth's men of Dacia appear to play out the results of such misogyny, their jealous nature leaving them without virtues such as "Noblenes, freedom, hospitality, freindship, blood, duty, faith," and inclined to "fury … to glutt unsociable cruellties" (16). It takes only a drunken feast to release these cruelties, as some of Amphilanthus's men meet

> the first beeginners of this fray, who full of wine, of madnes, of fury, and of victory, having imbrued them selves in innosent blood of their neerest neighbours, and some of their kindred … they fell on them, and they (brave and resolute) incounterd them, all unarm'd, butt with drinke on the one side, with truth and justice on the other, steeld with worthy courage and right in their owne defence, bravely maintained fight. (20)

Amphilanthus, eventually hearing the fray, formally calls the rest of his men to arms and the matter is finished in the streets. The duke of Saxony completes his report with the information that

> the King yeelding the soveranitie to the Emperour, all were putt to shamefull death that cowld bee found guilty of that fact, and the towne disarm'd, and by a decree made stronge, to last for ever. They are nott to beare armes, nor have any

> in their houses, and a garison of Germaines to remaine their of six thousand men … and the Governour to bee a Germaine, and still Chosen by the Emperour. ... Soe as now by an acsident Datia is made a member of the Empire. (21)

In this shameful conclusion, the imbalanced kingdom becomes an occupied state, subdued by Germans, this governing country evoking the German Prince Frederick. This suggests again that Amphilanthus is in part the successful version of the elector palatine, using his position as Holy Roman emperor to force the uncontrolled passions of men into order and re-establish active Protestant faith through the good rule of his countrymen. But the outcome also recalls the example provided by Nereana, in which immoderate consumption – "good feeding" (1.2.336) – paves the way towards disorder and corrupt rule.

It is the character of Claramundo, King of Cilicia, however, who retakes the "Citty most renowned and famous of the world," that overtly embodies the Christian sweetness imparted through a masculine version of virtuous hospitality. Clearly a model of the new Jerusalem of Revelations, the city is described in terms of its associations with sweetness, virtue, and Christianity: "the beautie and goodlines of the buildings, beeing most magnifficint and glorious … Churches of such glorious bignes and statelynes as never were ther any cowld compare with them" (2.2.239). After it is set on fire by its usurpers, "the basest scumm of hatefull Vassalls and slaves," the Christ-like saviour Claramundo leads his army to save it, dressed iconically in black armour decorated only by the emblem of a bleeding heart. Once he has vanquished his enemy

> the Army rose and marched towards the great Citty, the antient seat of the first Kings, wher the townes people receaved them with Joye, stroing the way in shew

> of the received comfort and new libertie in true subjection to ther King: non due to any other, nor is itt a griefe to obay, since the Government in Monarchi is the Sweetest, Noblest, and gentleest of all. (244)

Roberts suggests that this support for the monarchy is a "defense of absolutism" on Wroth's part, and one that mirrors James's own policies (xlviii-xlix). But the monarchy of Clàramundo is one that symbolically unites the king with God in a manner that recalls the covenant theology of Leigh and Clinton, for whom England is a new Jerusalem. Claramundo both reunites his torn kingdom and retrieves it from its Muslim overlords, returning it to a Christianized state. Wroth's vision of this Christianized East, and perhaps a rejuvenated Crusade, gives the reader a sense of her expansive hope for Protestantism, as well as its attendant sweetness. At the same time, this government is satisfyingly next to God, with its Christ-like "new Anointed King," a nursing father who will transmit the milk of the word to his people:

> hee the most reserved sweet prince on the earthe … feasted that Royall company … the Court was extreame glorious, all in infinite rich aparell, that itt made the night seeme as glorious as the day, and the day envy the nights more perfect brightnes … Then rare musick, but Very Sollume … him self as plaine as his Court sumptious. … his countenaunce, though excelling grave, yett soe excellent Majesticall as sayd for him therin did consist all greatnes, riches, and heroycall greatnes, and sweetest magnanimitie. (245)

Bringing light even to the darkness of night, Claramundo is as "reserved" as the court is "glorious"; he is revered despite his plainness, his natural nobility shining through, not needing the dazzle and overloaded richness of other, less worthy kings. While Wroth

suggests that courtly dining need not be corrupt, she also implies that what might be called the virtues of simplicity embodied in the lady of Robollo are necessary accoutrements. At the same time, both the lady and Claramundo appear to recall the sweetness of Elizabeth's rule, a term that Osborne notably uses to describe her calm and just governance:

> For through the series of her Raign she kept *Parliaments*, the pulse of this Nation, in such a temper as no signs appeared either of *Anarchy* or *Tyrannical Oppression*; her Government having been handed to the people with that sweetness, that it was esteemed of no less advantage to them, than their obedience brought honour to her. (463-64)

Such graceful rule in turn makes the ruled wish to be ruled, submitting and following the moderate example of their monarch. The similar honesty, grace, and good Christian hospitality displayed by the lady and Claramundo exemplifies the sweetness of rule through their meals that become acts of worship rather than appetitive frenzy, thereby providing the clarity needed for both a fine dinner and godly governance.

Visions of Virtuous Dining

The table, as both Grace Mildmay and Elizabeth Joscelin, author of *The Mothers Legacy*, establish, is a place for virtuous moderation, a place where food is meant, as Markham has outlined, "rather to satisfy nature than our affections, and apter to kill hunger than revive new appetites" (8). Moderate dining leads also to fine conversation that itself promotes good digestion and reasoned rule, a temporal rendition of the link between food and God's word. Mildmay includes in her autobiography thinly veiled

instructions for proper performance at table, focusing on dinnertime discourse. She gives two contrasting examples of conversational style, the first being negative:

> Also there was a gentleman of great account sitting at my father's table who spent all the dinner time in arguments and much talk, wandering in his discourses. So when dinner was done she [her father's niece and nurse to Mildmay and her sister] asked me if I did not observe the same and how he gloried in his own wit and to hear himself speak, and how his words were many but little true substance of matter, so that if we were so wise as he took himself to be she would judge him to be the wisest man in the kingdom. (27)

This unfocused, self-indulgent, and obviously unwitty discourse is reminiscent of that provided by the king of Lycia: empty words that reflect the emptiness of the speaker. But Mildmay also provides an instance of the purity of discourse as she holds up her father-in-law, Sir Walter Mildmay, as a model:

> He was a very pleasant conceited man at his table and continually would minister good occasions and give wise and profitable speeches to the great content of his servants and those that sat with him. He would never suffer any man to be evil spoken of at his table by any man whosoever, but he would cut him off in his speech and reprove him in a gentle and good manner. Neither would he suffer any of what calling soever he were to talk at his table of high matters of state, of the Queen, her counsel, nor of the nobility irreverently, nor prophanely of God, but he would cut off their speech in such a wise and loving manner that they ever took it in good part and reverenced him. (32)

In this performance, judged exemplary by Mildmay, discussion remains restrained and reverent; like the meal, conversation is meant to feed but not to excessively overstuff. As Michel Jeanneret suggests in *A Feast of Words*, his inquiry into the relationship of the meal to dinnertime discourse and literary narratives, "Words complement cooking; … they represent the specifically human contribution of a culture capable of keeping the excesses of nature in check … Table talk … gives form to desire, … it re-establishes man's unique role as a thinking animal" (93). In other words, the correct style of dining might well encourage rational judgement and good rule over oneself as well as one's subjects.

Elizabeth Joscelin, the well-educated puritan author of *The Mothers Legacy*, also mentions the importance of appropriate table conversation as part of her instructions to her unborn child:[38]

> The noone time is most vsed for discourse, it being all a man can doe while hee eats, and it is a time wherein a man ought to bee carefull of his speech, hauing before him Gods good blessings to refresh his body, and honest company to recreate his minde, and therefore ought to bee no way offensiue in his speech either to God or good men. (81)

Even more than Mildmay, Joscelin connects the meal with godliness, reminding her child that nourishment is "Gods good blessings" and that mealtime discourse should reflect the ingestion of such divinely derived foods. In the words of Jeanneret, the meal expresses

---

[38] The limited critical work on Joscelin has so far tended to focus on the privacy and "seclusion" communicated by her text (Poole, "fittest closet" 80; also see Feroli for a discussion of Joscelin's legacy as "an autobiography of a lost self" (91)). These readings, I would argue, reflect only a part of Joscelin's work, as she provides considerable guidance for a child's performance in the world. Not only does she briefly discuss table manners, but she also goes into some detail concerning such things as appropriate dress and devotions both public and private.

the "interdependence between the mouth that eats and the mouth that speaks" (2). The society that is joined at mealtimes should, clearly, reflect the eater's own values; this "honest company" permits the eater to rejoin the collective, to become once more part of a whole (Jeanneret 21). This collective discussion and reflection not only renews and stimulates the mind, it also permits the renewal of alliance and collective identity, whether religious or political. As Jeanneret notes,

> the meal does not only provide models of what it is to be well educated and to know how to behave. It also serves political ambition, is a mark of economic power and, in its symbolic language, can help stabilize a social hierarchy, the interdependence of the group, or various kinds of contract. (49-50)

A place for the measured exchange of ideas and witticisms, and thus an opportunity to confirm one's notions while learning more, the meal is a time for ritualized performance and negotiation between individuals reaffirming their status in the social contract as well as their contract with God.

Such moderate dining also finds some reflection in the poems of Ben Jonson, "To Penshurst" being a classic example as well as an ode to Wroth's parents.[39] Jonson's idealized depiction of Penshurst as a place not only of "plenitude and prosperity" but also "moderation" (Wayne, *Penshurst* 39), and his exploration of the countryside as a site of the "natural order of responsibility and neighbourliness and charity" (Williams 30), as well as "an ideal organic community in which rich and poor lived together in harmony and charity" (Norbrook, *Poetry* 169) is not unlike the impression given by Wroth of the

---

[39] Jonson clearly valued his relationship with Wroth, if only as his patron. He dedicated *The Alchemist* to her and wrote three poems in praise of her, perhaps the most famous being his "Sonnet, to the Noble Lady, the Lady Mary Wroth" (the others being 103 and 105 of *Epigrams*). Jonson praises Wroth's writing in his sonnet, claiming that "Since I excribe your sonnets, am become / A better lover, and much better poet" (ll. 3-4).

virtues of dining nobly and simply. Jonson evokes the hospitality that Osborne observes was dispensed by Queen Elizabeth, with rich and poor alike fed at the Sidneys' table: "Whose liberal board doth flow, / With all, that hospitality doth know! / Where comes no guest, but is allowed to eat" (ll. 59-61). Jonson also observes that he is treated as well as the king in a move that as Bruce Boehrer notes, is part of his "appropriat[ion] [of] traditional vocabularies of hospitality, manners, digestion … in the service of a largely unprecedented and self-aggrandizing literary professionalism" (86). Because such a subtle denigration of the king is so clearly related to Jonson's class as well as to his dependence on James and to his own identity as a poet, it is difficult to discern whether this might also contain more negative political commentary. But in Jonson's masque, *Pleasure Reconciled to Virtue*, written and performed in 1618 two years after the publication of "To Penshurst" in his *Works* (1616), Leah Marcus observes that "Jonson's theme of proper and improper hospitality, especially his treatment of Comus the belly god, evokes … a … license which currently governed culinary fashion at court" (121). Jonson's masque, she adds, "teaches a middle way between the prodigal feasting of courtiers and the equally undesirable alternative of no banqueting cheer at all" (123). An "unpopular" masque according to Stephen Orgel, in response to which James reportedly shouted "'Why don't they dance? What did you make me come here for? The devil take all of you, dance!" ("Introduction" 30), *Pleasure Reconciled* begins with the "bouncing belly" (l. 10) of Comus and contrastingly ends at "Virtue's seat" (l. 314). The followers of Comus are berated by Hercules and called "sponges, and not men," "Burdens and shames of nature" and "These monsters," this latter epithet similar to Osborne's description of Hay as a "Monster in excess" (ll. 85, 92, 102). Despite the apparently

frequent dances that follow, the rest of the text lends itself more to sermonizing than entertainment, as the audience is exhorted to "walk with Pleasure, not to dwell" (l. 296), and are informed that "what is noble should be sweet, / But not dissolved in wantonness" (11. 282-3). Prescient of Wroth's own dining discourse, Jonson emphasises that pleasure is not an end in itself but rather must be combined with the knowledge and performance of virtue that is necessary for truly good rule. The last two lines of the masque are most clearly emphatic about this matter: "'Tis only she [virtue] can make you great, / Though place here make you known" (11. 316-17).

One of Jonson's prime examples of virtue also makes an appearance in "To Penshurst." Barbara Gamage, the woman behind the scenes, is both invisible and present, with "her linen, plate, and all things nigh, / When she was far: and not a room, but dressed, / As if it had expected such a guest!" (ll. 86-88). Not only does her "high huswifery" (l. 85) provide this ease of hospitality, but her food provides the knowledge of virtue, at least to her children: "They are, and have been taught religion: thence / Their gentler spirits have sucked innocence" (ll. 93-4). The larger implication, of course, is that the Sidneys' table is virtuous in all respects, providing plenty, generosity, and pleasure alongside a truly noble and religious sweetness. Wroth's lady of Robollo and King Claramundo are her own explorations of such virtuous dining that involve an explicitly Christian nourishment of body and soul that encourages good self-governance and a correspondingly satisfying governance of others.

But Wroth's courtly country dining might also be understood as a healing practice, in which humours are balanced and spirits purified, and more might learn to reconcile pleasure with virtue. Her cookbook would perhaps look similar to Grace

Acton's five parchment-page octavo, Wellcome Western MS 1, that mingles fine country cooking with necessary remedies:

> 1 viande royal
>
> Take Greek or Rhenish wyne and clarifyde honie mix them well with grounde ryce ginger, pepper cinnamon and cloues saffron, sugar, mulberries and sandal-wood, boil the mixture and salt it and take care that it be thick …
>
> To cure a Wen[40] in neck.
>
> Chop an adder's tongue and pound wythe raw egg, sandal wood and saffron mix wythe lard from a fat hog and put on wen, follow by leche.
>
> Syllabub.
>
> 1 quartyrn of red wyne, 1 quartyrn of whyte wyne halfe quartyrn brandye sugar to taste, 1 bowle of milk half pound cream quartyr of a nutmeg. Milke the cow into the boule or pour from a height. (1)

The interlacing of medicinal and cookery receipts in Acton's manuscript acknowledges what Catherine Field calls the "overlap between medicine as cooking and cooking as medicine" (52). Women's medicinal foods might heal, it seems, the body and soul of the most lost and forsaken of royalty. If we return to Selarinus, now worn out and deposited in the "darck deserts of Morea" by the succubus, we see him revived by a series of female interventions intended to return him to his once noble identity and purpose. Melissea, the seer and frequent behind-the-scenes director, provides him magically with pure food, as if to cleanse him from the copious amounts of wine and fruit and falseness he had earlier ingested. Her cordial water is augmented by a goat and her kid, which begins Selarinus's return to health: "beeing extream hungry, a she goat came in his sight, having a kid

[40] A type of swelling.

runing by her." Drinking the milk, a symbol perhaps of rebirth, this being the original and originary food, he thinks "itt the best food hee had ever had," and the goat leaves her kid with him, an offering for his recovery (2.2.397). Melissea's work comes to fruition some time later in the house of an unnamed lady:

> The kid she tooke and gave order for part of that and other more rare provisions to bee made reddy for him, which was dunn in sivile, orderly, and quiett a way without noise ore boisterousnes, as was and indeed is the true essence and quintessence of true entertainment; the other butt Inn-like.
>
> Hee had longe binn fasting butt for his cordiall water and the Goates milke, which was butt little. Soe as the lady fearing suddaine eating might bringe som distemper in him, she gave him a glas of a curious wine of her owne making, which showld prepare him in safety to eate what he pleased and showld nott hurt him. (398)

Eating these foods associated with the anti-imperial politics of Tacitus, as well as with the cleansing and regulating experience of Nereana, Selarinus is both purged of his previous gluttony and prepared for a return to virtuous, reasoned living. Selarinus finishes his long recuperation in the country home of a woman who provides the "essence and quintessence of true entertainment," that does not include the raucous breaking of sugar plate, nor the outrageous gluttony needed to eat a £10 pie filled with indigestible yet sumptuous ingredients. Milk, water, and wine, gifts of women, God, and kings – Curtis Perry observes that "Milk and wine are both common symbols of royal and divine benignity" (129) – prepare Selarinus for recovery, establishing yet again the importance of sweet Christian foods and dining practices to nobility of rule.

CHAPTER 4

Feast and Fast: Taking Sides in the Civil War and Commonwealth

The Generals Dinner At the Lady Crispes (1647), an anonymous parliamentarian pamphlet, brings together royalists and army officers for a shared meal catered by a suspicious French cook. The nameless cook, as the tale goes, approaches the Lady Crisp, wife to the royalist merchant Sir Nicholas Crisp who had been part of a plot to take control of London in 1643. Promised information about her husband, who in the meantime had escaped to France, the lady agrees in exchange to allow her house to be used as a place for a meal, allegedly for two unspecified gentlemen and "Officers of Sir *Thomas Fairfaxes* Army" (2). Thus begins the record of the cook's multiple deceptions, as the meal is really intended for Fairfax himself. The cook then visits the Fairfaxes' residence, telling Lady Fairfax that Lady Crisp has invited them for dinner. Overcoming her husband's objections, "in regard of that good repute which the Lady *Crispe* hath in all those parts," the Fairfaxes agree to attend. Quickly swinging into action, the cook provisions the house for a dinner, with meat that "cost him only 16. s. and no more" (3). When Fairfax, his lady, Colonel Thomas Rainborough, and a Doctor Steines[1] appear at her door for dinner, all parties become confused, with Lady Crisp not expecting to host a

[1] Rainborough is less of an actor than a named presence, and is probably there as a political symbol. The doctor is an obscure figure, most likely included for the purpose of administering a poison antidote following the discovery of the French cook's deception.

meal and seeming inhospitable in her lack of preparation. Despite this uneasy beginning, each party chooses to assume that the other had ordered the dinner, and they tuck into their fittingly deceitful meal:

> There was of this meat which cost but 16. s. made above twenty dishes of meat, all French Quickshas,[2] such as none of the company knew what any of them were, save only the Cooke himselfe, yet they all had very good tastes, and it was supposed they had beene dishes of greater value: the Generall conceiving them to bee appointed by the Lady *Crispe*, shee by the Generalls Lady: but the Lady *Crispe* called for wine, and what she had in the house fit for that table. (5)

In the nature of genuine hospitality, which Lady Crisp attempts to provide, such deception cannot continue for too long, and honesty overcomes Lady Crisp's embarrassment amid the good cheer induced by dining:

> About the middle of the dinner, the usuall time of discourse, and drinking to one another, and bidding each other, much good doe it to you, and the like; the Lady *Crispe* made an Apology to his Excellency, and the rest, desiring to be excused, that she was so wanting in things fit for their entertainments, in regard shee had no knowledge at all of their comming. (5)

Given this rather alarming news, the party call in the cook, who defends himself with the story that "he heard his Excellency wanted a Cook, and he did not know how to present himselfe better to his Excellency, then by making a visible demonstration of what he was able to doe, and with little cost" (5). This weak explanation results in the cook's arrest, as

---

[2] The designation of the dishes as Quickshas (or kickshaws), an English derivation of the French "quelque choses," is itself a signal of the food's questionable quality. As defined in the glossary of the modern edition of Robert May's *Accomplisht Cook*, the quicksha was "a dish of no great consequence" and "(sometimes in a derogatory way) minor fancy foods" (33).

the diners have "great fear … of some poyson, that might be in the meate (as probably some mischiefe was in it)[.] They all had potions given them, and have since been in a course of phisick, so that (God be praised) they are all well" (6).

Whatever the truth of this unlikely story, it provides a remarkable example of the way food and its rituals developed as a medium for political propaganda in the divisive and unstable 1640s and 50s. This unusual dinner is fraught with behind-the-scenes political tension. Probably set during the Putney debates – Fairfax is in London only temporarily, returning "back to *Putney* after a day or two" (2) – Fairfax and the Leveller Rainborough attend the dinner as representatives of the two negotiating sides of the army.[3] While Lady Crisp clearly represents the royalist faction, Lady Fairfax is a more complex figure: a Presbyterian with royalist sympathies. David Underdown describes her as an "abrasive" woman who exerted a strong influence over her husband and "became intensely unpopular in the Army, especially after it was discovered in 1647 that she was relaying to Charles I inside information about discussions in the Army Council" (190). These sympathies explain her insistence on dining with Lady Crisp, despite the strangeness of an invitation being delivered by a cook,[4] and Fairfax's capitulation to her desires certainly exemplify her reported influence. It is possible, as well, that within this tale lies criticism of Fairfax, as his submission to feminine influence aligns him with the

---

[3] After entering London on August 3, 1647, Fairfax set up headquarters at Putney in September, with the debates being held in October and November. The debates were part of the army's negotiations with the king and parliament, but were also enmeshed with internal disagreements, primarily between moderates like Cromwell and Fairfax, who were interested in reaching an agreement with Charles that would limit his powers and provide for a regularly elected parliament, and the radical, Leveller-influenced faction that included Rainborough and advocated manhood suffrage and a parliamentary democracy. Financial matters added further complexity to these talks, as the soldiers were demanding their pay, but parliament wished to disband the army with minimal compensation. These divisions would become even more fraught after Charles escaped from Hampton Court on November 11th (Woolrych 381-90).

[4] The pamphlet draws attention to the unusual nature of the invitation on the titlepage, with the line "*How his Excellency was invited by a Cook.*"

parliamentary stereotype of Charles I,[5] and might in fact indicate the pamphlet's Leveller sympathies. Yet despite such possible slights, it is notable that these guests of disparate allegiances and beliefs come together around one table for what appears to be for the most part an enjoyable and harmonious meal, even as they collectively open themselves up to danger. If the French cook is a potentially destabilizing factor, evoking the perils of treating with a king overly influenced by his French wife, he is also the instigator of this curious gathering, joining erstwhile enemies through his deceits, as if his real purpose in this pamphlet is to reveal the more dangerous enemy to those distracted by internal squabbles.

While these warnings might have been variously delivered, the author's choice of a dinner as the framing event effectively allows him to enmesh several layers of implication in this pamphlet already dense with political allusion. References to gender, hospitality, and national health are readily packaged within the discourse surrounding food and its rituals, and the author takes advantage of this. The cook is established as an invader whose lies gain him access to a woman's home; his cooking is equally deceptive, with the lies infecting the food that passes across the boundaries of the diners' bodies, filling them not with English health but with suspiciously foreign dis-ease. The invasion of the nation, in other words, begins with this bodily intrusion masquerading as fine food. The author's insistence on the paltry sum of money spent on the dinner,[6] and his

---

[5] The recently published (1645) *The Kings Cabinet Opened*, which printed a series of Charles's letters to Henrietta Maria, was an effort on the part of radical parliamentarians to reveal the king's duplicity, including his allegedly excessive submission to his wife (Purkiss, *Literature* 72; see also Derek Hirst's "Reading the Royal Romance").

[6] According to Grace Acton's 1621 receipt book, which also contains a loose-leaf insert with an accounting for a substantial dinner, it was once possible to buy a reasonable amount of meat for sixteen shillings. While six swans cost fifteen shillings, twelve conies, or four dozen pigeons cost three shillings and four shillings four pence respectively. The 1640s were a time of high inflation, however, and it is realistic to think that cheap meat might have been all that was available to the cook for that price.

suggestion that the food was of lower quality than the diners surmised, adds to the notion that they have received a substandard and potentially damaging meal; their health, and quite literally the health of the nation – given both Fairfax's and Rainborough's roles in negotiating a peace settlement – are at stake. At stake too, are national traditions of hospitality, as the cook undoes them through his various misrepresentations, stepping into a role he should not have had in inviting Lady Fairfax to dinner, while pushing Lady Crisp aside to the extent that she cannot welcome her guests appropriately into her home. Although Huey-ling Lee has suggested that male cooks were often believed to protect diners from bad foods, becoming thereby "guardian[s] of humanity, protecting it from the invading force of wildness, bestiality, and barbarity," while women tended to let in "unruly, disruptive forces," this model is perhaps primarily applicable to early modern drama, as clearly the roles here are reversed ("Devil" 250-1, 256). An earlier and also anonymous pamphlet,[7] *A Trve Description of the Pot-Companion Poet ... Also, A Character of the Swil-bole Cook* (1642), draws a picture of a corrupt and corrupting cook as well, this time in the character of an army general who presides over an infernal kitchen "where his meat and he fryes together" (A3v) and where "he builds strange Fabricks in Paste, Towers, and Castles, which are offered to the assault of valiant Teeth" (A4r). After sending out his troops, he retires safely to the cellar "where he drinks and sleeps till four a clock in the Afternoon, and then returns again to his Regiment" (A4v). As foreign and other "disruptive forces" are embodied by these two very different cooks, English resilience and guardianship is initiated by Lady Crisp through traditions of hospitality that eventually unite the dinner guests in self-defence. Although England, because of its internal division, is posited as susceptible to this French invasion,

[7] Although no author is identified on the pamphlet, the EEBO database lists the author as John Earle.

manipulation, and deception, the pamphlet offers a chance for national redemption when even the party most allied to Charles and to France is forced to defend the boundaries of her own home.

I begin with this allegorical dinner to suggest the increased politicization of food discourse during the 1640s and 50s. As I will discuss, receipt books continued this trend, becoming royalist vehicles that insistently recalled the monarchy through allusions to food traditions and old aristocracy. Royalists turned to these books because of generic codes already in place; receipt book associations with women and secrets became part and parcel of royalist identity in the 1650s. Through such coded identification, receipt books advertised recipes to their readers, and a promise of pleasure and health that recalled the glories of a lost monarchy and hinted at those to come. The association of food with national healing was also adopted, but in a very different form, by the fasting pamphlets of sectarian women such as Sarah Wight and Anna Trapnel. Reminiscent of Elizabeth Clinton and Dorothy Leigh's insistence on women's powers of spiritual feeding, Wight's pamphlet reveals the female body as an exemplary site for national redemption and a model for England's renewal as the new Jerusalem. Trapnel's pamphlet, on the other hand, adopts the discourse of sweetness and healing lately seen in Mary Wroth's *Urania*, as Trapnel defines and contrasts the sweetness of divine hospitality and the selfishness of courtly dining in a denunciation of Cromwell's protectorate.

Royalists, Secrecy, and the Feminine

Pamphlets such as *The Generals Dinner* and the *Swil-bole Cook* were not anomalies, as food discourse was used across party lines to slander the opposing side. Lois Potter, in her illuminating analysis of codes of royalist literature, records satirical pamphlets by both royalists and Levellers, each depicting the other as cannibalistic gluttons (31).[8] Food also became a site of specific political contest following the parliamentary institution of public fasts and thanksgivings in 1641, an attempt to co-opt now royalist traditions of fish days and Lent. Potter observes that these new fasts and thanksgivings "had always been associated with the Puritan element in Parliament, which no doubt is why Elizabeth I indignantly rejected the first request for a public fast, in 1580" (139). Regular monthly fasts were held successfully from 1641 to 1649, and thanksgivings continued into the 1650s. These events too provided opportunities for satire, both in print and performance:

> Royalists responded with parodies of every aspect of each occasion, from the form of its proclamation to the speeches and sermons which were its centrepiece. In 1643 a royalist company deliberately spent the day after a parliamentary fast in riotous drinking and singing, while another town got into a fight over the celebration of a thanksgiving. (139)

Kristen Poole also acknowledges the prevalence of anti-puritan satire in the 1640s that depicted puritans feasting instead of fasting, and engaging not only in gluttony, but in drunkenness and lechery as well (*Radical* 7-8, 46-8). To offer an explanation for the popularity of such food-based satire, Poole examines Christian practices, elaborating that

[8] Potter provides the examples of two anti-Laudian pamphlets, *News from Hell, Rome, and the Innes of Court* (1642), and a play, *Canterbury's Change of Diet*. An anti-Cromwellian pamphlet with the same theme, *Epulae Thyestae, or The Thanksgiving Dinner*, was written in 1649 (31).

Christianity "depends on food rituals to enact and reinforce communal boundaries: the sharing of the eucharist celebrates the community's cohesion, while periods of fasting can invoke a meditative spiritual solidarity … competing notions of Christian community positioned these rituals as points of strife and cohesion" (48).[9] The civil war and its aftermath heightened tensions associated with dining rituals to both religious and political effect.

Given food's already politicized function during the civil wars, one might naturally expect that cookbooks would also be claimed for political purposes.[10] Previous commentators on the cookbooks of the 1650s have recognized their overwhelming tendency to overtly align themselves "to royalty or aristocracy" (Hunter, "Sweet" 51), and to assume "a fraternity of cooks catering to a privileged clientele" (Wall, *Staging* 53). This is particularly notable in contrast with earlier receipt books that tended to be written by professional writers such as Murrell and Markham. Recent work has also acknowledged that W.M.'s *The Queens Closet Opened* (1655), attributed to Queen Henrietta Maria, and the post-Restoration *The Court and Kitchin of Elizabeth* (1664), a satire of the Cromwells through the context of Elizabeth Cromwell's allegedly bad housekeeping, were written as royalist propaganda.[11] But no one has yet established the

---

[9] In an interesting development of the puritan thanksgiving, county feasts of the 1650s were adopted by royalist sympathizers. Newton E. Key records that "Feast sermons of the Midlands and West" in particular "noted the contributions that their locality had made to the Royalist cause during the civil wars" (236). He adds, however, that these were focused not only on royalist nostalgia but also on creating "a harmonic mean between divisive fasting and inebriated riot" (243); in other words, these feasts were a method of maintaining public order while also building a healthy collective.

[10] While critics such as Kevin Sharpe and Steven Zwicker have suggested that all styles of writing in the seventeenth century were tinged with political allusion, Nigel Smith has observed more specifically that following the civil war, allegiances tended to be flagged in the pages of manuals to do with "the land, landscape, cultivation and fishing" (*Literature* 12). Cookbooks, it follows, should not be exempt from this trend.

[11] It is difficult to miss the propagandistic slant of *The Court and Kitchin*, as the preface is more accurately a 46-page rant against the Cromwells. See in particular Katharine Gillespie's "Elizabeth Cromwell's Kitchen Court: Republicanism and the Consort" for a discussion of this receipt book. While the attribution

indubitably political claim of royalists to the cookbooks of the 1650s in general,[12] which not only kept royalist figures in the public eye, but also promoted royalist values and created hope for the national restoration of the orderly royalist household.

Generically, the receipt book was a natural place for royalists to congregate. Leah Marcus notes that Jacobean and Elizabethan "pastimes," often associated with high church festivals, were "abolished" by parliament, resulting in royalists reclaiming these "interdicted pastimes" as "a language of covert opposition" (21). Commonwealth receipt books similarly recalled courtly dining traditions, the pre-civil-war aristocratic milieu, and the now-banned celebrations of Lent and fish days. It could be argued, of course, that the protectorate had by now adopted at least some of these courtly trappings; Trapnel, for instance, criticizes Cromwell and his associates roundly for their royal appetites. But the referential framework of these books, along with other generic considerations, situates them clearly in the royalist camp. The ease with which they might be associated with codes of royalist literature as outlined by Potter in particular – femininity, secrets, and the elite – in fact welcomed royalist appropriation.

Both Potter and Annabel Patterson have remarked on royalist adoption of other genres, namely the play and the romance. Although, as we have seen in reference to both Sidney's *Arcadia* and Wroth's *Urania*, the romance had been used previously to critique the monarchy, romances, as well as dramatic works of the 1640s and 50s "belonged specifically to the royalists … simply to write in either form was to make a statement

---

of *The Queens Closet* might itself suggest its political purpose, only two critics so far have firmly established it in this light: Laura Lunger Knoppers in "Opening the Queen's Closet: Henrietta Maria, Elizabeth Cromwell and the Politics of Cookery," and Edith Snook, in "'Soveraigne Receipts' and the Politics of Beauty in *The Queens Closet Opened*."

[12] Elaine Hobby, however, has recognized that "it may be that cookery books published in the mid-seventeenth century will prove to be a useful index of ways in which political positions could be signalled" ("A woman's" 197).

about one's relation to the party in power" (Potter 74). The romance looked back to Barclay's *Argenis* in particular, a historical fiction written by a Catholic with "a firm commitment to absolute monarchy" (74).[13] Romances, as I have discussed, were often associated with women, but Charles's reign associated them with a more politically charged femininity:

> In defending the role of women and of the private life, romance allows the major religious differences between the king and queen, the hostility between their two countries, to be glossed over by the myth of love which transcends conflict. (Potter 80)

Charles had also claimed a role within romance tradition, styling himself as St. George whose image he used to support "his pacifism, his commitments to spiritual reform and monarchical absolutism, and his isolation" (Patterson, *Censorship* 168). Such alignment with chivalry did not save him from the negatively feminine associations of romance, however, particularly with the publication of his letters in *The Kings Cabinet Opened* (1645) that revealed him to be both duplicitous and uxorious. But royalist response to this embarrassment tried to rework such associations with effeminacy through a dogged insistence on these letters' maintenance of secrecy around the king's person; these were not revelatory of the king's inner self, they argued, because of the unapproachable "eternal virtues embodied in the figure of the ruler" (Potter 64). At the same time, royalists lauded the letters as a "defence of the place of romance within marriage" (Hirst, "Reading" 219).

---

[13] The *Arcadia* was also reprinted frequently throughout Charles's reign, in part a reflection of the fact that Henrietta Maria "had chosen the pastoral romance as her personal genre" (Patterson, *Censorship* 170, 171).

The notion of secrecy also derived in part from the romance. Patterson asserts that following the translation of *Argenis* "the word 'cabinet' and its synonyms begin to approach the status of key words" (7). As she notes, "the resolution of the plot depends on the safe reception of a 'little Cabinet. … There was in the letter a little key: the same indeed which was to open the Cabinet'" (8). The "key" of course suggested *roman à clef* revelations, but in this case, the revelations were to come through a knowledge not only of individuals, but of history, whose decoding presented certain truths (184, 188). Parliamentarian attempts to claim control over the presentation of such decoded truths through the publication of *The Kings Cabinet* was shortlived, however, as Charles posthumously helped to wrest secrecy back into the hands of his supporters with the publication of *Eikon Basilike* (1649). Reclaiming a positive association with femininity through the depiction of Charles as a martyred, Christ-like figure of "romance and female suffering" (Potter 212), it also responded to *The Kings Cabinet* in its authorized exposure of the king's secrets: "To counteract the damage done by the contents of the king's cabinet, it was essential to believe that the piety and forgiveness expressed in the posthumous book came from the still more secret cabinet of the king's heart." Potter cites a poem by Abraham Wright written about a particular edition of the *Eikon* which had been transformed "into a holy relic by being bound 'in a Cover coloured with his Blood.' The poem compares the book itself to a treasure but then insists that 'The chiefest Jewell is the Cabinet' – that is, the cover which recalls the king's martyrdom" (175).[14] Such association of Charles with secrecy, cabinets, and closets united the monarchy rhetorically with the already established tendency of receipt books to favour similar terminology. Not only did Charles's execution establish "a new political idea of what

[14] See Abraham Wright's *Parnassus Biceps* (54-5).

masculinity might be" in the face of the "masculine republic" of Cromwell, but it asserted secrecy as a royal virtue. In their appeal to both male and female readers, receipt books of the 1650s expressed a similar acceptance of what Diane Purkiss calls "a feminised model of the masculine" (*Literature* 2); such slippage might also evoke the new (royalist) national household now headed by an exiled queen and her son. As well, receipt books' regular references to the terms of secrecy would have strongly evoked the former king and his *Eikon* that situated his heart as the true prize for those who knew how to look.[15]

Importing French Civility

Receipt-book publishing almost came to a halt in the 1640s, although reprints of Murrell's *Two books of cookerie and carving* (1641), Hugh Plat's *Delights for Ladies* (1647), and Gervase Markham's *The English Housewife* (1649) were available. Despite the political critique originally communicated by these books, by the 1640s, they would have been most valued for their evocations of a past now longed for by embattled royalists, and might well have encouraged royalist adoption of the genre in the 1650s. Along with further reprints of the above manuals in particular, the 1650s saw a small flurry of publications beginning with a translated French cookbook by the professional cook Pierre François de la Varenne in 1653. Books by royalty, aristocracy, and members of the deposed king's household quickly followed, with ten books in all published between 1653 and 1658.[16] Only one book, *A Pretious Treasury*, published a bit earlier, in

[15] Secrecy could be found in women's manuscript books as well. Katherine Packer's 1639 book, Folger MS V.a.387, includes the frequent use of an unintelligible shorthand among the receipts.

[16] Two additional and anonymous publications, *A Book of Fruits & Flowers* (1653, 1656), a quarto handsomely illustrated with pictures of fruit, and *The Ladies Companion* (1653), are harder to locate politically. The latter text, however, does appeal to royalist elitism with its titlepage advertising receipts by "persons of quality whose names are mentioned." Among these are included "Lady Gray," probably Elizabeth Grey, Countess of Kent, and an attendant to Henrietta Maria.

1649, appears to break the royalist mould. Instead of participating in the "obsession with preserving the social hierarchy" (Potter 28) indicated by the status associations of 1650s books, this short pamphlet of medicinal and cosmetic recipes is allegedly written by two travellers, "*Salvator Winter* and Signiour *Francisco Dickinson*" (titlepage). While the book on the whole does not appear to offer particularly outlandish instructions (suggesting the very traditional application of clove oil for a toothache, for example), its titlepage indicates its more satirical purpose. This advertises the contents as a series of quack remedies with the woodcut on the cover depicting two men on the hustings playing to a crowd, one leaning towards the people with a small pot requesting "Your Money Gent."; the other stands in the centre of the platform claiming "Me cure all Diseases." The triangular puritan-style hats of the onlookers suggest the deliberate deception of the godly by these foreign charlatans with rudimentary English skills who are importing suspiciously foreign goods and practices.

La Varenne's *The French Cook*, however, gladly promotes the importation of French dining practices as well as French "civility, courtesie, and comeliness" (A8v). No snake-oil huckster, La Varenne is presented as offering legitimately healthful advice that is tied to the country of the exiled queen. Rich with prefatory material, this book does not have to mention secrets to associate the author closely with royalty – he is described as "the neatest and compleatest [cook] that ever did attend the French Court and Armies" (A2r) – and over half his book is dedicated to Lenten and non-meat dishes at a time when fish days had been eliminated "as a Popish institution" (Wilson, *Food* 46). Offering as well new and foreign delicacies – "severall Sauces of *haut goust*, & with dainty *ragousts*, and sweet meats, as yet hardly known in this Land" (A2v) – his food is both fit for a king

and for "the publique good, in teaching every body how to continue and prolong comfortably by a well relished diet, the sweet marriage of Soul and Body" (A2v-A3r). Philip Stubbes would have blanched at such a claim for French sauces, but this tie between both spiritual and physical health in the context of continental practice is a significant rejection of puritan dining habits.

Despite an emphasis on the French court – La Varenne identifies his employer as the "High and Mighty Lord, *Lewis Chaalon Du Bled*, Counsellor of the King" (A5r), for example – an interest in spreading his advice beyond elite readers is elucidated in the translator's preface as well as the translations of the original French dedications. The translator helpfully provides a table of non-English or specialized terms so that it might be "compleat and easie, to the end that it may be usefull, not onely for Noblemen and Gentlemen, but also for every private family, even to the Husbandman or Labouring man, wheresoever the English tongue is" (A4v).[17] This rhetoric of expansion might be worrisome to those concerned about French and Catholic influence on the nation, but this book expressly hopes to entice its readers towards traditions of French court cookery and away from English puritan parsimony. Likewise, in La Varenne's dedication to his employer he sets out his larger public goal, writing, "I think, that the publique ought to receive the profit of this experience of mine, to the end that it may owe unto you all the utilitie, which it will receive thereby" (A5v).

The French Stationer's dedication to the reader, also reprinted in translation, further develops these themes of useful and profitable knowledge leading to increased public health. Comparing this receipt book to those providing "remedies and the healing

[17] While many of these words are indeed specific to French, such as "Gaudiveaux" and "Litron," others would have been common knowledge to cooks and cookbook readers: "Lard," "Hash," and "To farce," for example, are part of a standard early modern English vocabulary of the kitchen.

of sicknesses with little cost, and without the use of Apothecaries," he presents *The French Cook* as one that "tends onely to the preserving and the keeping of health in a true and constant course … to afford unto man a solid nourishment, well dressed, and comformable to his appetites" (A8r). This is seen as a preventative health measure, and one that is economical, since

> it is sweeter by farre to make according to one's abilitie an honest and reasonable expense in sauces, and other delicacies of meates, for to cause the life and health to subsist, then to spend vast summes of money in drugs, medicinall hearbs, potions, and other troublesome remedies for the recovering of health. (A8r-v)

He once more establishes the potentially wide audience for this book, stating that La Varenne does not only provide "the finest and the daintiest fashions of making ready meates … but he gives you also the precepts of the most common and most ordinarie things," which are often misused in the more modest households where it might well make a difference in both economy and status (A8v). The stationer ends his dedication with a promotion of the French nation as a model for both "conversation" and "feeding." Citing the city of Paris as the centre of civility and hospitality, as well as "the seat of our Kings," he suggests that "other Nations may very well be stirred forward to conforme themselves to her, who as she doth excell in all what belongeth to life, cannot be ignorant of the meanes how to preserve it contented and peaceable" (A9r). The translation of this dedication gives English readers recovering from the straitened circumstances of civil war a reminder of the wealth and peace of France, in which a monarchy still reigns. This French food thus provides not only health, but a return to a corresponding civility,

implying that both the person and the nation can nourish themselves and others through this more stable foreign model.

A second French cookery book, *The Perfect Cook*, was published in translation in 1656 by the printer Nathaniel Brook, who also released W.M.'s collection of recipes attributed to Henrietta Maria, *The Queens Closet Opened* (1655).[18] This is less clearly royalist, and might even be seen to advocate a rapprochement between France and the protectorate, but its communication of political allegiance is ambivalent. Its publication the year after *The Queens Closet* might have encouraged assumptions about its political slant, and it appears that Brook might well have had known royalist sympathies. In 1656 he also published two compilations by John Phillips, Milton's nephew and author of *A Satyr against Hypocrites* (1655), a long and scurrilous poem about gluttonous, lecherous Presbyterians.[19] Although, as Gordon Campbell notes, Phillips's "political principles were flexible," his 1656 publications – *Sportive Wit, the Muses' Merriment*, and *Wit and Drollery* – were "'lampoons on some heroic persons of these late times,'" or members of the present government. Brook's approval of this project is clear, as not only was *Sportive Wit* burned on April 30, 1656, but *Wit and Drollery* was also put to the torch scarcely a week later (Campbell). Although Brook might have been simply hoping for notoriety, he also put himself at risk by publishing such volumes.[20]

---

[18] Brook also published Robert May's 1660 *The Accomplisht Cook*. May was probably a Catholic, and worked as a chef for a series of Catholic employers with whom he prominently associates himself. I will discuss this book further in chapter 5.

[19] This was also published by Brook.

[20] Although it is difficult to discern political alliance from publishers' lists, simply because business imperatives prevent exclusivity, Brook's list appended to *The Perfect Cook* confirms his royalist sympathies through its inclusion of a number of plays – *The Unfortunate Mother, a Tragedy*; *The Rebellion, a Comedy*; and *The Tragedy of Messelia* – as well as a Spanish romance – the *Illustrious Shepherdesse*.

Despite the publisher's political tendencies, M. Marnette's *The Perfect Cook* often appears to promote the republican cause. Far more focused on pastry than La Varenne's contribution, it includes only two Lenten receipts as well as a very short section on "The perfect English Cooke," which provides instructions apparently designed for the tables of country gentry, with recipes for eel, wildfowl, and fruit pies, and a series of fish recipes for those continuing to observe fast days.[21] This combination of French and English cookery is reflected in the prefatory material by its rhetorical truce between England and its foreign neighbours, with Marnette immediately stating his dual citizenship, being born in London to "*Forreign Parents*" (A3r). He describes himself as a soldier – perhaps a Huguenot – now returned in peace to the city of his birth, and dedicates his book to the wives of the Lord Mayor and Sheriffs of London, the ladies Dethick, Thompson, and Frederick, respectively. Naming them his "*Political Parents*" (A5r), he implies his alliance with friends of the protectorate: London was a republican stronghold during the civil war, and John Dethick, Lord Mayor of London, was knighted by Cromwell in 1656. Alongside his association with London, and in contrast to La Varenne, Marnette also distances himself from France and its court, claiming the "ill nature of our most famousest Pastry Cooks of the French Court, and of the City of *Paris*" due to their refusal to spread their knowledge "very profitable unto all such persons as are in health, and most requisite for such as are sick" (A6v).

Marnette, too, ties his cookery to the health of the nation, but, perhaps because of his nationality, his receipts might be construed not merely as an alliance between English and French Protestants, but like La Varenne's, as an invasion of French ideas. He notes

[21] This constitutes about a tenth of the book as a whole, with the "French Pastry Cook" taking up 312 pages and the English Cook only 34.

that he writes his book because of the "favourable construction" given by readers who "finde the Names of *French* Authours annexed to their Titles" (A6r), a description certainly applicable to readers of the royalist persuasion, and he also depicts London as a place for culinary conquest. His dedication to the London ladies permits flattery that initially pursues his project of reconciliation as he touts their skill in "*the Pastry Art, as that they may out-vie the best Forreign Pastry Cooks in all the World*" (A4r). Yet despite their expertise, he alleges that these recipes contain "*some Forreign Cates and Delicacies, happily never as yet tasted within her walls*" (A4v). While his inclusion of women suggests their part in the regeneration of England through the infusion of foreign foods, the image of foreign delicacies breaching the walls of London is also rife with military connotations. In the end, he depicts a complete conquest of his readers, but this is downplayed through an association with female hospitality and healing:

> hence forwards there will not be any City, Town … where the good Housewives, and ingenuous young Maidens may not on a sudden be able to give a most noble and delicious treatment unto their Kindred, Allies, and Friends, upon all occasions, and in all the several seasons of the year, as well to the sick, as to those which are in health, with a great deal of ease and pleasure to themselves, and a very inconsiderable charge or expence (A7r).

The tension between expressions of Protestant alliance and foreign, and royal, invasion is perhaps coincidentally illustrated by the final two of his "fifty five ways of dressing of Eggs" (titlepage). The first of these, titled "*being exquisite, and Courtly, buttered Egges*" gives instructions for mixing egg yolks with meat broth, sugar, lemon peel, musk, and rosewater, with the eggs "tame[d] with a silver spoon" (308-10). The

following receipt is for the "*stirring of Eggs, called in French* ala Hugenotte, *or the* Protestants *manner*," a no less complex instruction for eggs with meat broth, orange, lemon, mushrooms, ambergris, and sugar (310-12). Whether this juxtaposition is truly significant, it is difficult to say, but it is notable that of the final section of egg recipes, only the Huguenot eggs appear in the table of contents, with the interesting typographical alteration: "*called in French,* ala Hugenotte *or Presbyterian Eggs; &c.*" (A11v).[22]

Gentry, Royalty, and their Cooks

Although the French cookbooks might well have had different political agendas, they both insisted on their contribution to health and hospitality that assumed an interest in the collective nation rather than the individual. The insistence on national improvement was part of a wider discourse of the 1650s as the country emerged from both civil war and bad harvests in the 1640s. Methods of raising and diversifying agricultural production through enclosure and converting "neglected" land, such as the fens, to pasture, could once again be considered and were frequently carried out (Thirsk, "Agricultural" 303-4). In Joan Thirsk's words, this decade was "rich in constructive thought about improving food supplies and the health of all" (*Food* 99). Despite protests from fen dwellers and users of the commons, the attitude towards these projects was generally positive as it was assumed that such changes could take place "without hardship to the poor" (Thirsk, "Agricultural" 318) and, on the contrary, provide much-needed jobs (321). Husbandry manuals gained a new lease on life, with titles such as Walter Blith's *The English Improver* (1649) and its update, *The English Improver Improved* (1652,

[22] This recipe appears in the later receipt books of Robert May (1660) and William Rabisha (1661), both of which are overtly royalist in tone. If not in Marnette's book, then by the Restoration this receipt was simply a successful egg recipe.

1653).[23] And if profit motives were in effect, these too were generally justified as promoting the "general betterment" of the commonwealth (Wrightson 203). The microcosm of the farm contributed to the well-being of the state as a whole, with the individual improver being both personally and financially improved in the process.[24] Although the art of cookery was several steps removed from agricultural production, the language of improvement and the language of health appear to have been inspired by markedly similar interests. As Albala notes in reference to dietaries, "Improving diet benefits the state, not only creating a stronger populace ready and able to defend the realm but a sober people willing to invest their savings in profitable venues rather than squander them on superfluous enticements of the gullet" (223). Healthy individuals, then, were able to contribute to a healthy nation both militarily and economically. And in a royalist context, such national health necessarily included the return of the king.

The first English receipt book to overtly keep alive the king's memory was *The Art of Cookery Refin'd and Augmented,* published in 1654 by Joseph Cooper, "chiefe Cook to the Late KING" (titlepage). After declaring this relationship, Cooper proceeds in his introduction to evoke the spectre of royal legitimacy through allusions to receipt book "*cheats*." These books, promising more than is really offered, are designated "false pretenders" to his more legitimate publication (A2r). Suggesting that rationality is the key to determining such legitimacy, he goes on to aver that his knowledge will contribute to "the Common good" (A2v). But this knowledge, he suggests, is also risqué; he tells his designated audience of ladies that "if any thing displeases you, it will be to see so many uncommon, and undeflour'd *Receipts* prostituted to the publique view, which perchance

[23] These two manuals were dedicated to parliament and to Cromwell, respectively.
[24] See Andrew McRae's "Husbandry Manuals and the Language of Agrarian Improvement" for more discussion of these relationships.

you will think might have been plac'd better among the paper secrets in a few of your Cabinets" (A2v). Seemingly recalling the exposed letters between Charles and Henrietta Maria, Cooper's book both reveals and returns his information to female cabinets for use against false pretenders and in hope of a better future.

In 1655, a year of royalist uprisings, came the publication of two books by W.M.: *The Queens Closet Opened* and *The Compleat Cook*, both published by Nathaniel Brook. *The Queens Closet Opened* repeatedly evokes royalist memory, both in the titlepage and note to the reader. Henrietta Maria is recalled three times in the titlepage alone: first in the title itself, then in the assertion that the "Incomparable Secrets … were presented to the QVEEN," and last in the source information that these recipes were "Transcribed from the true Copies of her MAJESTIES own Receipt Books." Even though W.M. makes apologies for transgressing the privacy of the queen's chamber, he notes the use of this publication in maintaining Henrietta Maria's memory in England:

> I thought this publication to stand upon no ordinary tearms of honour, as it might continue my Soveraign Ladies remembrance in the brests and loves of those persons of honour and quality, that presented most of these receipts to her. (A4v)

The book is also rife with references to secrets and closets, and rather than being a "companion-piece" continuing the satire of *The Kings Cabinet* as Diane Purkiss suggests (*Literature* 77), it seems more accurately to align itself with the *Eikon Basilike* as a negation of the *Cabinet*, with W.M.'s reference to the queen's recipes as "Reliques" as dear to him as "my dearest bloud" (A3v). Also seeming to refer to the exposure of the royal letters, W.M. suggests that the unauthorized circulation of these recipes inspires his own righting of the matter: "I should not have thought it lesse then Sacriledge, had not

the lock been first pickt, to have opened the Closet of my distressed Soveraigne Mistresse" (A4r-v). Acknowledging his questionable act, he also makes clear that his purpose is to redeem, rather than slander, "for a more general good" (A6r). Jayne Archer has suggested that W.M. is in fact Walter Montague, secretary and spy to the queen, in her article "The Queens' Arcanum: Authority and Authorship in *The Queens Closet Opened* (1655)." Montague himself would have been immediately recognizable as part of the royal household, and as the author of *The Shepherds Paradise*, performed at court in 1633 by the queen and her ladies (Potter 79).

W.M. suggests also that national regeneration can be found in the institutions of tradition passed down through the experience and practice of "Persons of Honour and Quality" (A3r). Laura Knoppers notes that such a reference both emphasises the "elite origins of the recipes" and involves Henrietta Maria in a wider English "social network," sharing hospitality, knowledge, and healing among each others' households (473). Although W.M. does not specifically discuss the health benefits of these receipts, this goal is implied since the majority of the proffered instructions are medicinal. The first and longest part, the "Pearl of Practice," consists solely of physic, with many attributed recipes including "*A drink for the Plague or Pestilent Feaver proved by the Countess of* Arundel, *in the year* 1603" (25-6). Referring not only to a well-known member of the nobility who was also a practising Catholic, this recipe also recalls the year of James I's coronation. The second section, the "Queens Delight," which deals with the art of preserving, includes recipes for perfumes and medicinal distillations as well. Continuing the interest in the "common good," this section continues to evoke nostalgic memories of a nobler past through the receipt attributions. Most notable are the perfumes attributed to

King Edward and Queen Elizabeth (272); others are attributed to royalist icons Sir Walter Ralegh and Sir Kenelm Digby (274, 290-91). Even the beauty recipes, as Edith Snook discusses, continue the emphasis on national recovery: "the recipes situate beauty and fairness as signs of a vital constitution and natural power. Recipes stand among the queen's epistemological contributions to balance and order, in the body and in the nation" ("'Soveraigne" ¶3).

W.M.'s second publication, *The Compleat Cook*, which includes mostly cookery recipes with a few banquet receipts tucked in, is less overtly political in its message, being printed without dedications or introductions. Even so, its publication in the same year as the *Queens Closet* would easily inspire the idea that these cookery recipes, too, were secrets from the kitchens of Henrietta Maria.[25] The titlepage also advocates a loyalty to a European style of cookery (and by association, style of government), stating that its design is in "Expertly prescribing the most ready ways, Whether, *Italian, Spanish,* or *French*. For dressing of *Flesh* and *Fish*, Ordering of *Sauces*, or making of PASTRY." Although it includes English favourites such as "*To make a Collar of Beef*" (22-3), it is more important for the author to appeal to royalist sympathies by situating the recipes in a European context, often indicated by the descriptor in "*the French manner*," or by the use of French words such as "*To fricase Campigneons*" (Table F2v-F3r). Once again, attributions and a healthy dose of fish recipes add to recollections of an elite context in which the traditional nobility and its rituals were honoured and practised.

[25] Later editions saw *The Compleat Cook* and *The Queens Closet* published together, which would have more conclusively connected the two books. There does not appear to be any evidence that *The Compleat Cook* was based on any recipes by Henrietta Maria, however, and the decision to unite the two was likely that of the publisher (White 74).

Perhaps taking advantage of Cromwell's illness and death, the fourth of these cookbooks written by employees of the exiled monarchy was published in 1658. Reproduced, as it notes, "from a choice Manuscript" belonging to Sir Theodore Mayerne, the French Huguenot physician who served both James I and Charles I, this book also directly reminds the reader of the royalist past (titlepage). Although Mayerne had died in 1655, his name and recipes remained useful for royalist purposes, and he is clearly identified on the titlepage as "Physician to the late K. CHARLES."[26] Alluding to his alchemical practice in its title, *Archimagirus Anglo-Gallicus*, this book provides a range of receipts from cookery, to elaborate sugar-work instructions, to making preserves. Suggesting a rapprochement of sorts with the descriptor "*Anglo-Gallicus*" in the initial title, the titlepage reiterates this joining of cultures in a later note concerning the recipes: "According to the *French* Mode, and *English* Manner." Both Archer and Knoppers note that several of the cookery receipts are very similar to those in *The Queens Closet*, perhaps another level of allusion to be caught by careful readers (17, 483).

Although political criticism remains implied rather than overt in the publisher's preface, this preface exemplifies many of the key indicators of royalist style identified by Potter:

> Royalist style … was marked by a taste for obscurity, mystery, and playfulness. This was because, first, these were qualities which could be seen as distinguished from the vulgar; second, because they facilitated deception at a time when it was a necessary survival tactic; and third, because they justified that deception by

[26] Mayerne appears to have been Henrietta Maria's doctor rather than Charles's, an alliance that became patently clear when he refused to join Charles in Oxford in 1642, and stayed in London instead. Although this was initially regarded as desertion by the royalists, he did attend Henrietta Maria at Oxford two years later when requested (Trevor-Roper).

> invoking a language in which context was everything and literal meaning nothing. (209)

Well-larded with Latin phrases, a snippet of Greek, and clever jokes, this short preface is less interested in conveying information than in asserting its learned wit. But it does return to the importance of food and the cook in civilizing an uncivilized world. Quoting Plautus, the publisher refers to the cook as "*The preserver of mankind*" and notes that the "*Art of Cookery, and Teaching men to eat, not like Canniballs, but, like men, is none of the lowest Requisites in a well-governed Common-wealth*" (A2v). Perhaps recalling civil-war pamphlets depicting cannibalistic feasts, there is an implicit suggestion that re-education is necessary even now. While on the one hand accepting the present form of government, the introduction on the other suggests the lack of civility and even bad governance stemming from the commonwealth with the implication that the art of cookery has indeed been neglected during this period.[27] And like the other cookery books, this alludes to the health that comes from good cooking, or "*Kitchin-physick*," and asserts the book's interest in general improvement: making "*badde meat good, and good meat better*" (A2v). As well, the preface separates those "*substantiall men inclined to Hospitality*" in their county seats from the charlatans spreading "*the too Epidemicall humour of these times*" and "*drain[ing] the[ir] purses*" (A3r), a clear reference to post-civil-war overturning of traditional social relationships. This publisher's preface might also locate the political interests of the printers, G. Bedell and T. Collins, who published gentry receipt books as well. Although their list of advertised publications includes such items as the declarations of "his Highness the Lord Protector" between 1653-1654 (G3r),

[27] This was a charge that would be taken up robustly by the author of the anti-Cromwellian cookbook *The Court and Kitchin of Elizabeth* published in 1664.

their publications tend to evoke memories of royalty, thus confirming the hints provided by the preface. These include *The Hystory of King Henry the VII* by Francis [Bacon] Lord Verulam, for example, and a selection of romances and plays: *Orlando Furioso*, *The Nuptial Lover*, and *Hypolito and Isabella*, as well as three plays by Jonson and four by Davenant, both identifiably royalist figures (G2v, G4r, G6r).

Bedell and Collins published two of the three gentry receipt books of the period, both firmly royalist in association: *Natura Exenterata*, attributed to the Countess of Arundel, Alethea Talbot, in 1655,[28] and Lord Patrick Ruthven's *The Ladies Cabinet Enlarged and Opened*, in 1654.[29] A third manual, published in two parts – *A Choice Manual* and *A True Gentlewomans Delight* – in 1653 by "W.I. Gent.," was based on the receipts of Talbot's sister, Elizabeth Grey, the Countess of Kent.[30] Lynette Hunter has discussed the books of Talbot and Grey, along with that of Henrietta Maria, as early and exceptional examples of female "technical and scientific" publishing, and indeed, these books are the first to be so closely linked to female authorship ("Women" 89).[31] Although these are illuminating examples of female interest in science and medicine, as are many

---

[28] The receipt book is not directly attributed to her on the titlepage, although a picture of the countess is printed alongside it. Bedell and Collins do, however, list her as the author in their catalogue at the end of *Archimagirus*, likely the most compelling evidence for her authorship (G4r).

[29] An earlier edition of this book was published in 1639 (Hunter, "Women" 89), but the publisher's introduction to the 1654 edition suggests that it comes with improvements, including new recipes and a more highly categorized text.

[30] Elizabeth David has suggested that it is only the *Choice Manual* and its medical receipts that can be attributed to Elizabeth Grey, and that the cookery receipts of *A True Gentlewoman's Delight* appear to be written by another. The two volumes might have been printed together for cost purposes and to raise sales, and certainly the implication of relationship might have increased the number of interested readers (48, 51). Their combined publication could have inspired the co-publication of *The Queens Closet Opened* and *The Compleat Cook*; like these books, only the *Choice Manual* is directly attributed to Elizabeth Grey on the titlepage with *A True Gentlewoman's Delight* gaining fame only implicitly.

[31] Earlier allusions exist, however: Gervase Markham, for example, attributes the medicinal section of his *English Housewife* to an unnamed "honourable Countess" (3), and dedicates it to Frances, Countess Dowager of Exeter. This, and similar dedications and attributions to women in the early seventeenth century might have inspired the publication of these later texts under female names. As Hunter has observed, "the female aristocrat, even when not claimed as the source of the text, was invoked by authors as an authority with whom the text might be appropriately associated" ("Books" 519).

of the manuscript receipt books of the period, it is unclear what role, if any, these women had in publishing these manuals, given that they were no longer alive at the time of publication. It is certainly likely that the prominence of their names might have encouraged women such as the prolific Hannah Woolley to publish in this area, but in the context of the period, I would argue, it is the class and political affiliations of these authors that are of most relevance, rather than gender. Although Ruthven as well as Grey and Talbot had died by the time these were published[32] (Talbot in 1654 and Ruthven and Grey also quite recently, in 1651), their names would readily have evoked a royalist past. Both Talbot and Grey had attended Queen Anne, and later became close to Henrietta Maria, with Elizabeth joining her in the Netherlands in 1642 (Hunter, "Women" 90). Talbot and her husband Thomas Howard were publicly identified with Catholic interests and Talbot in particular had drawn attention to herself in the 1630s for "Catholic proselytizing" (Smuts). Ruthven would have been recognizable in his role as a royalist general during the civil war. Like the employees of Charles and Henrietta Maria, these receipt-book authors were politically identifiable individuals. Although Grey's publisher W.I. tries to play both sides, dedicating the *Choice Manual* to Letitia Popham, wife of parliamentary general Alexander, and, it appears, a patron to W.I., Grey remains inescapably associated with the royalist cause; and indeed, Popham himself had begun to distance himself from Cromwell and eventually lent full support to Charles II and the Restoration.

Not only did these individuals recall a royalist past, but these books continued to employ identifiably royalist rhetoric. The word "secrets" is used in all three titles, and Ruthven's book once again evokes the cabinet. An emphasis on national health remains

[32] Henrietta Maria is an exception, as she lived until 1669.

in effect: *A Choice Manual*, *Natura Exenterata*, and the majority of *The Ladies Cabinet* provide medicinal receipts. Talbot's book, like Henrietta Maria's, situates its receipts within a larger social circle, providing "A Catalogue of such Persons of Quality, *viz.* Knights, Doctors of Physick, Gentlemen, Countesses, Ladies and Gentlewomen, &c. by whose Experience, these Receipts following have been approved" (A3r). Reasserting an earlier "social hierarchy" (Potter 28), the book also engages in word play similar to de Mayerne's, with Latin phrases, Latinate words, and a Greek signature – Philiatros. Ruthven's book, with a preface by M.B., most likely the publisher M. Bedell, returns to the image of the cabinet in a manner reminiscent of Abraham Wright's description of the *Eikon*, once again restoring the contents of the opened cabinet to rightful purpose: "(since its called A Cabinet) laying each Jewel in his peculiar box; and so having fitted it for readier use, to have sent it abroad again to salute your gentle hands the second time" (A2v). If we recall Wright's assertion that "'The chiefest Jewell is the Cabinet,'" referring to the king's blood binding his own words, this line in Ruthven's book appears to suggest the king's return, refitted and "sent … abroad" for a "second time."

Sarah Wight's Fast for the Nation

If royalists claimed the receipt book for their purposes, sectarian women often approached the question of food through the practice of the fast. Their interests in these opposing practices of dining and food refusal were surprisingly similar, however, as each method promoted a desired-for political future. It was not only food that these publications had in common; the sectarian pamphlets of Sarah Wight and Anna Trapnel returned to the theme of health and healing in aid of their particular hopes for national

recovery. But the visions of a healthy nation promoted by these women were as opposed to the royalist vision as their fasting was opposed to courtly cooking. And like the women I have previously discussed, Trapnel and Wight integrate the discourses of food and religion as they present political possibilities and criticize the political present.

Sarah Wight appears initially a poor symbol for political propaganda. Essentially a suicidal teenager, fifteen-year-old Sarah Wight was "struck *deafe, blind,* and *lame*" (3) after four years of acute depression. Confined to her bed, she then began what was to be a miraculous seventy-six-day fast during which she ingested only small amounts of water and the occasional small beer. Providing counsel for numerous visitors, Wight is presented by her amanuensis, Baptist minister Henry Jessey, in *The Exceeding Riches of Grace Advanced*, as a spiritually troubled girl who undergoes an *ars moriendi* struggle and rebirth, through which process she becomes an "*Empty Nothing Creature*" who channels the word of God (titlepage). Published in 1647, the same year as *The Generals Dinner*, Jessey's pamphlet calls for unity among London's political and religious sects during this rest between civil wars. Through Sarah Wight, who continually stresses the necessity for a belief in God over that in the merely human, this pamphlet taps into the millenarian enthusiasm of the decade that saw the civil war as a sign of Christ's forthcoming reign on earth. The frequently discussed female technique of the fast is in this case only a bridge towards the critically unacknowledged, and more overtly political, link made between Wight's physical trials and the health of the national body politic that turns her recovery into a symbol of hope for England's status as a new Jerusalem.

Wight was not the author of *The Exceeding Riches*, and her biography and words of inspiration were probably recorded and certainly published by Jessey, whose interest in

promoting his protégé is abundantly clear.[33] Yet as both Jennifer Summit and Joad Raymond have noted, whatever the male editor's textual manipulations, the female voice does not disappear in the "interpretative struggle" that ensues (Summit 10). Raymond, in writing of Anna Trapnel, observes that she gained "publicity" and "authenticity" by allowing her words to be recorded by her male editor in *Cry of a Stone* (311); under cover of well-known ministers, both women became widely-distributed preachers, with Wight apparently providing an inspiration for Trapnel's later, and more overtly political prophesying in the 1650s. As the receipt books of female gentry and royalty might also indicate, with their recipes similarly framed and presented by the voices of male publishers, women's voices and bodies served a purpose for various political tendencies. While royalist women provided a tie both to the monarchy and to the still-living queen in particular, dissenting women of the middling classes were perhaps as far away from the image of the king as one could get. And Sarah Wight was certainly one of these, with her deceased father "sometimes of the *Auditors Office*, and of the *Exchequers Office*" (Jessey 5). Carola Scott Luckens suggests that she was a particularly good symbol for the imminence of the second coming, as her "public raising up by God signified that the exaltation of the lowly signalled the coming of God's new Kingdom, where all that was high would be brought low in a new world order" (227). Wight's lowly voice found considerable popularity, being reproduced in seven editions between 1647 and 1658 and reprinted as late as 1761.

As Keith Thomas has observed, the independent sects were particularly attractive to women, since these offered a recognition of women's spiritual equality, and gave

[33] Their relationship appears similar to that between Anne Askew and her publisher John Bale, who printed her examinations by religious authorities in 1546 and 1547 with the goal of turning her into a Protestant martyr.

women greater agency within their congregations. In taking on public roles, however, women still faced social censure. Concerns about women's insubordination through their insistence on obeying God and the church rather than their husbands or fathers (Thomas, "Women" 52) were expressed by pamphlets portraying female sectaries as women of excessive appetites.[34] *A Discoverie of Six women preachers* (1641) for instance, defines them as "Gossips" (2) more interested in stuffing themselves with food – "a good fat pig to breakfast, besides a cup of Sack or Claret to wash it down" (3) – than in contemplating matters of the spirit. The traditional interest in controlling a woman's physical desires explains the emphasis on the fast in conjunction with preaching or prophesying; by refusing earthly food, women ensured that their bodies could be seen as pure and contained vessels whose controlled appetites were available only to God.[35] Jessey's pamphlet might also have derived some of its authority from earlier accounts of young fasting women, which, as Nancy Gutierrez discusses, reached their height of popularity between 1589 and 1635. Gutierrez notes that many of these women "had come to abhor food as a result of an illness and … believed they were healthy only *because* they had rejected food." Wight certainly participated in this convention, but her subsequent

---

[34] Discussed in detail in Sharon Achinstein's "Women on Top in the Pamphlet Literature of the English Revolution."

[35] For discussions of female prophets and fasting as purification and justification for speech see Phyllis Mack's *Visionary Women: Ecstatic Prophecy in Seventeenth-Century England*; and Jane Shaw's "Fasting women: the significance of gender and bodies in radical religion and politics 1650-181." For connections to maternity, the female body and the public sphere see Sharon Achinstein's "Women on Top in the Pamphlet Literature of the English Revolution"; Elizabeth Sauer's "Maternity, Prophecy, and the Cultivation of the Private Sphere in Seventeenth-Century England"; Katharine Gillespie's *Domesticity and Dissent in the Seventeenth Century: English Women Writers and the Public Sphere*; and Diane Purkiss's "Producing the Voice, Consuming the Body: Women Prophets of the Seventeenth Century." For fasting as theatre see Susan Wiseman's "'Unsilent instruments and the devil's cushions: authority in seventeenth-century women's prophetic discourse." For a discussion of fasting as a link to pre-reformation Catholicism see Stevie Davies's *Unbridled Spirits: Women of the English Revolution: 1640-1660*; and Vera J. Camden's "Attending to Sarah Wight: 'Little Writer of God's Wonders.'" For fasting as part of an *ars moriendi* struggle towards rebirth see Carola Scott Luckens's "Propanganda or Marks of Grace?: The Impact of the Reported Ideals of Sarah Wight in Revolutionary London"; and Barbara Ritter Dailey, "The Visitation of Sarah Wight: Holy Carnival and the Revolution of the Saints in Civil War London."

validation of what Gutierrez terms "God's goodness and might" ("Double" 83)[36] had a uniquely political thrust.

While fasting may well have enabled and justified the speech of certain female prophets, this strategy also gave women the opportunity to unite the domestic and the public spheres, as their weakened bodies lay on display in the usually private space of the bedchamber. Jessey's pamphlet and Sarah Wight's body bring the public and private together to appeal for national unity in the face of uncertain peace and political and economic disarray. Barbara Ritter Dailey has suggested that the impetus behind the pamphlet was "to support the toleration movement and to help reconcile the violent divisions of Londoners between 1645 and 1648" (450). Wight's fast, which began on April 6 and ended June 11, 1647, took place during the latter stages of the first civil war, shortly following parliament's decision to disband the army and negotiate with the king for a Presbyterian settlement of the church in exchange for his return to power. By June, the king had been seized by the army, at which point Oliver Cromwell and other army officers stepped into the negotiating breach with the Heads of Proposals that provided for a limited monarchy and an elected parliament. Wight's words provide an aura of certainty for those confused about where their sympathies should lie – with God rather than the earthly negotiators – and her stream of visitors includes, as Dailey notes, "Independents, Presbyterians, and sectarian radicals" all waiting for reassurance. Dailey suggests that Jessey's lists of visitors turn his pamphlet into "a kind of petition" (452), perhaps recalling the example set by the army's petition to parliament appealing the conditions of

[36] Gutierrez pursues more detailed discussions of fasting women in her book, *'Shall She Famish Then?': Female Food Refusal in Early Modern England.*

its disbandment.[37] Jessey himself states that he names so many to encourage the credulity of others, that they might "sooner beleeve, and reap benefit" through a belief in the "mysteries of God" (a1v). This rationale not only suits the petition but it also, like the lists of attributions in receipt books, situates Wight and this pamphlet within particular social networks. In this light, it is not only the described bedchamber of the fasting woman which becomes "a sectarian congregation" (Gillespie, *Domesticity* 184), but the pamphlet itself that draws an ever-growing collection of people around the imaginary body of Wight.

Given Jessey's millenarian views – he eventually associated himself with the Fifth Monarchists in 1654 (S. Wright) – a growing audience for Wight's word was highly important. B.S. Capp has noted the rising prevalence of millenarian attitudes among puritans in the 1640s; such beliefs were even promoted in the state-sponsored fast sermons established in 1640 (38). Millenarianism came to be associated primarily with the Fifth Monarchists by the 1650s, but this sect shared a more general conviction in the second coming of Christ and the establishment of a new Jerusalem in England. Relying on Daniel and Revelations for scriptural support, these believers saw themselves as saints who would prepare the way for the miraculous event; prophecy as well as scripture was deemed important as they headed towards the promise of Christ's return (Hinds, *God's* 8). The civil war itself was seen as progress towards this event; in this sense Jessey's "mysteries of God" included political shifts and depositions as the earthly kings were gradually eliminated to make way for the heavenly. In his summation concerning the

---

[37] Jessey provides an initial list of visitors, which includes Anna, or as he writes, Hanna Trapnel, in his dedicatory "Postscript to the Reader" (a1v), but he continues to name them throughout his publication, with an especially long list on pages 9-10. These petition-like lists may be particularly relevant as the petition was also a form that came to be associated with women in the 1640s, as Elaine Hobby has noted ("'Come to Live'" 77; also see Mack 122).

import of Wight's story, Jessey emphasises the necessity to believe in God's will, framing his pamphlet as a warning to "*Inferiours*, to *wives*, to *children*, to *servants*, *flock*, and *subjects*; against fearing *man*, that shall *dye*, more then the *living God*," or, in other words, a justification for these broadly defined "inferiours" to attend to a superior greater than those on earth, and support the overturning of mortal hierarchies (153). In this context, Wight's fast fits the mould of puritan fasting identified by Kristen Poole: "The practice of *not* eating, virtually impossible to police, reclaims a sense of personal somatic autonomy that directly undermines the power of the body politic" (*Radical* 50).

Jessey also connects Wight to the future Fifth Monarchist Anna Trapnel, referred to by Jessey as "H.T," to further ensure that his pamphlet will be linked to this explicitly political belief that requires the deposition of the earthly king. Trapnel, too, began a short fast from June 9 to 16, which was accompanied by a series of prophecies. While the relator notes that her prophesying "seemed strange to him" in the light of Wight's more conventional and less confrontational scriptural advice, he spends two more pages justifying prophecy through scripture, thus reassuring himself and his readers of the equal legitimacy of Trapnel's enterprise (139-41).[38] If Wight's millenarianism is less overt, given away only by her mention of the lowly being saved (16), for example, and her allusion to God's gift of a kingdom (49), whatever she has not said might be filled in by Trapnel, a figure whom Jessey clearly assumes his readers will know.[39] Wight's fast and recovery thus becomes not only a symbol of unity or of the "triumph of good, of the

[38] Jessey's Oxford biographer, Stephen Wright, notes that he was a moderate millennarian, which included, in his case, a "broad acceptance of the Cromwellian establishment" despite the contradictions of these two stances.

[39] As Sue Wiseman has observed in "Margaret Cavendish among the Prophets," Trapnel "draws on Wight's use of body and voice" and goes beyond it (101). Although Wiseman here discusses issues of theatricality and performance, Trapnel also goes well beyond Wight in her ability to use and engage with contemporary political discourse, seen particularly in her 1654 pamphlets, *Report and Plea* and *Cry of a Stone*.

healthy state of her soul and of the ultimate triumph of the independent church" (Shaw 104), but a promise of things to come.

If Jessey's pamphlet contains the inherently political call for sectarian unity in preparation for the coming millennium, it is Wight's physical trial that communicates the hope for national healing in conjunction with God. For her body becomes both a mirror of the nation's disarray and a model for its recovery. Christopher Hill has noted that the 1640s were "the worst decade of the period," with the low point reached between 1647 and 1650, when the price of food skyrocketed and wages failed to keep up (86). Repeated bad harvests caused famine conditions and riots in certain areas (Underdown 90), grain exports were prohibited, and by 1649, with the renewed war, the stress caused by the continual need to feed the army was acute (Thirsk, "Agricultural" 302). But famine and dearth also gave rise to larger concerns, and pamphlets of the 1640s delivered warnings about God's punishment of sinners by the mighty trio of plague, the sword, and famine, the latter seen as the most dire of the three. *Englands Remembrancer, or A Warning from Heaven* (1644) castigates the nation for its sins and counsels "*true repentance*" (5) to avoid worse treatment from God, as the titlepage clearly explains:

> Setting forth the two Iudgements of God now upon the Land,
>
> *viz. Sword* and *Plague*
>
> With an admonition by a well-willer to his Countrey, for prevention of the third Iudgement threatned, which is Famine.

A Bottle of Holy Tears, published a year later, finds the disaster approaching more quickly, and provides a verse rendition of Lamentations

> Very suitable for these times, wherein we have a call every day to learne the Lesson of *Englands* Lamentation, Warre and Plague having made a strong entrance into divers parts of the Land, and leane Famine and Desolation knocking at the doore for entrance. (titlepage)

The punishment of starvation, inflicted by God on the wayward, whether for their own or collective sins, is also endured by Sarah Wight, whose body experiences extremes of dearth for an astounding seventy-six days. The prophet's starving self becomes a place for the enactment of national upheaval; her trials mirror those of her country, with her recovery and redemption offering national solace and hope. Wight is established as a miraculous example, her survival dependent on her faith in God's will; her eventual recovery alludes to Christ's healing of a twelve-year-old girl in Mark 5:25-43 (137). Like the healed child, Wight arose, walked, and ate once again, her afflictions erased, and her body, though weak, relatively unaffected by the prolonged avoidance of food. But more pointedly, it is Wight's return to food that overtly connects her body with that of the nation, as her fast ends in a "bodily refreshing in a cheerfull manner … eating and drinking of what was *sweet* and *pleasant*" (145). This brief reference to Nehemiah 8:10 explicitly ties Wight's fasting and feasting to the recovery of the nation and its redemption as the new Jerusalem in its recollection of the repentance of the Israelites and their renewed faith in God that leads to the signing of a new covenant.

Wight's progress towards this particular place of faith is one that is gained through struggle, not unlike England's recent experience. Her recovery and survival is a distinct contrast to her life before this event, in which she was afflicted by suicidal misery

from 1643, when she was twelve. Dating to the beginnings of the civil war, Wight's attacks on herself imitate the increasingly violent battles that scarred the country, as she

> sought to beat out her braines, against the wall, many times: and thereby was bloudy and sweld. And sought to cast her selfe down from steep places: and got knives and other things to kill her selfe withall: but was miraculously preserved. (59)

Embattling herself with the sword, Wight is eventually afflicted with the inexplicable condition that begins her fast:

> *All was shaken, and shee trembled exceedingly. That her hands were clinch'd up together, and so were her feet, as if it were in a Cramp, and her mouth was drawn up, as a purse, and her eyes were with the eylids folded up and closed, and her hearing was taken from her; and shee had no motion nor desire of any good.* (60-1)

Freed from acute physical violence, Wight's paralysis is now accompanied by a famine that leads to her eventual redemption. As she reaches the end of her fast, even her relator attempts to encourage her to eat, fearing that she will do herself harm in the process. Wight replies that she does not "*abstaine out of wilfulnesse, for I would if I could*" and explains that she simply cannot ingest food, as she is made "*the worse by it*" when she tries to eat (132). Having communicated to several visitors that she is "*so full of the Creator, that I now can take in none of the Creature. I am fild with heavenly Manna*" (31), and that the food she had eaten before her fast was "mine own damnation" (a8r) rather than nourishment, Wight inverts the normal order of plenty and famine. Yet this inversion is an indication of her use by God, who informs her at the end of her fast, which

she breaks with a piece of broiled fish, "*Thou hast fasted long; thou shalt fast no longer; it was but to make my power known to the sons of men, what I have done, and what I can do*" (139).

If Wight is a template on which the trials of the nation are being played out, her successful recovery through faith in a millennial God is a further sign of the national renewal that might come through the faith of fellow sufferers. Jessey is interested in garnering believers in the miracle of Wight's fast and recovery as well as in creating a critical mass of believers in the recovery of the nation and a future in which Christ will rule the earth. Her decision to eat again was thus not only, as Nigel Smith writes, "a sign of enhanced unity in the gathered church" (*Perfection* 49). The timing of Wight's fast, and particularly its end, spoke directly to the peace process as the nation moved away from war and towards, in the minds of millenarians, Christ's kingdom. On June 7th, four days before Wight ended her fast, Oliver Cromwell had his first meeting with Charles I. In the week following, Trapnel staged her fast and spoke her prophecies, supporting Cromwell at this early stage as a Gideon[40] leading them towards their desired goal. Both women in their different ways thus indicated support for Cromwell's intervention, with the ending of one fast denoting a trust in the possibilities of the future, and the beginning of a second providing a context for visions that would confirm these hopes. The publication of Wight's story as a demonstration of God's works, and a warning to obey the calls of conscience and God rather than demands issued by men (Jessey 151-53) is a highly specific and politicized assertion of the value of unity and faith in the face of danger and disarray. With the struggles imposed by violence, disease, and famine apparently nearing an end, the time for nourishment and a return to physical, mental, and

[40] Gideon was chosen by God to rescue the Israelites from the oppression of the Midianites, see Judges 6-7.

spiritual health comes near. Wight eats as a "furtherance to the main work then intended" (145), preparing herself and her country for the return of the non-earthly king and a renewed covenant with God.

Dining at the Table of the Lord

Anna Trapnel's relationship to food is a curious one, for despite her repeated fasts, depicted in *Cry of a Stone* and the *Report and Plea*, both published in 1654, she remains highly interested in food and particularly in its intake by others. Although her fasts,[41] which seem in part designed to establish her as a modern-day Daniel, whose biblical fast was followed by visions and prophecy,[42] have garnered critical attention, no one has noted her concurrent interest in food expressed throughout *Report and Plea* and *Cry of a Stone*. Eating, as well as food refusal, signifies political intentions, and it is her attention to ingestion that more conspicuously encapsulates her criticisms of the protectorate. In *Cry of a Stone* in particular she continually stresses the superiority of the divine food she is fed during her fast in contrast to the dainties now eaten by former soldiers and army veterans whom she sees as betrayers of the "Good Old Cause." This comparison belies a clear anxiety about the priorities of a protectorate whose lifestyle appears increasingly monarchical. God's food, she insists, *is* better than the foreign-inspired banquets and rich dishes that now often seduce former saints, and who appear more interested in following the directions offered in royalist cookbooks than by righteous Fifth Monarchists like Trapnel. Her reiteration of the sweetness in her food

[41] See Diane Purkiss ("Producing") and James Holstun in particular, and as discussed below.
[42] Kate Chedgzoy, for example, has noted the propensity of female prophets to "present themselves as the modern counterparts of Old Testament prophets such as Daniel" (243). See Daniel 10 for the connection between fasting and prophecy.

both indicates its divine source and appeals to those for whom earthly dining might indeed provide pleasures more immediately satisfying than those provided by God. Furthermore, Trapnel attacks not only what is eaten by Cromwell and his associates, but also the selfish lack of hospitality that extends from their gluttony and leads to the neglect of a people and nation who had once put their trust in Cromwell and the New Model Army.

Trapnel's fast and her ensuing prophecies were enmeshed with her Fifth Monarchist associations that placed her in opposition to Cromwell's government after the dissolution of Barebone's Parliament on December 12, 1653. Her Whitehall prophecies were made during the January 1654 trial of Vavasour Powell, a former member of parliament and one of several Fifth Monarchists who were arrested following the establishment of the protectorate. This sect was known for its advocacy of armed rebellion in pursuit of its millenarian ends, and the arrests of Powell, John Simpson, and Christopher Feake, among others, triggered an increasingly radicalized response to Cromwell's government. Following the visionary sessions recorded in *Cry of a Stone*, Trapnel herself was arrested during her progress to Cornwall, an event she records in *Report and Plea*. During her spectacular marathons of prayer and song at Whitehall, Trapnel had become a political threat; her travels opportunistically spread her renown and oppositional words further afield. As Nigel Smith has observed, the act of prophesying was seditious in and of itself, especially when it came from those with little authority (*Perfection* 30), in this case, a woman and the daughter of a shipwright. But Trapnel's performances were able to attract well-known and powerful people. Like Henry Jessey, the recorder of Trapnel's trances carefully lists her influential visitors, setting her in a

context of "what she is" and "to whom is she known" (*Cry* 2). Members of the Barebone's Parliament and several army colonels were among the community of people who showed their support for Powell and the Fifth Monarchist agenda through their attendance at Trapnel's bedside.

Much of the critical work on Trapnel and her fast has drawn attention to the ways in which she negotiated restrictions on her gender in order to perform in public. Diane Purkiss, in her influential article on sectarian women and the fast, suggests that Trapnel gained legitimacy through her apparent physical debilitation during her periods of prophesy, as this displayed her direct connection to God and proved that he provided her with heavenly food. Invoking the maternal cycle discussed earlier, in which a woman's ingestion of God's words allowed her to feed not only her child but others as well, Trapnel's reception of heavenly manna inspires the songs that feed her visitors. Purkiss goes on to suggest that the fast was also a way "to control and manage the problem of the female body," as it distanced Trapnel from any conscious control of her words or actions, which were all directed by God ("Producing" 150). While it could also be argued that this distancing was pursued in the very form of *Cry of a Stone*, as this, like *The Exceeding Riches*, was mostly written by an amanuensis,[43] Trapnel does not actually seem to be suffering from much lack of agency. In the *Cry*, she writes her own introduction, which foregrounds her involvement in the production of this text, and the relator adds very few of his own editorial comments, unlike Henry Jessey, who continually interprets events. And Trapnel is a writer in her own right; she goes on to pen *Report and Plea*, the *Legacy for Saints* (1654), and *A Voice for the King of Saints and Nations* (1657), as well as a thousand-page folio manuscript now held at the Bodleian Library. There are compelling

[43] Katharine Gillespie identifies her recorder as the Baptist minister Hugh Peter (*Domesticity* 10).

reasons for Trapnel to use a recorder in this particular case. This format would immediately evoke the format of Jessey's pamphlet, which was still in print, and also legitimize the event; for Trapnel, if she were really in prophetic mode, would have been unable to record her own words. Having her voice transcribed by another would have further evoked the sense of being a witness to this community event; the reader, like the writer, is positioned as one of many standing at Trapnel's bedside hanging on her every word.

It is likely, as well, that Trapnel did not have to overcome her gender, as this would have been helpful to the Fifth Monarchists. That her pointed critique of Cromwell during the Whitehall visions did not lead to an earlier arrest is surprising; ultimately she seems to have spent only about four months in prison for her seditious speech. James Holstun has remarked that Trapnel's gender significantly improved her political effectiveness, as she transformed her "prophecy chambers into a hybrid public/private space" and created a "politicized household" for her sympathetic visitors that rivalled the adjoining space of parliament (279).[44] The fast, he suggests, was likewise politically charged, going well beyond what he terms the "authority of the deathbed" delineated by Purkiss. Instead, the fast protected Trapnel from criticisms exposing the supposedly uncontrolled appetites of women while enacting an alternative to the official fast-days instituted by the Commonwealth government which, Holstun argues, had become associated with Laudian rituals. Trapnel's food refusal, then, was meant "to restore fasts

[44] Hilary Hinds notes the symbolic value of Whitehall in her recent article "Sectarian Spaces: The Politics of Space and Gender in Seventeenth-Century Prophetic Writing." It had been not only the main residence of Charles, and the site of the banqueting house, but also of Charles's execution. By 1654, Cromwell had taken up residence there. Trapnel inserted herself into this historically and politically important space that was equally a residence and a place of government. Her ability to turn the private space of the chamber into a public forum was thus remarkably apt.

to their earlier ascetic purity and reveal Cromwell, his Council, and his tithe-fed ministers as versions of their erstwhile Laudian enemies" (281). The decision to fast was thus not only a "counterpoint to aristocratic excess" (Gillespie, "Elizabeth" ¶32), but also a critique of the "emergent court culture of the Protectorate" (Holstun 282), drawing attention to its dangerous similarity to a monarchy.[45]

Several other scholars have commented on Trapnel's ability to cross the boundaries between the public and private.[46] Katharine Gillespie, for instance, notes that she adapted "the private spaces of the home and their attendant domestic subject positions … into sites for the production of a female public voice" (*Domesticity* 99-100). This "collapsing" (Hinds, *God's* 176) of distinctions between public and private gave sectarian women a speaking position, according to many critics, and discussions of food and its intake certainly lay within the traditional female purview. While most critics reserve a discussion of the domestic to the bedroom that Trapnel occupies while prophesying, the domestic task of food preparation with its attendant concerns of hospitality could also be an avenue for the "production of a female public voice." An interest in feeding the appetites of others was not, as I have previously discussed, relegated only to the material world. As Hilary Hinds observes, Trapnel's promotion of the concept of "free grace," with its Calvinist belief that salvation was solely dependent on God, allowed her to escape from her physical body, but "not from the impetuses of desire and appetite"

---

[45] Marcus Nevitt and David Loewenstein have also noted that Trapnel set herself up as a contrast to the perceived material excesses of the protectorate.

[46] These include Erica Longfellow's *Women and Religious Writing in Early Modern England*; Hilary Hinds's "Soul-Ravishing and Sin-Subduing: Anna Trapnel and the Gendered Politics of Free Grace"; Tamsin Spargo's "The Fathers' Seductions: Improper Relations of Desire in Seventeenth-century Nonconformist Communities"; Susannah B. Mintz's "The Specular Self of *Anna Trapnel's Report and Plea*"; Maria Magro's "Spiritual Autobiography and Radical Sectarian Women's Discourse: Anna Trapnel and the Bad Girls of the English Revolution"; Katharine Gillespie's "Anna Trapnel's Window on the Word: The Domestic Sphere of Public Dissent in Seventeenth-Century Non-conformity"; and Elizabeth Sauer's "Maternity, Prophecy, and the Cultivation of the Private Sphere in Seventeenth-Century England."

("Soul-Ravishing" 131). Both Hinds and Matthew Prineas have discussed Trapnel's use of the Song of Solomon in her prophecies; Hinds suggests that these references were of principal importance in giving Trapnel the ability to acknowledge the "bodiliness of the pleasures that follow" from a union with Christ ("Soul-Ravishing" 127). The biblical context for these feelings of desire appear to have assisted Trapnel in acknowledging the pull of earthly appetites for those newly in government, especially for food and clothing, both recognized symbols of class and power.

In her critique of protectorate consumption, Trapnel participated in a wider reassessment of Cromwell that began in the late-1640s and portrayed him as a man of excess. His appetites, sexual and otherwise, were deemed out of control, as were his military pursuits.[47] While these criticisms were common after the Restoration, as Roger Howell points out, "the image of Cromwell as ambitious, hypocritical and tyrannical was well established in his own lifetime" (35). But such disapproval did not come from royalist quarters alone. Katharine Gillespie's recent article on Elizabeth Cromwell notes that the Cromwells were found lacking by royalists and republicans alike, with royalists finding the couple "too plebian" to fill the shoes of the monarch, and republicans believing them pretentious and overly enthusiastic about the trappings of royalty (¶3). Both sides, she observes, used "gustatory and other domestic metaphors" to criticize Elizabeth in particular:

> Either she overfed a commonwealth meant to be slimly republican, or she starved what was supposed to have been a jolly fat monarchy fit for a king. In both cases

[47] See Diane Purkiss's *Literature, Gender and Politics During the English Civil War* for an extensive discussion of Cromwell's alleged sexual excess and his projected image of masculinity (131-62).

> she was a rotten cook whose unappetizing fare was said to have sickened the body politic. (¶5)

Such criticism reached its height in the anonymous and royalist *Court and Kitchin of Elizabeth, Commonly called Joan Cromwel* (1664). Through a vitriolic attack on Elizabeth Cromwell's housewifery and cooking abilities, the author suggests that her bad household governance was symptomatic of Cromwell's equally bad governance of the nation. Issues raised by earlier cookbooks of the 1650s are similarly highlighted through the dearth found under Elizabeth's rule: hospitality is found lacking, the standards of diet are slovenly, and the health of the nation is generally left to ruin, with Elizabeth's neglect proven by Cromwell's illness and demise. Trapnel's critique of Cromwell focuses, naturally, on his consumption rather than preparation of food. In advocating a heavenly diet as dainty as that found on earth, Trapnel establishes God as the true measure of good hospitality that includes a table open to all. In comparison, the tasty food of mortals falls short, as it rides on the back of class inequality and national impoverishment.

Trapnel is notable in her discussions of food because she does not simply advocate and demonstrate parsimony in her diet as is the tendency of other writers of a puritan persuasion. Philip Stubbes, as we know, endorses a diet of plain, unsauced meat in opposition to the rich dainties of the day; similar arguments are repeated in the 1650s when presenting modes of eating that would lead to spiritual salvation. Roger Crab, the famous hermit and vegetarian of *The English Hermite, or Wonder of this Age* (1655), chooses his restricted lifestyle, according to the publisher's preface, because he

> saith it is a sinne against his body and soul to eat flesh, or to drinke any Beer, Ale, or Wine; his dyet is onely such poore homely foode as his own Rood of ground

> beareth, as Corne, Bread, and bran, Hearbs, Roots, Dock-leaves, Mallowes, and grasse, his drink is water. (A2r)

Other authors such as John Rogers, who depicts his own conversion experience as fuelled by a process of fasting and self-mortification in *Ohel* (Smith, *Perfection* 37), and sectarian women such as Mary Cary who offers her words as a healing "CORDIALL for a distempered KINGDOM" (titlepage) keep the discussion of food within a similar discourse of spiritual purity and restraint. Trapnel certainly contributes to this discourse, as descriptions of her fast demonstrate:

> The first five days neither eating nor drinking any thing more or less, and the rest of the time once in 24. hours, sometimes eat a very little toast in small Bear, sometimes only chewed it, and took down the moysture only, sometimes drank of the small Bear, and sometimes only washt her mouth therewith, and cast it out, lying in bed with her eyes shut, her hands fixed, seldom seen to move, she delivered in that time many and various things. (*Cry* 1-2)

But unlike other authors, she revels in the sweetness delivered by her fast: "I found a continual fulness in my stomack, and the taste of divers sweet meats and delicious food" (5). Fasting is not an experience of deprivation, as divine foods are placed in direct competition with the newest delicacies.

In this, Trapnel's understanding of food is not unlike Milton's, who provides a detailed description of the dining practices of Adam and Eve as they prepare for the arrival of the angel Raphael in Book V:

> She turns, on hospitable thoughts intent
> What choice to chose for delicacy best,

What order, so contrived as not to mix
Tastes, not well joined, inelegant, but bring
Taste after taste upheld with kindliest change,
Bestirs her then, and from each tender stalk
Whatever earth all-bearing mother yields
In India east or west, or middle shore …
… fruit of all kinds, in coat,
Rough, or smooth-rined, or bearded husk, or shell
She gathers, tribute large, and on the board
Heaps with unsparing hand. (ll. 332-339, 341-344)

Eve here performs the role of a good housewife, turning her mind to hospitality and planning the order and quantity of service that will best display these delicacies, inspire desire, and encourage a love of variety. She might well be following the instructions of Gervase Markham, who provides detailed advice concerning the ordering of banquets and feasts (121-24) so that they might "invite the appetite with the much variety thereof" (121) and give "much pleasure and delight to the beholders" (124). Making food fit for an angel, Eve reaches not only for variety, but for rare foods from far-off places (in this postlapsarian world), but these, in the context of Eden, are naturally God-given. Eve's ready willingness to prepare "dulcet creams" (l. 347) and display the bounty of her garden proves her true understanding of open-handed hospitality.

Trapnel does not present herself as a housewife of any sort, since in both *Cry of a Stone* and *Report and Plea* she is dependent upon others for her food. But in her position of being fed, she knows when she experiences the right sort of hospitality, whether from

God or from her various friends and supporters. This food is not restricted to "small Bear," despite its alleged similarity to "sweet meats and delicious food" in the midst of her prophesying. She records in *Report and Plea* frequent experience of the enjoyments of the table during her dinners and food-sharing with fellow sectarians. She does continue to fast, though more briefly, before periods of prophesy, and emphasises the sweetness and sustaining nature of the heavenly foods that allow her to refuse more earthly sustenance. Trapnel also "eats" as part of communion, joining with her co-worshippers in the "sweetness in the supper of breaking bread, which filled my heart" (6). In her description of communion, it is a sociable event in which the goodness of heavenly foods mingles with the nourishment of company, a combination that continues to be important to her dining experience. On her journey down to Cornwall, which takes thirteen days, she frequently dines and rests with hospitable friends by whom she is "lovingly entertained." The most notable stopover is with the relations of Fifth Monarchist Captain Langden: at his sister's house she "had much love from God, and from strangers, and a very refreshing lodging, and the creatures were very sweet to my taste there"; and at her brother's, "we received a courteous entertainment, and a refreshing lodge; and my heart there was taken up much with the apprehension of the vanity of outward enjoyments, and great attendances, and brave houses" (10). The godly dining that Trapnel experiences does include sensual pleasures and comforts, but in contrast to that found in "brave houses," the refreshments she receives display an old-fashioned hospitality very similar to that advocated by Mary Wroth or Milton's Eve, as all women stress the qualities of sweetness and simplicity while simultaneously allowing for abundance.

Later dinners allow Trapnel to elaborate further on her definition of godly hospitality. Shortly after her arrival in Cornwall at Captain Langden's, she joins her London friends "in the Spirit" for the "Ordinance of breaking bread; I partook of that sweet supper with them in the Spirit" (14). After her first Sessions hearing and

> the day before that the Souldiers came for me, I was very heavy in my spirit, as I sat at dinner with my friends, and I was very ready to shed tears; and being loath my friends should see me … I rose from the Table where I dined, and went and took my Bible, wherein the Lord refreshed me. (E1r)

While she is fed and cared for by her friends, God provides what her friends cannot give: protection and preparation for the trials that follow. Even after she is imprisoned in Bridewell God continues to intervene in and improve her dining experience; when she is finally granted the right to have visitors by the court, "the Lord gave health and strength and stomack to my food, and a better digestion then ever I had since I can remember" (43). This community-based and God-given enjoyment of food is something clearly to be distinguished from that pursued by earthly rulers, however, and Trapnel situates herself and her fellow prisoners in "defiance" to such craven desires:

> you cry to the Lord, and not for earthly Palaces, nor *White-Hall*-Garden-Walkes, nor Kitchin-belly-chear, nor Lairdery-dainties, nor Banquet-sweet-meats; nor Councell-Robes, nor Parliament Tithes nor Emperour Advancement; nor great Attendance, nor for Colonels and Captains silken Buffe, and garnished spangled Coats, and gilded Cloakes, and brave *London* and Country Houses; I say, fellow-Prisoners and sufferers for Christ, seeing we have none of this in our eye nor desires, let us bid defiance to all reproaches (58).

In *Cry of a Stone*, her companion pamphlet, Trapnel more directly attacks the protectorate for its love of splendour, particularly in the way of food and clothing, targeting soldiers, merchants, the clergy and Cromwell himself in a series of "Spiritual Songs" (titlepage). Although Trapnel also delivers several long narrative "Prayers," her songs appear to have been particularly popular; as Matthew Prineas, one of the few contemporary critics to discuss her songs, notes, "Part of her claim to prophetic authority … seems to be the sheer volume and startling intensity of her verses" (97). If her songs were attention-getters in performance, Trapnel also became increasingly interested in the song as a form. Prineas's discussion of her sizeable manuscript folio makes clear that it consists entirely of "sermon-like 'songs'" collected between 1657-58, which Trapnel describes as "'prophetic epistles' and 'psalms.'" Drawing on the authority of Paul (93) as well as the musical tradition of the psalms, she also turns to the Song of Solomon which "offers Trapnel a rhetorical means for reconciling expressions of desire … with assertions of purity and chastity" (103). Although Prineas suggests that her use of the Song is most notably developed in her folio songs, it clearly gives her the language through which to discuss her love for God's sweet foods in contrast to her dislike of the rich foods ingested by the protectorate.

Trapnel manages to address the dining habits of all the main representatives of the establishment, beginning with the army, proceeding to the merchants and clergy, and ending by lecturing Cromwell himself. In her first song, she addresses the "Colonels," "Captains," and "Serjeants," designating them vow-breakers: "They have not brought forth Righteousness, / Nor relief to the poor" (20). Instead of making way for a generous state which cares for its people both materially and spiritually, the formerly righteous

army members fall into "vanity" or "Roastmeat of this sort." Their self-serving consumption is contrasted with the open hand of God, whose "bread and water is more sweet" and "meat of herbs betters [*sic*] for you," words that evoke the ascetic puritanism of Stubbes or Roger Crab (20). A second song about the army's profligacy, however, spends more time on its love for "dainty dishes that / They have with them inrich'd" (25). But this time the love of food, contrasted with the dearth experienced by other parts of the population, is compared to the "costlie" and "delicate" food offered by a merciful God:

> Then he will welcome all of you,
> And say, oh here is that,
> Which is more costlie food for thee,
> And far more delicate
>
> Then all thou hast of that thou stol'st
> From the Commonweal-poor,
> For to feast thy carkass withall,
> Which is to be no more. (25-6)

Although England was emerging from a long period of economic hardship by 1654, the memory of dearth was very recent. Poor wheat harvests had already lasted for six years, between 1645 and 1651, and any relief was "limited" (Bowden 56, 57). Some of the shortages were caused by the army, of course, as they requisitioned food from an already reduced supply throughout the 1640s. Trapnel suggests that the military establishment still continues to ignore the lack experienced by many in the nation, several of whom would have been soldiers themselves. The establishment in 1652 of a Committee for the

Poor (Thirsk, "Agricultural" 322) is indicative of the widespread difficulties faced in returning England to a modicum of health.

Trapnel next takes on the merchants and their love of imported foods. Comparing the foods of the Indies with those provided by God, Trapnel acknowledges that both are sweet and even desirable, but that foreign goods are still perishable and ultimately not worth the adoration so many give them:

> Oh I desire sweet preserves, which
> Christ unto you doth leave.
>
> The sweet preserves come from the Seas,
> And from those forrain parts,
> Which are made up by those Indians
> That are so full of Arts.
>
> You have your Canded Ginger, and
> Your Preserved Nutmegs too:
> That so you may delight therein,
> And your mouthes overflow.
>
> But! oh there's canded things indeed,
> Which is covered with Gold,
> There is not such preserves as they
> Which shall be turned to mould. (30)

Trapnel's emphasis on sweets and spices might well derive from the Song of Solomon, in which both items are definitively associated with the beloved. On the one hand "Thy plants *are* an orchard of pomegranates, with pleasant fruits"; on the other, the garden is filled with "Spikenard and saffron; calamus and cinnamon, with all trees of frankincense; myrrh and aloes, with all the chief spices" (*KJV* 4:13-14). The beloved is described physically as containing both sweetness and spice: "His cheeks *are* as a bed of spices, *as* sweet flowers" (5:13). Such allusions give these foods a place in both the divine and temporal worlds; their doubleness is evident in Trapnel's song itself, in which the "sweet preserves, which / Christ unto you doth leave" shift smoothly into "sweet preserves" which "come from the Seas," or foreign imported delicacies. Neither ginger nor nutmeg was new to England, having been imported since at least the fifteenth century, but they were certainly symbolic of foreign trade and of the propensity for the more well-off to look abroad for new food items. Joan Thirsk notes that returning royalists brought "fresh English perceptions of the food that was eaten in Europe" (*Food* 103), along with an accompanying desire for such goods. In her technique of overlapping divine and temporal foods, Trapnel appears to acknowledge the attraction of imports while pointing out that these will "mould" and prove to be only passing pleasures. While the argument that the earthly is devoid of substance when compared with the heavenly is a traditional one, Trapnel's specificity appears directly to address the cultural desire for the new and foreign that is indicated more positively in the receipt books. With such items associated with France and the monarchy in cookbooks such as La Varenne's, her attention to the merchants' participation in importing luxury goods also alludes to the distance of civil-war England from the new Jerusalem for which Fifth Monarchists longed.

After her harangue against the merchants, Trapnel continues with a song to the "University-learning and the National Clergy" (42), which describes them in terms reminiscent of Protestant attacks on Catholic priests, identifying them as overfed and overdressed:

O you have been so gallant, and
you have in silken walk'd
O you in dainty food have been,
that hath made you to talk;

But when that they cease putting in
to your wide mouthes that gape,
O then you'l cease speaking that, which
before you did relate. (43)

If her readers do not pick up on the Catholic allusions – no doubt a slur on the alleged Laudian tendencies of the clergy – Trapnel suggests a few stanzas later that they receive their "pay" from "rome" rather than from Christ. In other words, the clergy is corrupted by its paymasters who clothe and feed them and help them forget the true source of food. She straightforwardly condemns them to hell – "The Lord will set his fire to them / and it shal them devour" (43) – before moving from her song into a passage expanding on the clergy's sins: "Oh, where has been that marrow and fatnesse flowing forth from them? Oh, let there be more of that, thou wilt delight in such as delight in thee, they that delight to serve Tables more then thee, and thy flocke, thou wilt not serve them" (44). Mingling the theme of gluttony with that of hospitality, Trapnel identifies the clergy as selfish and

greedy, hoarding delight for themselves and refusing to serve their "flocke." In turn, they forfeit their chance to be served by Christ as they lose sight of all but their own appetitive needs.

Finally, Trapnel addresses Cromwell directly, beginning her long song to him by wishing that he "most willingly, / On righteousnesse would feed" (53). She then discusses his intake of food at some length, setting up a conflict between the Lord's food and the food of the monarchs, and eventually showing that Cromwell's (or "Gideon's") loss of control over his diet leads to an appetitive lust that prevents him from generously caring for the nation:

> Oh, the Lord then will say to him,
>
> he must not have such food,
>
> Which Queen-mother, as they did call
>
> did drink up as a floud,
>
> That swallowed up all in the pulpe;
>
> shall he such juyce here take?
>
> Or shall he have such gellies as
>
> those, whom thou didst forsake?
>
> And take him Lord, and show him it;
>
> now that he thus begins,
>
> Acquaint him that these flowings will
>
> increase his flame of sin: …
>
> Then into the City he must come
>
> among the great ones there,

And their great Royalties of food

which, Lord, thou'l from him tear

Oh this food and these dainty things,

these pleasures him did smother: …

Oh you great Aldermen and Sheriffs,

you Lord Mayor also,

That have been in the City, you

have *Gideon* overflown:

For your entertainments and your baites

his spirit have so smoother'd …

For truly it hath in him and you,

raised up fleshly lust:

Oh tremble yee therefore, for you

have roasted meat so dry;

His Wines you did mingle, whereby

you have blinded his eyes. (54-5)

Identifying forbidden foods with the "Queen-mother," or Henrietta Maria, Trapnel suggests that Cromwell's partaking of such royal goodies not only identifies him as a greedy monarch, but also as feminine and perhaps even as Catholic-influenced as the national clergy. If God's response to such eating is not obvious, Trapnel emphasises that Cromwell's choice is "gellies" or the Lord, with jelly-eaters being "forsake[n]" for their overindulgence. After this warning, Trapnel recounts the trust she and others had in the now lord protector, before depicting his downfall due to the "great Royalties of food" –

another clear equation between the protectorate and the deposed monarchy – offered him by London administrators. In a sort of *ars moriendi* struggle between God and the devilish procurers of food in "the City," Cromwell at last succumbs to, or is "smoother'd" by, the heaps of dainties he finds before him. Although she does blame others for his downfall, she nonetheless holds the lord protector accountable for being seduced by these earthly treats. In the final pages of her tract she continues to berate Cromwell for his love of finery and his resulting inability to understand the national practice of selfless hospitality. "Art thou a rational man, a wise and a valiant souldier?" she asks, and continues, "how can the Commonalty be relieved, and thou hast such great things for thy Table?" (68). Strangely old-fashioned in her memory of a ruler who looks after his people, she ends her pamphlet with a food-based curse: "the Lord would have your Protestations, Vows, Covenants and Narrations brought into your Pallace against you, this shall be bitterness in your dishes; You shall have plenty and fulness, but without comfort." (70).

Although far distant politically, Trapnel and her royalist counterparts shared a dislike of the protectorate communicated in part through food discourse. Collective health was understood to be dependent on traditions of hospitality and good nourishment, whether in the context of a heavenly or an earthly king. If Sarah Wight's fast aspired to bring on the new Jerusalem, Trapnel's later fast provided the realisation that Cromwell would not provide the deliverance they had hoped for. Trapnel's parting curse might well have been most enjoyable to the ears of royalists, proving the fragmentation of Cromwell's supporters even as the royalists were preparing to open the cabinet to the new jewel of Charles II. As the nation's household was, to their minds, set to rights, royalists

continued to demonstrate concern about the proper performance of this household. Metaphors of hospitality were indicative of governing style, and royalists were equally eager to develop the association between dining and hospitality to communicate approval or disapproval for the restored monarchy.

CHAPTER 5

"Those Golden Days of Peace and Hospitality": The Politics of Restoration Dining

As the previously discussed songs of Anna Trapnel demonstrate, food and hospitality were intimately entwined; generosity at the table and the proper nourishment of guests and dependents were ways of re-creating the munificence of God. But the term "hospitality," particularly after the Restoration, was also a code word evoking pre-war traditions of royalty and the aristocracy. Professional cook Robert May, in his Restoration cookbook *The Accomplisht Cook* (1660), exemplifies the politicization of this term as he cites his exclusively Catholic and royalist list of dedicatees – the lords Montague, Lumley, and Dormer, and Sir Kenelm Digby – as "*so well known to this Nation for their Admired Hospitalities*" (A3r). Writing his cookbook in the 1650s, May makes it clear that his own idea of the Nation excludes the protectorate, and he continues the royalist appropriation of the cookbook genre by implicitly foregrounding his political disapproval of Cromwell's regime. If Trapnel's vision of hospitality is one in which the poor and outcast will be fed at the open table of God, May's recalls stately abundance. But these otherwise polarized authors agree that Cromwell's protectorate did not know how to care for either vision of the body politic; its mismanagement of foodstuffs indicated a more extreme mismanagement of the nation's household.

Restoration cookbooks such as May's, as well as that of William Rabisha, the anonymous *Court and Kitchin of Elizabeth*, and even the rather differently directed books of Hannah Woolley, recall earlier practices of hospitality to signal their distance from the interregnum. Embedded in such a signal, of course, is a hope that under the new rule of Charles II the country would return to earlier traditions of household governance in which Christian virtues of charity and grace would combine with social precepts of deference, honour, and loyalty in a manner that would "entertain and releive others" (May A3r). Women, as frequent providers of hospitality, use similar techniques to indicate political attitudes. Following a broader discussion of hospitality, I will examine the hospitable discourse of food in the diaries of Lady Anne Clifford and the memoir of Ann, Lady Fanshawe. Clifford's diaries, spanning from 1603 until her death in 1676, are notable for their evolving depictions of hospitable behaviour. Her Jacobean, or Knole, diaries evoke the Elizabethan nostalgia hinted at by Restoration receipt books in a criticism of a king who refused to recognize Clifford's claim to her ancestral lands; in her latter years, Clifford is able to offer her own vision of appropriate hospitality that exemplifies her attachment to landed tradition in the face of a regime once again rife with "conspicuous expenditure" (Seaward). If Clifford's approach to household management is implicitly at odds with that of Charles II, the memoirs of Ann Fanshawe explicitly criticize the restored king through descriptions of hospitality that look to foreign lands. After experiencing an ideal reception from the Spanish monarchy – a regime at odds with Charles's through much of his reign due to his support for France's plans to annex the Spanish Netherlands (Seaward) – Fanshawe finds nothing but dearth at Charles's table, where the old traditions of graciousness and honour are no longer valued. As the

romanticized hopes for another Elizabeth disappear under the actual reign of Charles, the nostalgia communicated through hospitality is transformed from being a hopefully supportive memory to a politically subversive code marking resistance to and disapproval of the new regime.

The Politics of Hospitality

As Felicity Heal has shown, hospitality involved a complex ritual centred on "the household, its elements primarily food, drink, and accommodation." Having its roots in Christian interpretations of charity, particularly in the sixteenth and earlier seventeenth centuries, hospitality was meant to be dispensed freely for the benefit of the "commonweal," among "the neighbour *and* the stranger, the rich *and* the poor" (3). Trapnel's insistence that a godly state should care for its people derives from such civic obligations; aristocratic recollections of hospitable traditions further evoke a social order in which their position was still paramount and in which the rules of gift and service were honoured by monarch and nobility alike. As Heal explains, rituals of hospitality included the

> sense of entertainment as duty … political advantage was to be gained from these displays of virtue … [it was] an arena, in which the host [could] dramatize his generosity and thereby reveal his hegemony. The household ordinances, regulating the behaviour of noble establishments, frequently indicate[d] the importance of social drama in their insistence on ritualized behaviour. (6)

Dinnertime, with its multiple courses and displays of fine cookery, was an ideal place on which to focus rituals of hospitality; not only was the host on display, with dishes proving

his or her wealth and generosity, but guests could flaunt their knowledge of table manners, their conversational skills, and use the time allotted to eating to make and cement alliances. These multiple effects of hospitality are observed by Elise-Noël McMahon who notes the importance of food and dining as an "index of education, civility, and zest for life" in her article on Rabelais's *Gargantua* and *Pantagruel* (186); Michel Jeanneret also acknowledges that "The table is a microcosm of society, the ideal place for communication, the nexus where ideas are exchanged, where social relationships are formed" (21). Hilda Smith's more political reading interprets dining as a time for "socializing, plotting marriage and kinship strategies," as well as an event that "included a patronage system that used the standing and contacts of both male and female members of the governing class" (6). Heal also focuses extensively on the politicized potential for exchange contained in acts of hospitality, arguing that "the notion of hospitality … seems to be bound to that of reciprocity, of the exchange of gifts and rewards to which value not simply articulated in money terms attaches" – that is, "honour, loyalty, alliance, beneficence" (19-20).

In the context of the changes wrought by the civil war, and even, as we will see in the case of Anne Clifford, in the differences brought on by any change of government, an attachment to the rituals of earlier days was understandable, particularly when the performance of such rituals was linked to concerns of political recognition and alliance. Norbert Elias, whose foundational work *The Civilizing Process* discusses the changing rules for social behaviour as having a key impact not only on individual subjectivity but also on "longer-term structural changes in society as a whole" (450), posits humanist tracts such as Erasmus's *De civilitate* as "a kind of bridge between [the manners] of the

Middle Ages and modern times" (60-1). The early modern period, he argues, was a time of intense "social restructuring" in which new class divisions were generated and supported in part through social rituals that included dining behaviour (63). Beginning with table manners, what Elias refers to as a developing concept of civility required a performance on the part of the individual alongside an awareness of social context: "one was to some extent obliged to observe, to look about oneself and pay attention to people and their motives. In this … a new relationship of person to person, a new form of integration is announced" (67).

Anna Bryson has extended Elias's analyses of civilization with particular reference to early modern England, and she too notes the political cues embedded in social performance:

> codes of manners developed with the structures of household and court life and were informed with meanings and purposes which were, in the broadest sense of the term, political. They expressed and projected particular visions of the authority and legitimacy of the élite and they provided a basic language both of solidarity and competition within that élite. (24)

Distinguishing "courtesy" from "civility," Bryson defines courtesy as extending from medieval and Christian attitudes based on traditional hierarchies (64-66), as opposed to the developing understanding of civility which derived from humanist education and urban relationships in particular (69). In London, where "social contacts between courtiers, gentlemen, and the upper echelons of merchant society were scarcely to be avoided" (135), Bryson explains, "it was important for a man to be able to identify himself by his manners with an image of behaviour associated with a particular kind of

company" (136). These learned manners, that enabled cross-class access to London dinner tables, would have been part of aristocratic experience, but royalist nobility had tended to distance itself from London following the civil war, often returning to country houses and the practices of contractual obligation. Bryson emphasises that "The values and practices of country lordship, centred upon the maintenance of household hierarchies of service and the provision of hospitality, retained their importance as expressions of status for the major land owner" for much longer than has been previously supposed, and cites the earl of Argyll's *Instructions to a Son* (1661) as proof of such continued interest in sixteenth-century practices (140-1). It is this latter vision of an old world courtesy that appears also to be evoked by Restoration receipt books as they situate hospitality as-it-should-be firmly in the houses of past nobility and royalty.

Receipt Book Nostalgia

The first of the Restoration receipt books, Robert May's *Accomplisht Cook*, borrows part of its rhetorical framework from the books of the 1650s with its emphasis on noble tradition and royalist associations.[1] But May innovatively puts the issue of hospitality front and centre. Perhaps picking up on La Varenne's assertion that Paris is the seat of all civility and hospitality,[2] May suggests that his book enables the return of these values to England as he recalls past glories of English dining in the houses of his Catholic employers. His dedications repeatedly remind the reader of the hospitality once

[1] May cites *The Queens Closet Opened* as a particular influence: "Nor is there any Book except that of the *Queens Closet*, which was so *enricht with Receipts* presented to her *Majesty*, as yet that I ever saw in any *Language*, that ever contained so many *profitable Experiences*" (A5r).

[2] Although May borrows very few recipes from other sources – Tom Jaine's introduction to the facsimile edition suggests that only 150 of the 1300 recipes derive from previous authors – La Varenne's are some of those he includes. May also reproduces receipts from Joseph Cooper, W.M.'s *Queens Closet*, Elizabeth Grey's *A True Gentlewoman's Delight*, as well as John Murrell (May 19).

found in England. "He is an Alien, a meer Stranger in *England*, that hath not been acquainted with your generous House-keepings," he writes to his dedicatees; "those times which I tended upon your Honours were those Golden Days of Peace and Hospitality when you enjoyed your own, so as to entertain and releive others" (A3r). Those who have not attended these noble tables can scarcely call themselves English, May proposes, a statement that automatically puts those on the parliamentary side of the civil war in the role of the "Alien." The return of the monarchy, and the concurrent return of such noblemen to their rightful places of honour, will, May hopes, result in the reestablishment of the "Golden Days" and the renewal of pre-war, and even Elizabethan, generosity. Not only have these practices enriched May's training as a cook, but he also claims that "your Country hath rept the Plenty of your Humanity and charitable Bounties," suggesting that his patrons' hospitality benefited more than simply their noble friends, and indeed the nation as a whole was better off for it. In a final paean to such longed-for days, he closes his dedication:

> Right Honourable, and Right Worshipful, Hospitality which was once a Relique of the Gentry, and a known Cognizance to all ancient Houses, hath lost her Title through the unhappy and Cruel Disturbances of these Times, she is now reposing of her lately so alarmed Head on your beds of Honour. (A3v)

Equating hospitality with a relic (a term that, as I have discussed, holds resonances of Charles's *Eikon Basilike*, and here must allude to Catholic practice as well), May sees these ancestral values in retreat, but he offers the reassurance that these beliefs are being secretly nurtured so that they might effectively return once the country is put to rights.

If May's repeated attention to hospitality is not enough to alert the reader to its importance, W.W., who writes a short narrative on May's life as part of the prefatory material, returns to the theme in a manner that identifies clearly the responsibilities involved in claiming hospitality for one's own:

> such Noble Houses were then kept, the glory of that, and the shame of this present Age; then were those Golden Days wherein were practised the *Triumphs and Trophies of Cookery*; then was Hospitality esteemed, Neighbourhood preserved, the Poor cherished, and God honoured; then was Religion less talkt on, and more practised; then was Atheism & Schism less in fashion: then did men strive to be good, rather then to seem so. (A6v)

Alluding to former times with more orderly social hierarchies and communal responsibilities, W.W. identifies care for the poor, good governance of the estate, and religious observance as part and parcel of hospitable practice. He implies that these traditional values support national peace, an idea elucidated by the description on the following pages (A7v-8r) of these *Triumphs and Trophies of Cookery*, which involve an outrageous display reminiscent of the earl of Hertford's 1591 banquet for Elizabeth, as a pastry ship, castle, and stag, the latter filled with claret wine, become a staging ground for a mock battle in which ladies throw eggshells of sweet water at each other. The ability to execute such courtly mirages of warfare, May implies, was what kept the country at peace: "These were formerly the delights of the Nobility, before good House-keeping had left *England* [i.e. during the civil war], and the Sword really acted that which was only counterfeited in such honest and laudable Exercises as these" (A8r).

May's rhetorical emphasis on hospitality has been observed by other receipt book readers: Robert Appelbaum, for example, suggests that May "produced his cookbook in part as a celebration of a return with the Restoration of the old 'hospitality'" (*Aguecheek's* 282); Wendy Wall notes that May "promotes the value of country hospitality and international feasting" (*Staging* 53). David Goldstein, in a longer consideration of May and his cohort, the cook William Rabisha, who authored *The whole Body of Cookery Dissected* (1661), also acknowledges the traditional hospitality that both books recall, noting that "The cookbooks … spring from an intense nostalgia for royal extravagance, and from an understanding of the Civil War as having severed England … from this lost world of excess and wealth" (134). Reading extravagance through the lens of Georges Bataille who posits such excess as necessary for the productive growth of society (135-36), Goldstein suggests that these receipt books advocate a world in which "The model of copia, of reasonable excess, provides the ground for a new conception of English nationalism, an open-ended model of liberality by which a newly rejuvenated noble and monarchical class fuels an innovative approach to English culture" (154). But I would suggest that if such liberality looks to the future, it tempers this future with a good dose of the past, and longingly wishes to ignore the fact that Restoration society is built on the historical changes – the "unhappy and Cruel Disturbances" – that May seemingly hopes to bypass.

The desire to start again, as though the wars had not occurred, is present in Rabisha's book as well, which like May's looks to the past practices of hospitality as a symbol of such seamless resumption. As Rabisha's *ODNB* biographer observes, his text is "not only antiquarian but pointedly royalist," and he chooses for his dedicatees "five

women with royalist connections" (Considine): the Duchess Dowager of Richmond and Lennox, the Duchess of Buckingham, Lady Jane Lane, Lady Mary Tufton, and Lady Agnes Walker (A2r). If May's book is exclusively focused on hospitable men, Rabisha brings women into the picture, acknowledging their role in keeping this particular national tradition alive. Most intriguingly, Rabisha identifies his women as "nourishers," a term that recalls breastfeeding advocates who see learning and improvement blossoming from female dedication to feeding others. "[I]*n your Liberality and Hospitality, by which you have been upholders and nourishers of all ingenuous Arts and Sciences*," Rabisha writes, identifying his dedicatees as protectors of old household traditions that of themselves support healthy national development (A2r). As he reiterates, "*according to your various roots of goodness, you have sprung forth and born fruit for the nourishment of all that came under your shadow*," a nourishing that includes Rabisha and has led to the production of what he believes is a worthy contribution: his receipt book (A2v). His dedication to the reader expands on his link between the nourishment of the body and the nation, and explicitly situates his text as encouraging the return of the traditions that he believes to be integral to a healthy body politic:

> I was further encouraged to this work, by seeing that happy and blessed restauration of our long-exiled Royal Luminaries; and the hopes of the benevolent Influence of Liberality and Hospitality, which is in part the Life of Arts and Sciences. It is indeed like the Sun in the Firmament, which keeps not his light and heat for himself, but … freely bestows himself to the giving of life, feeding and cloathing the whole Universe: And doth not his Representation and Production,

> even our Sun, or King and his Nobles do the like? Do not thousands live by their benevolence? (A3v)

Rabisha returns to these connections, between hospitality and learning, nourishment and national well-being, in a post-script that reproduces the records for a feast "*made by* George Nevil *Chancellor of* England, *and Arch*-Bishop *of* York, *in the dayes of* EDWARD *the Fourth*, 1468" (S3v). This massive undertaking, that included 1000 egrets, 504 "Stags, Bucks & Roes," 6000 "Dishes of Jelly," and 1500 "Hot Venison *P*asties," and fed 2862 servants alone, not counting aristocracy and other invitees (S3v-S4r), is presented here as an example of "what liberality and hospitality there was in antient times amongst our Progenitors." Comparing Edward IV to a Solomon by whose "liberality his subjects were made rich … and there was peace in all his dayes," Rabisha looks back not just to pre-war practices but to medieval traditions in his desire "to see liberality flourish amongst us once more, as in old times" (S3r).[3] Like May, Rabisha supports Bryson's proposal that earlier practices of hospitality lingered into the Restoration, if not in practice, then certainly in politically charged memories that found in the provision of nourishment a source of order and harmony.

Rabisha's identification of women as the source of such nourishing hospitality is pursued in different ways by other cookbooks of the period. *The Court and Kitchin of Elizabeth* (1664) identifies Elizabeth Cromwell's "thrifty way of House-keeping" (35) as partly indicative of her overall "negligence and ill management of the Domestique Affairs" (B4v), thrift of course being the opposite quality from the liberal hospitality that Rabisha espouses. Cromwell's feasts, this author asserts, "was none of the liberallest, and

[3] Rabisha's evocation of Edward IV, who died as a result of "over-indulgence in food and drink" (Horrox), was perhaps more prescient of Charles's extravagance than he had intended.

far from magnificence," and clearly provided nothing in the way of the Solomon-like generosity at the table of Edward IV (44). Elizabeth Cromwell, the pariah of this tract, is an example of what women should not do; indeed, her inability to provide adequate nourishment is accused of contributing to her husband's death (135) and implicitly adds to the impoverishment of the nation. The receipt books of Hannah Woolley, on the other hand, these being the first to be penned by a professional female cookbook writer, are designed to assist women in the arts of hospitable nourishment, with an emphasis on the needs of the middling practitioner and a concurrent acknowledgement, as Goldstein observes, of the necessity for careful management of limited resources (156). But despite Woolley's interest in hospitably thrifty housewifery, she too evokes earlier practices of royal hospitality in her books. Her 1662 *Ladies Directory* names her on its titlepage as one "Who hath had the Honour to perform such things for the Entertainment of His late MAJESTY, as well as for the Nobility"; this claim is repeated in her 1672 *Ladies Delight* (A2v).[4] Her evocation of royalty appears again in the title of her 1670 *Queen-Like Closet*, an obvious allusion to *The Queens Closet Opened*; and her 1664 *Cooks Guide* presents its recipes as a means "Whereby Noble Persons and others in their Hospitalities may be gratified in their Gusto's" (titlepage). Dedicating all these books to "Ladies and Gentlewomen," Woolley recognizes women as providers of hospitality, and in turn provides women with a knowledge of cookery that enables the proper performance of generosity. While her concerns are unquestionably different from either May's or

[4] Lynette Hunter questions Woolley's involvement in *The Ladies Delight*, implying that it was cobbled together by the printer from previous works by Woolley ("Books" 530). Neither her *ODNB* biographer, John Considine, nor Elaine Hobby, whose article "A woman's best setting out is silence" is the first to be written about Woolley and her work, raise this question, however. Books published under her name after 1675 are thought to be pirated editions. These include *The Accomplished Ladies Delight* and *The Compleat Servant-Maid* (Hobby 179 n.1).

Rabisha's, she too recalls earlier, though less specific, events of grandeur based in the houses of nobility and royalty.

Even manuscript receipt books evoke grand hospitality in recipes that recall royalty or nobility, both in substance – these are often for cakes or other types of sweets and thus a luxury good – and in name. Sarah Longe's 1610 book, Folger MS V.a.425, mentions two receipts associated with royalty. Visually, her book models neatness and order with its quarto pages bordered in red ink, and the clean italic hand suggesting the care with which these receipts were written down. Her first recipe, "To make another Bisket, whereof King James, and his Queene have eaten with much liking" emphasises a similar care when it comes to cooking, with an stress on fine ingredients and accuracy:

> Take a pound and a quarter of sugar, and a pound of fflower very finely boultede, and after finely searched, you must beate the sugar very fine, and then search it through a fine lawne search, and mingle the flower and sugar together, then take 12 Eggs whereof you must take but halfe the whites, first beate the Eggs with 3 or 4 sponefulls of rose-water, then put the flower and sugar that are mingle together to the Eggs, then beate them one hour together, a little before you put them into your Oven, put a few Caroway seeds, and Aniseeds into it, and [wett?] your plates before you put on the stuff; and the oven must be noe hotter then for a Tart. (20-21)

A second recipe honours Princess Elizabeth: "To make Cakes the Royall princesse her way."[5] This, too, stresses careful preparation and the best ingredients: "Take a pound of sugar finely beaten 4 yolkes of egges 2 whites, one halfe pound of buttar, washed in

[5] This receipt appears to be written in a hand different from Longe's, suggesting it as a later addition to the quarto. Longe herself includes a cake recipe commemorating Queen Elizabeth, however: an "Excellent fine Cake," noted in the margin to be "Queene Elizabeths fine Cake" (42-3).

rosewater 6 spoonesfull of sweete creame warmed, one pound of currants well picked." But she also emends this recipe, noting that "wee put in but halfe the proportion of Sugar & think it enough wee also put in nutmeg & mace and some ginger" (69). Individualizing this borrowed receipt, perhaps in part because of the price of sugar, Longe defines her style of hospitality. Although concerned to keep costs reasonable, she also experiments to meet the needs of both her guests and herself, possibly making the cake even better as a result.

Longe's reproduction of receipts made for the Stuarts seems unusual; of the twenty-nine manuscripts I was able to consult, hers seems to be the only book to make such a reference. Attributions to nobility, however, are much more common, and, like the dedications of May and Rabisha, promise a quality of product that will contribute to fine hospitality. Jane Parker's 1651 book, Wellcome Western MS 3769, gives instructions on how "to make the countess of ruttlandes cheesecakes," with indications similar to Longe's that this recipe is a bit special. "take cheese curds that are mayd of creame let them be very tender," she begins, and ends with advice on how to make a more unusual pastry casing for the cake, saving the egg whites for the "crust, then make them up like curdes and edge ye lides a litell up." However, she also reassures the cook that "you may make them ye ordenary way" if she is not ready for this more skilled pastry work (11v). The late-seventeenth to early eighteenth-century receipt book compiled by Rose Kendall, Anne Kendall Cater, Elizabeth Clarke, and Anna Maria Wentworth, Folger MS V.a.429, also attributes some of its sweeter instructions to nobility: "To make Almond Butter The Countis of Warwickes" (1r); "To make Cleare Cakes of Goosberrys ye Lady Barringtons way" (4v); "To make Orange Cakes Cleere ye Lady Maynards" (5r). These are part of the

first seventeen leaves that form a unique section. Written in one hand,[6] like Longe's book, it is inscribed with presentation in mind. Both red and black ink are used, with red saved for titles, margins, and ruled separations between the different receipts. The writer's hand is ornate and bold, using lots of curliques, and frequently adding decorative lines and swirls to her pages, making her text an object of both pleasure and display. Combined with her emphasis on sweet foods, the text itself appears to denote hospitable values coherent with those of higher status.

The Politics of Anne Clifford's Diaries

The diary, particularly that written by women, has generally been seen as a private document of personal revelation. Feminist scholars of life-writing observe that women tend to explore "domestic details, family difficulties" and other events contextualised by personal relationships (Jelinek 7-8).[7] Scholars of early modern autobiographies have taken a less essentialist stance, observing that the dividing line between the personal and political, the home and the world, was more permeable for women writing at the time. Both Patrick Coleman and Elspeth Graham note the importance of social and cultural context to both male and female autobiographers; as Coleman observes, "early modern representations of that self do not emerge in isolation from their material and cultural contexts, but as a reflection of and on the communal discourses and practices in which they are embedded" (11). As well, Debora Shuger has noted the propensity for the

[6] Although all four women sign the front of the book, it is unclear whether any of their hands actually appears in the book. This section of receipts is dated "Aprill ye 3d 1675" (12v), which actually comes before the earliest signature date: "16:82," which is written under the names on the first page, "Rose Kendall & Ann Cater there Book."

[7] For more on feminist theories of women's autobiographical writings see in particular Estelle C. Jelinek's introduction to *Women's Autobiography: Essays in Criticism*, Bella Brodzki and Celeste Schenck's introduction in *Life/Lines: Theorizing Women's Autobiography*, and Mary G. Mason's essay, "The Other Voice: Autobiographies of Women Writers" in Brodzki and Schenck.

personal and political to overlap in seventeenth-century life writings: "on the rare occasions when these texts avert to what we would consider 'private' matters, the intimate revelations turn out to be 'public' signifiers." (63). Although Shuger focuses primarily on male writers, her observations ring true, at least for the women discussed in this chapter. The diaries and memoirs of Anne Clifford and Ann Fanshawe, while recording personal and domestic details and relationships, use such detail to discuss and situate highly politicised events and concerns, whether it be inheritance matters in the case of Clifford, or the more widely political context of the civil war and Restoration in the case of Fanshawe. As Shuger suggests, "The speech acts they record" frequently do appear as "strategies for holding one's own against power" (65).

The majority of Clifford's critics have found her diaries to be more often public and political than not. Some, such as Mary Ellen Lamb ("Agency"), Helen Wilcox, and Kim Walker see the diary emphasising Clifford's role as wife and focusing on her relationship with her husbands, particularly Richard Sackville, Earl of Dorset. But because of her undeniable interest in her ancestry and inheritance, they acknowledge that her diaries can also be read as a "'public' statement" (Walker 41). Clifford's long-standing legal battle to inherit her father's lands challenged her father's will that left his titles and properties to his brother Francis, with only a £15,000 portion left to Anne in recompense. Clifford and her mother fought the will on the grounds "that baronies were entailed upon the heir of the body, regardless of gender" (Acheson 38). Looking back to Isabella de Veteripont's inheritance of the baronial estate before 1299, Anne Clifford attempted to declare ancestral rights to her lands through legal arguments that would acknowledge the rights of women's inheritance. Not only did Clifford face her uncle's

resistance in this matter, she also struggled against her husband's avarice, which was supported by the king, both of whom pressured her to give up her claim for more immediate economic gain. Refusing to compromise, she was left at the mercy of James, who decided in favour of her father's will and left her with £17,000 that Dorset promptly took (Spence). She gained her inheritance only by outliving all her male relatives.

Clifford's lifelong pursuit of her property rights, or what she often calls her "business," and her self-conscious interest in ancestry is recorded in her diaries in what Mary O'Connor calls "always a public act: a making of history and a confirming of lineage" (88). This public act is also political; Clifford continuously positions herself in relation to power elites even as she claims her own position as a member.[8] Bishop of Carlisle, Edward Rainbowe, author of Clifford's funeral sermon published in 1677, provides a contemporary acknowledgement that her diaries had public and political purpose. Spending three pages on Clifford's construction of her journals and family chronicles, he begins by placing the diaries within a religious context of self-discipline and spiritual accounting, observing that "she had such a desire to know, review, and reflect, upon all the occurrences, passages, and actions of her Life, as thinking it an especial mean to *apply her heart to Wisdom, by so numbring her days*, that none of them might be wholly lost" (50). But he quickly admits that her self-investigation is a small part of her larger purpose: her inquiry into her lineage, "the Lives, Fortunes, and Characters of many of her Ancestors" (51). Linking Clifford's diaries firmly to this

[8] See Mary O'Connor's "Representations of intimacy in the life-writing of Anne Clifford and Anne Dormer"; Susan Wiseman's "Knowing her place: Anne Clifford and the politics of retreat"; Mihoko Suzuki's "Anne Clifford and the Gendering of History"; Katherine Acheson's "The Modernity of the Early Modern: The Example of Anne Clifford"; Meagan Matchinske's "Serial Identity: History, Gender, and Form in the Diary Writing of Lady Anne Clifford"; and Aaron Kunin's "From the Desk of Anne Clifford" for further discussion of Clifford's political manipulation of her ancestral history.

greater project, he goes on to describe the construction of the annals as a public work, like her rebuilding campaigns, planned and overseen by herself with the help of collaborators:[9]

> But this I will say, that as from this her great *Diligence* her Posterity may find contentment in reading these abstracts of *Occurrences* in her own Life; being added to her *Heroick Father's* and *Pious Mother's* Lives, dictated by her self; so, they may reap greater fruits of her *Diligence*, in finding the *Honours, Descents, Pedigrees, Estates*, and the *Titles*, and *Claims* of their *Progenitors*, to them; comprized Historically and Methodically in three Volumes of the larged [*sic*] size, and each of them three (or four) times fairly written over; which although they were said to have been collected and digested in some part, by one, or more, Learned Heads, yet they were wholly directed by her self; and attested in the most parts by her own Hand. (52)

Rainbowe emphasises that the purpose of these annals is to be read by others, both as a means for Clifford's descendants to situate themselves within this ancestral record, and as a way for them accurately to chart their legal rights of inheritance. Clifford, already suggested to be both heroic and pious throughout his sermon, here associatively becomes both mother and father of her texts, embodying male and female qualities as she constructs a written monument to her family heritage. Most importantly, perhaps, the bishop stresses that Clifford's writings are not spontaneous outpourings but rather purposefully rewritten and "digested" by contemporaries under her guiding hand.

---

[9] Aaron Kunin also observes the connection of her written work to her "larger historical project" that included "genealogies, and commissioned monuments, buildings, and works of art" (591). He suggests that her diaries were always dictated to a scribe and later revised and further contextualized by herself, particularly through the addition of marginalia that juxtaposes past and present events in such a way as to continually remind the reader of the historical and political contexts.

It is in this light of public record and political negotiation, I believe, that the contents of Clifford's diaries should be discussed. Her frequent references to hospitality, an aspect that has not yet been considered, also fall within the purview of her public affairs rather than her private domestics. Susan Wiseman has suggested that Clifford invites the reader to "decode [her] relationship to court politics through textual juxtapositions" ("Knowing" 203). She, like Aaron Kunin, situates these juxtapositions in the relationship between the marginalia and the text, but they also exist within the narrative itself, as Clifford reports social and domestic performance for political effect. In what is now known as the Knole diary, dated 1603 and 1616-19, Clifford positions herself within and against James's court in a large part through reference to the inadequacy of hospitality under this new regime. In her final records, written in 1676, the year of her death, she depicts and records her own acts of hospitality that embody many of the traditional values promoted by May and Rabisha and keep her domain representative of an older England and steadfastly resistant to continental connections and shifts in social allegiances.

Elizabethan Nostalgia

Although my broader emphasis in this chapter concerns the Restoration, Clifford makes it clear that depictions of hospitality could communicate political perspectives in the early seventeenth century as well. In the 1603 portion of her diary, Clifford takes the time to establish her connections with the courts of both Elizabeth and James, with her mother and aunt attending as official mourners at Elizabeth's funeral procession, and later, with her father entertaining the new king and his court on their way down to

London.[10] She seems most concerned to depict the new court in a less-than-laudatory light as James and his associates are frequently found lacking in their enactment of liberality. This downfall appears also to have gender implications; Clifford draws attention to the gendered rearrangement of power by emphasising the loss of her own future role in Elizabeth's privy chamber in light of James's accession to the throne. The gendered transformation of hospitality[11] is alluded to almost immediately after the queen's funeral, as Clifford recounts her family's first meeting with the new king. Although James "used my Mother & Aunt very graciously," she goes on to observe that "we all saw a great change between the fashion of the Court as it is now and that in the Queen's time, for we were all lousy by sitting in the chamber of Sir Thomas Erskine" (22). The level of hospitality offered during the king's progress is judged and found wanting; Erskine, it seems, is unable to provide even a basic level of cleanliness and comfort for his equals and betters. Under the new "fashion" of the court, proper observance of hierarchy and hospitality begins to wane; this bodes badly for Clifford herself, as it is her claim to status and titles that will be undermined and denied by this new and fashionable regime. The fine household governance provided by Elizabeth is replaced by the household misgovernance of men, who replace substance with empty show. Clifford's use of the word fashion itself indicates her disapproval of the change, the term being laden with negative connotations by the end of the sixteenth century, as it was related to "the dissolution of the body politic and with the exorbitance of the state's

[10] Although this account takes place when Clifford is thirteen years old, it is clearly written later, at least following her marriage in 1609, as she notes that they received the message of Elizabeth's death "in the same chamber where afterwards I was married" (21). This entry does not follow the standard dated diary form, being instead a narrative recounting of this momentous change of governance that seems also to have led to a shift in gender politics.

[11] This shift was also alluded to by Francis Osborne, as I have discussed in Chapter 3.

subjects" as well as "the sense of a mere form or pretence … at the very end of the sixteenth century, to 'fashion' acquired a new meaning: to counterfeit or pervert" (Jones and Stallybrass 1).

The female side of the family continues to find disrespect and inhospitality as they travel down to meet Queen Anne, riding through the heat to find the Lord of Kent's residence, where they had hoped to lodge, "shut & none in the House, but one Servant who only had the Keys of the Hall, so that we were forced to lie in the Hall all night till towards morning, at which time came a Man and let us into the Higher Rooms where we slept 3 or 4 hours" (23). Such neglect seems one more indication of the new fashion; generosity has fallen by the wayside as Kent barely provides the basics of accommodation let alone nourishment. In contrast, the queen "kissed us all & used us kindly" allowing them to join her train (23); they also found true hospitality from Elizabeth Knightly who "made exceedingly much of us" during their overnight stay. In the wake of Queen Elizabeth's death, it is women who appear to provide the appropriate hospitality and recognition of status; men on the other hand appear less than noble and even purposefully neglectful and rude. Even the coronation ceremonies come under fire for their lack of adherence to traditional forms:

> From thence the Sovereign removed to Windsor where the Feast of St George was solemnised tho' it should have been done before. There I stood with my Lady Elizabeth's Grace in the Shrine of the Great Hall at Windsor to see the King and all the Knights sit at dinner. Thither came the Archduke's Ambassador, who was received by the King & Queen in the Great Hall where there was an infinite

> Company of Lords & Ladies & so great a Court as I think I shall never see the like again. (24-5)

While there is in this account something of the naivety of a dazzled schoolgirl, a sense of implicit disapproval exists alongside her awe at the spectacle. Once again, the performance is not quite right; the feast of a national icon is belatedly performed, in keeping with the earlier, haphazard inhospitalities, and further suggesting the change in the fashion of the court.

The Business of Hospitality

If these early entries denote a disapproval of the changes resulting from Elizabeth's death, Clifford's 1616-19 diary suggests her more avid participation in the hospitable exchange of dinners that stemmed from James's court. But Clifford's acceptance of hospitality is invariably linked to the political "business" of her inheritance.[12] Continuing to reveal her distance from the masculine court of James, she pursues alliances with women associated with Anne's parallel court in an effort to attain the lands and titles she believes are rightfully hers. David Goldstein, in his work on Ann Fanshawe, notes the purpose of both her memoir and her receipt book as providing a genealogical context for her family's "credibility and influence" by recording the names of receipt contributors or hosts and gift-givers (102). In a similar vein, Clifford integrates food into her memoir to mediate her genealogical pursuits; it is only once she has succeeded in gaining her inheritance that she reveals herself dispensing food and

[12] Clifford less often records any sizeable hospitable acts of her own during these years even though she managed a considerable household and maintained traditions of great hall dining. With typical care, the names of all her people have been recorded in "A Catalogue of the Household and Family of the Right Honourable Richard Earl of Dorset" (Williamson 477-78). Notably, this is done in the context of the dining hall, with the list organized by table.

hospitality in a reflection of the body politic she controls, as the "whole Country" finally becomes her "House" (Rainbowe 34).

An unusual mention of her own dinner party on January 22nd 1619 provides a useful explanation of the purpose of Clifford's engagement with such hospitable acts:

> The 22nd here supped with me my Sisters Sackville & Beauchamp, Bess Nevile, Tom Glenham and my brother Compton and his Wife. I brought them to sup here on purpose hoping to make them friends. (67)

The early modern notion of the friend involved far more than kindly social acquaintance, and included very political interests of patronage, alliance, and other types of financial and often factional support, particularly in courtly contexts.[13] Dining, friendship, alliance and business were all of a piece; humanist theories of moderate civility at the table were displaced by the realities of political negotiation that took advantage of the social contact permitted by the aristocratic meal. This seems to have been particularly true in the context of the centralized Jacobean court in which "the calculus of reward" became a significant concern (Heal 402). Aemilia Lanyer, author of the long poem *Salve Deus Rex Judaeorum* (1611), herself used the dining metaphor in the context of appeals for patronage. In her poems to nine powerful women, which included Anne Clifford and her mother Margaret, Lanyer invites them to the "holy feast" (18) she has prepared in the pages of her book. As there is no record of Lanyer achieving support as a result, there has been critical speculation as to what went wrong;[14] perhaps her Jonsonian move of inviting

---

[13] For more on the friend in early modern England see, for example: Linda Levy Peck's "Benefits, Brokers and Beneficiaries: The Culture of Exchange in Seventeenth-Century England" and *Court Patronage and Corruption in Early Stuart England*; Alan Bray and Michel Rey's "The body of the friend: continuity and change in masculine friendship in the seventeenth century"; and David Wootton's "Francis Bacon: Your Flexible Friend."

[14] For discussions of the place of patronage in Lanyer's work see: Barbara Lewalski's "Seizing Discourses and Reinventing Genres"; Kari Boyd McBride's "Sacred Celebration: The Patronage Poems" and

these women of much higher status to her table was her first misstep as she should have more accurately approached their tables as a supplicant. Apparently hoping that her generosity as host might put her dedicatees in her debt, as a middling woman Lanyer also exhibits an arrogance that bypasses protocols of status, an important aspect of hospitality. Anne Clifford, while looking for favour rather than patronage, was careful to attend the dinners of others during her quest, using meals as a time for politicking but acknowledging her position of lesser power. Indeed, many of the women she mentions as companions at dinner – the countess of Bedford and Lady Rich in particular – were central players at Queen Anne's court. Linda Levy Peck has identified these two women as "important court brokers" who mediated between the queen and those hoping for favour or influence (*Court Patronage* 68).[15] As Leeds Barroll has observed, the female side of Clifford's family had been close to Queen Elizabeth but less so to Queen Anne (77); Clifford was well-born but struggling to get into the inner circles of the new court.

One of Clifford's first mentions of dining with others, on January 1st 1616, in fact includes Lady Rich, who joins Clifford and her sister-in-law in a quiet dinner in Clifford's chamber, to which she notes she "kept ... all day." Eating privately with at least one of the queen's favourites, she is excluded from her husband's activities as Dorset and "all the Company at Dorset House" go to see the new court masque. It is not until the sixth that her turn comes along; Dorset is notably absent at this event as Clifford dines with "my Lady of Arundel" and sits with her during the performance (28). These entries

---

"Remembering Orpheus in the Poems of Aemilia Lanyer"; Colleen Shea's "Literary Authority as Cultural Criticism in Aemilia Lanyer's *The Authors Dreame*"; Michael Morgan Holmes's "The Lover of Other Women: Rich Chains and Sweet Kisses"; and Lisa Schnell's "'So Great a Difference Is There in Degree': Aemilia Lanyer and the Aims of Feminist Criticism," and "Breaking 'the rule of *Cortezia*': Aemilia Lanyer's Dedications to *Salve Deus Rex Judaeorum.*"

[15] See also Helen Payne's "Aristocratic Women, Power, Patronage and Family Networks at the Jacobean Court, 1603-1625" for further discussion of influential women at Anne's court.

are typical in their depiction both of Clifford's participation in dining events that reveal her interest in obtaining friends and influence, and her distance from her husband and thereby James himself. Dorset's favoured status with James – Clifford notes this on February 13th 1617, writing that Dorset stood by James's chair in the Star Chamber and was "on extraordinary Grace & Favour with the King" (49) – suggests that records of Clifford's detachment from Dorset simultaneously allude to her position at James's court. Similar to her early entries that show the female side of her family pushed aside by the new fashions of the changed regime, Clifford's Jacobean diary finds her repeatedly excluded by the male elite as she is refused her inheritance and her claim to full participation in the structures of power.

In June of 1616, after negotiations between herself and Dorset regarding her inheritance of her mother's lands at Westmorland, and Dorset's persuasive kindness designed to convince Clifford to leave the estate to him should she be without heirs, Clifford again records two dinner events, on the 24th and 30th respectively. On the 24th she joins Dorset to "[wait] on the King and Queen to Chapel" and then dines at "my Lady Bedford's," once again targeting one of Anne's intimates. The monarchs appear to dine separately, and Clifford and others rejoin them following the meal, at which time "the Queen used me exceeding well" (38). Both her husband's companionship and the queen's kindness are of importance here; Dorset performs well because of his desire for Westmorland, and Clifford hopes for further support from him, and the queen is established as an ally independent of the king. On the 30th, Clifford returns to Greenwich after dinner, and once again notes specific individuals – "my Lady Robert Rich" and her "Coz. Cecily Neville" – as companions, and also notes the disapproval, most likely to do

with her business, coming from some quarters, specifically the "unkind words" exchanged between herself and the Lady Knolles. In contrast to these unkindnesses, Clifford assures herself of the friendship emanating from Queen Anne's court in her final phrase: "I took my leave of the Queen and all my Friends here" (38). This gathering would have included women only; Barroll notes that as the queen consort Anne was able to create her own court of "strictly female … access," and was "regarded as the (social) head of all female nobles in the land." As a result, noblewomen assumed her "moral authority to intercede on behalf of one noblewoman or another" (40).

In her final entries for December 1616, Clifford records a temporary breakthrough in business negotiations, while making clear the public discussion surrounding this difficult matter. She notes that she was "visited by many" in London, it "being unexpected that ever matters should have gone so well with me & my Lord, everybody persuading me to hear & make an end, since the King had taken the matter in hand so as now." If her visitors wish her success with her suit, this does not come without a price, for they appear to hope that a settlement will end the unpleasantness that must have influenced many of the friendships at court. Immediately following this observation, Clifford notes her dining location on the 27th, citing Lady Elizabeth Grey, Lady Compton, and Lady Fielding as companions. This is not simply a social occasion, for part of their dinner conversation involves, on the one hand, Clifford's "coming to the King." On the other hand, it is also a precursor for a public showing with Dorset, as they "went together" to the Lady Arundel's to view the "Pictures and Statues in the Lower Rooms" (43). All her dining companions are close to the queen; even though she appears to have reconciled somewhat with Dorset, at least for public appearances, she pursues her own

alliances during separate meals, another indication of their individual interests and her emphasis on the importance of maintaining her own political associates.

As relations between Clifford and Dorset begin to deteriorate again in 1617, Clifford continues to curry favour with female courtiers, especially those who might influence Queen Anne. Clifford's dining consistently includes lists of her female friends and her discussions with them concerning her business. Although neither the business nor the outcome of these discussions is elucidated in the diary, food serves as a mediating factor in what is a litany of names and associations that might get her an audience with the queen. This proceeds from the first sentence of the 1617 entries, which states that "presently after Dinner, I went to the Savoy to my Lady Carey [and] from thence she and I went to Somerset House to the Queen" (44). After a falling out with Dorset over Westmorland, her pursuit of the queen grows more intense, and she attends her in "the Drawing Chamber where my Lady Derby told the Queen how my Business stood." Anne in exchange offers her support, and "promised me she would do all the good in it she could." Her subsequent passage between the queen and the king, as Clifford and Dorset next meet James, who "persuaded us both to Peace," and then return "to the Queen's side" to pick up a friend, further establishes the gendered courtly divide that exists both between James and Anne and Clifford and Dorset (45). Clifford's marginal record that "The Queen gave me a warning not to trust my matters absolutely to the King lest he should deceive me" drives this point home, and materially solidifies her alliance with the queen (45 n.30). The attention given to her case by royalty also signifies the importance of her suit; Clifford stresses its national significance in another marginal note: "All this time of my being in the Country there was much ado in London about my Business" (48

n.31). This, of course, makes sense, given aristocratic interest in both genealogy and inheritance. The delights of dining become a mere backdrop to this more rigorous debate that reflects on noble traditions, a debate made perhaps more volatile by James's own propensity to dispense titles at will, for a price. The old ways of hospitality, based on a particular system of order and respect, as Clifford suggests in 1603, are here replaced by the new fashions that reward novelty over ancestry and personal favour over merit.

With entries for 1618 missing or non-existent, Clifford's diary for 1619, which records the illness and death of Queen Anne, further laments the changing style increasingly associated with James's dissipated rule. Now mostly disconnected from the London scene, keeping apart from her husband who retains the king's favour, Clifford's dinners are increasingly taken alone, suggesting not only her political marginalization but also her desire for self-control.[16] At the end of the October she eats with Dorset and then "never stirr'd out of my own Bed Chamber till the 23rd of March" (80). This separation seems symbolic of her strong attachment to her lineage; she keeps to herself in part to avoid further arguments with her husband over her claim to Westmorland. She notes in November that "Though I kept my Chamber altogether yet methinks the time is not so tedious to me as when I used to be abroad" (81), and on the 18th of December, she records Dorset's visit to her Chamber, also over dinner, "which he had not done since his coming from London, for I determined to keep to my Chamber & did not so much as go over the Threshold of the Door" (82). Her cloistered status helpfully shields her from the political and social pressures brought to bear on her when she does remain "abroad." In stark contrast to her Kendal diary, in which the country comes to her bedchamber, here

[16] She does, however, have another reason for her withdrawal, as she notes her probable pregnancy in October 1619.

Clifford detaches herself from participating in the rites of hospitality altogether. Excluded from James's court because of her gender and her political will, pushed, as it were, to a lesser table, she begins to distance herself from the new London styles of courtly hospitality that she has attempted to negotiate.

Restoring Tradition

In 1643, the last in the male line of the Cliffords, Henry, fifth Earl of Cumberland, died, and Anne was free to inherit the estates she had struggled to regain. Unable to reclaim her lands until 1649, she remained in London, protected by the parliamentary allegiance of her second but estranged husband Philip Herbert, Earl of Pembroke. On June 3rd 1649, she writes, "I took my last leave of my second husband ye Earle of Pembroke … which was ye last time he & I ever saw one another, it being then Sunday" (100). From London she travelled to claim her ancestral inheritance, much of which had been damaged in the wars. D.J.H. Clifford, editor of her diaries, notes that she "Almost immediately … set about repairing and restoring her ancient heritage," a risky business because of her royalist allegiance. Clifford characteristically sloughs off the danger, defiantly writing "Let him [Cromwell] destroy my Castles if he will, as often as he levels them I will rebuild them, so long as he leaves me a shilling in my pocket" (101). Possibly because he was busy in Ireland, Cromwell left Clifford to her own devices, and she rebuilt all five of her castles, seven churches, and an almshouse, creating her own fiefdom in the north that appears to have become a defiant assertion of the old ways not only under Cromwell, but under Charles II as well; D.J.H Clifford observes that "The

profligacy of the court under Charles II disgusted her as much as had the period under Cromwell" (102).

Her Kendal diaries, dated 1650-1675, record Clifford's building projects, her governance of her estates, and visits from her growing family. Her relations continue to be involved in royalist resistance; she notes in October 1655 that her "first Grandchilde the Lord Nicholas Tufton" was imprisoned in the Tower by Cromwell because of his part in "the late Plotte," no doubt the attempted royalist uprising of that year (125). In 1660 she announces with joy the return of Charles II and the sitting of a new parliament which included – "most part by my means" – relatives as representatives of Westmorland and Appleby (144). But Clifford shows little interest in the new London-based rulers, recording only briefly Charles's marriage in 1662 (157), and visits to England by Henrietta Maria in 1662 and 1665 (159, 176-77). In 1667 she records the signing of the peace of Breda that ended – for the moment – Charles's aggression against the Dutch (187), and in 1669 she recalls the third miscarriage of Queen Katherine while calling Charles "our new King Charles the second," a rather condescending description of a king who had then been governing for nine years (193). Other mentions of court affairs are equally brief, including notes about Henrietta Maria's death in 1669 (198) and the visit of William of Orange in 1670 (206-7). In short, the court is a distant entity that does not appear to have any impact at all on Clifford's own work of governing. For this is undoubtedly what she does as she travels between her castles, attends assizes, and sees to the peace and well-being of her lands and tenants.

Perhaps because Clifford spends much of her time in transit, she seldom connects dining with hospitality during these years, and returns to this question only in the last

year of her life, in 1676, when almost every entry includes the notation "I went not out of my house nor out of my chamber today." But it is clear that then, and previously, she relied on local sources for foodstuff, buying her claret from the mayor of Appleby (Williamson 326), her cheeses from the wife of the vicar at Brougham Castle, and her sweetmeats also from local women (327). Politically and economically, she supports her own lands, a fact most eagerly recorded by her eulogist, the Bishop of Carlisle, Edward Rainbowe. Without fail she is generous, and certainly one can discern an effort to recall May's "Golden Days of Peace and Hospitality" as Clifford does indeed "entertain and releive others" (May A3r). In his self-consciously rhetorical eulogy, the bishop identifies "Hospitality and Charity" as the means by which Clifford succeeds in her work of governing. Seemingly selfless, and "contented with any pittance," relying on "*Viands* not costly or rare, not far fetch'd and dear bought" and teaching that "Hunger and Health seek not Delicacies nor Fulness" (31), Clifford seems to model Gervase Markham's piously nationalist English housewife. The ways in which she feeds herself as well as others instructs by example, encouraging guests to imitate Clifford's spiritual and patriotic practice. Yet despite such parsimonious habits, Clifford was similarly known for her generosity and largess:

> Indeed the whole Country, considering the freedom of her Hospitality, was, in this sense, her House; nay, even all of Quality that did pass through the Country. It was held uncouth and almost an incivility, if they did not visit this Lady, and her House, which stood conspicuous and open to all Commers, and her Ladiship known to be easie of access to all addresses in that kind. And seldom did any come under her roof, who did not carry some mark and memorial of her House;

> some Badge of her Friendship and Kindness: she having always in store such things as she thought fit to present. (Rainbowe 34)

Despite the rigour of her own regimen, Rainbowe implies, Clifford did not stint when receiving guests, even keeping a stock of items that might serve as worthy presents; she appears to favour gloves in 1676. And in 1676 she repeatedly shows herself caring for her people by feeding them, recording her visitors who "dined here without in the painted Room with my folks" (233) before or after she has received them. Fed on local goods, her "folks" and visitors are kept healthy in body and soul and amenable to the harmony she maintains. That this dining is part of a broader act of hospitality is indicated by her invariable reception of her visitors in her chamber. A representative passage reads: "today there dined here with my folks John Webster, so after dinner I had him into my chamber and took him by the hand and talked with him, and a little after he went away from mee" (262). This seems an act worthy of Queen Elizabeth; it is worth repeating Francis Osborne's memory of Elizabeth's own performance of hospitality that compares nicely with Clifford's: "*Hospitality*, *Charity*, and *Splendor*, were dilated over the whole *Court*; where; upon the least acquaintance, all strangers from the Noble-man to the Peasant, were invited to one *Table* or other." This, he observes, kept her people loyal, "like Dogs seldom biting those have once fed them" (438); Clifford's acts are not simply kindnesses, but works that perpetuate and strengthen her political control. Rainbowe alludes to this by nominating the "whole Country" as her house, which confirms her as a significant regional authority.

Discussions of Clifford's position as "lord of the manor" have failed to include any consideration of the role of hospitality that Rainbowe so lauds. Her meticulous

dictation of these daily acts confirms the importance she placed in them and they prove her steadfast adherence to Elizabethan values with even her own parsimonious dining habits recalling the past queen. This allegiance would have been a particularly political statement under Charles II; as Ann Fanshawe later makes clear, women did not play much of a role in his court, unless, it seems, they were sexually available to the king. Clifford's virtuous rule significantly contrasts with the "scandalous tendencies" (Bryson 260) of Charles's court: his messy Dutch wars, his "inability to economize," his love of foreign, especially French, ways, and his flirtation with Catholicism (Seaward). In opening up her house to "all Commers," Clifford provides an island of political security, modelling the tradition, hierarchy and order strongly associated with Queen Elizabeth.

Ann Fanshawe's Hospitality

Clifford's political allusions to hospitality have a strongly national focus, recalling the glories of Elizabethan practice in contrast to the less generous – but excessive – James I and Charles II. Clifford's foodstuff is local, she is highly interested in her English ancestry, and she finally institutes her own local system of government when she regains her estates. Ann, Lady Fanshawe, who records the hospitality of others in a manner that ultimately damns the court of Charles II for its lukewarm and partial support of her and her family following years of faithful service, introduces a tension between England and the continent, as England's deficiencies are seen in the light of Spanish generosity. Critical responses to Fanshawe's 1676 memoir – addressed to her only surviving son, Richard – [17] have seen it having a traditionally female focus on home and

[17] Fanshawe's memoir, British Library Add. MS 41161, like her cookbook, Wellcome Western MS 7113, is written by an amanuensis, although in both cases she makes later additions and deletions in her own hand.

family as well as one that is more worldly and political. Mary Beth Rose, for instance, suggests that Fanshawe's main intention is to depict herself as a "perfect wife," one who is more interested in being "loved" than in pursuing or developing individual action or subjectivity ("Gender" 255, 256). Helen Wilcox briefly acknowledges Fanshawe's involvement in civil war politics, but does not consider her political response to the Restoration ("Private" 60). N.H. Keeble, on the other hand, proposes that Fanshawe's memoir depicts her as a woman on the "public stage" (205), and considers the memoir once again primarily in the context of the civil war. But he also notes the critical devices that appear in her writing, seeing the framing of her actions in relation to her husband or King Charles II, whose retinue the Fanshawes accompany during much of the wars, as revelatory of "the impotence of masculine authority" (210).

Fanshawe's opinion of Charles following the Restoration, a question which has not yet been considered in any depth, gradually deteriorates, and she indicates not only the king's impotence, but also his distinct lack of honour and inability to value loyalty. The editor of her memoir, John Loftis, asserts that Fanshawe maintains a "reverence for Charles II" which is "conveyed rather by silence about his failings … than by anything she writes. Her silence did not extend to his Ministers … her Memoirs are not charitable in their judgement of Englishmen in high office – the Royal family always excepted" (xvi). The assumption that silence implies reverence is surprising; Fanshawe certainly offers little praise for the royal family following the Restoration and communicates, as Loftis admits, considerable disapproval of Charles's ministers. Since Charles has given these men their positions, they are de facto representatives of the king, and it is far safer to criticize them directly than it is to criticize the king himself. In looking at Fanshawe's

depictions of hospitality – these having been brushed aside by other scholars as frivolous and self-indulgent – I intend to show how these become a distinctive code for her disapproval of Charles II and his court.

Like Clifford, Fanshawe imbues the act of hospitality with traditional values associated with her ancestry. In her narrative that records the decline, re-establishment, and relative impoverishment of a family during the civil war and Restoration, she establishes at the beginning the importance of hospitality to both her husband and her parents.[18] She writes first of her husband, remembering him as

> the tendrest father imaginable, the carefullest and most generous master I ever knew. He loved hospitality, and would often say it was wholy essentiall for the constitution of England. He lov'd and kept order with the greatest decency possible, and though he would say I managed his domesticks wholy, yet I ever governed them and myself by his commands, in the managing of which I thank God I found his approbation and content. (103)

As I have outlined, hospitality included an understanding of charity, generosity, and order, primarily in the context of food and dining, which were understood as important, as Fanshawe points out, for upholding "the constitution of England." Her view is concurrent with that of Rabisha and May; indeed, one of May's dedicatees, Sir Kenelm Digby, lists one of her receipts in his 1669 receipt book,[19] and thus links her with other

---

[18] Richard Fanshawe was her second cousin, and thus also embodied her family's ancestral values.

[19] Digby died in 1665, and *The Closet of the Eminently Learned Sir Kenelme Digbie Kt. Opened* was compiled and published by his assistant George Hartman (xxx). As the editors of the modern edition note, Digby's attributions identify "a particular social milieu … a … courtly, internationalist, Catholic social group" (xl). Fanshawe, it should be acknowledged, was not Catholic, although she was certainly tolerant and found great mutual acceptance in Catholic Spain.

royalists known, as May so eloquently puts it, "for their Admired Hospitalities" (A3r).[20] Fanshawe asserts her parents' love of this value as well, claiming that "My father and mother were both great lovers and honourers of clergemen … We lived with great plenty and hospitality, but no lavishness in the lest, nor prodigality, and I believe my father never drunk 6 glasses of wine in his life in one day" (110). In almost one breath, Fanshawe establishes her family's piety, as well as their position and corresponding generosity that combines plenty and restraint in a model for the nation. These ancestral values both establish a pre-civil-war lifestyle, and become a distinct contrast to the dissolution of these values both during and after the wars.

As Fanshawe records the downfall of her family during the civil war, noting that her father's lands were taken from him in 1643, after which he and his family went to join the court in exile in Oxford, she focuses extensively on the availability of dietary comforts. Immediately comparing their previous comforts – "we … had till that hour lived in great plenty and great order" – with the new disorder, she describes their shift from generous members of the gentry class to people concerned with daily survival:

> [we] found ourselves like fishes out of the water and the sene so changed that we knew not at all how to act any part but obedience; for from as good houses as any gentleman of England had we came to a baker's house in an obscure street, and from roomes well furnished to lye in a very bad bed in a garrett, to one dish of meat and that not the best ordered; no mony, for we were as poor as Job … alwaies want, yet I must needs say that most bore it with a martyrlike cheerfulness. (111)

[20] Digby also has a recipe for "white metheglin," a herbal liquor, that he attributes to the "Countess of Dorset," or Anne Clifford (49-50).

All the symbols of their status – house, beds, food, and wealth – are removed from them, and who they are depends solely on their memories and continued ability to act nobly. Although she herself evinces a certain amount of ironic despair, her father, Sir John Harrison, continues to act in a manner suitable to his lineage, refusing a "warrant for a baronnett" sent by Charles I, "saying he had too much honour of his knighthood which His Majesty had honoured him with some years before for the fortune he now possessed" (111). By refusing to be paid for his allegiance, especially not with the title of baronet, which had been created by James I as a means of raising money, Harrison becomes a further symbol of moderation and integrity, and shows that his family's sympathies were not up for sale.

Ailing England and Healthy France

As Fanshawe shifts her focus to her life with Sir Richard, whom she marries in 1644, she records the gradual diminishment of nourishment to be found in her homeland, and suggests, like many of the royalist cookbooks discussed in the previous chapter, that a more healthy diet might be found in France. Following, like "marchant adventurers," the then Prince Charles to whom Richard was "sworn Secrettary of War" (112), the Fanshawes initially appear to do quite well, for despite experiences of deprivation, they also encounter plenty, and find relative wealth despite the challenges of survival. They are generously welcomed by the governor of Barnstable, for instance, who provides "all sorts of good provision and accommodation" (117), which includes an unusual and pleasurable food: "They have neer this town a fruit called a massard, like a cherry, but different in tast, and makes the best pyes, with their sort of cream, I ever eat" (116-17).

Fanshawe's interest in this regional food indicates her developing enjoyment of the new and the foreign; this interest is also reflected in her receipt book, as I will shortly discuss. But this observation has its own political slant; in this particular case, the kindness of strangers immediately follows a memory of her exclusion from the prince's court. Like Clifford, her access to the court is limited because of her gender, as she explains: "during all the time I was in court I never journyed but either before him [the prince], or when he was gone, nor ever saw him but at church, for it was not in those days the fashon for honest women, except they have business, to visit a man's court" (116). Like Clifford, again, who used the term "fashion" to deride the type of hospitality received by herself and her female relatives as they journeyed to attend the ceremonies of James's accession, Fanshawe appears also to indicate her disapproval of this exclusionary practice. The hospitality she receives from the town's merchants and governors directly opposes the lack of hospitality she receives at Charles's court.

Fanshawe's travels get progressively worse the further they are from London. A stay in Cornwall is described in reasonably positive terms, with Fanshawe reporting that "That country hath great plenty, especially of fish and fowl, but nothing near so fatt and sweet as within 40 miles of London" (117). But the next step, which leads them to the Scilly Isles in 1646, finds a virtual breakdown of hospitality. Lodged in the house of a fisherman, Fanshawe wakes to find "our bed was neer swimming with the sea," a trial she endures while near the end of one of her numerous pregnancies. These conditions are only the beginning of their sacrifices:

> With this we were destitute of clothes, and meat or fewell for half the court, to serve them a month, was not to be had in the whole iland. And truly we begg'd

> our dayly bread of God, for we thought every meal our last. The Councell sent for provisions into France, which served us, but they were bad, and little of them. (118)

While the hospitality they are offered is certainly judged as lacking, Fanshawe's emphasis on the dearth they encounter seems here more an illustration of their loyalty and endurance than a criticism of the court, or even of the islanders themselves. Although distinct from the mainland – Fanshawe notes that the inhabitants "neither speak English nor good French," indicating their otherness and separation (119) – the Scilly Isles remain part of England, ensuring that the deprivations of the civil war exist there as well, and the state of the nation is reflected in the paucity of provisions available to the court.

Fanshawe's description of later challenges further emphasises the lamentable state of England through a contrast with the natural abundance found on the continent. In 1649 the couple follow the now King Charles II to the continent, first to Spain, and then by ship to France. Fanshawe's arrival in France is notable for its record of plenty, as well as for its emphasis on the relative pleasures of survival. Having been dangerously close to shipwreck, on landing they

> sat up and made good cheere, for beds they had none, and we were so transported that we thought we had no need of any, but we had very good fires and Nance white wine, and butter and milk, and wall nuts and eggs, and some very bad cheese. And was not this enough with the escape of shiprack to be thought better than a feast? I am sure untill that houre I never knew such pleasure in eating. (131)

Despite the "very bad cheese" and lack of beds, they have, it seems, entered a new world in which the land and the people generously provide the few things they have. The health and bounty of the land is stressed a few lines later as the party travels towards Nantes, finding "by the way good grapes and wall nuts growing, of which we culled out the best" (131). The nationalist dining advocated by Gervase Markham and performed by Anne Clifford is no longer possible in the context of civil war England, but France is still generous and plentiful. As they continue their journey, they do find "English provisions, and of all sorts, cheap and good," and it is ironic that they must travel so far away from home to find them. But she is most lavish with her praise of local items in her description of their barge ride to Orléans:

> Every night we went a shoare to bed, and every morning carryed into the boat wine and fruit and bread, with sum flesh which we dressed in the boat … We like wise caught carpes, which were the fattest and the best I ever eat in my life. And all of my travells none was for travell's sake, as I may call it, so pleasant as this. (132)

Although none of these victuals is dainty or unusual, they are fresh, honestly procured and indicative of the willingness of the land and the people to provide food for these exiles. When the Fanshawes return to England, moving to Yorkshire in 1653, they appear to have helped restore some of their homeland's bounty, planting fruit trees where before there were none, similarly encouraging a land and people that was "civil and kind upon all occasions, the place plentyfull and healthfull and very pleasant." This lasting gift is, upon later report, "the best fruit in the north," and a generous legacy of provision (136). But this act is also royalist in nature, as Keith Thomas points out:

> The depredations wrought in the 1650s upon the estates of the Crown, Church and supporters of Charles I were exaggerated by Royalist propagandists after the Restoration in such a way as to create an association between the wanton felling of trees and republican politics. [John] Evelyn and other contemporaries cleverly represented tree-planting as a way of affirming a gentleman's loyalty to the restored monarchy. (*Man* 209)

Writing this memory well into the Restoration, Fanshawe's mention of their planting project would have emphasised that the couple remained loyal to Charles and indeed planned for his return by improving their lands for the greater good. A work of charity and contribution to national nourishment that also restores ruined estates to their former grandeur, tree-planting is part of the broader ethos of hospitality that runs through Fanshawe's book.

The Spanish Ideal

Such hopes for the return of tradition under the new king would be disappointed. The nourishment Fanshawe ends up receiving from her homeland is reminiscent, perhaps, of that depicted by Margaret Cavendish in *Poems and Phancies*, in which Nature is served up a variety of dishes, from the "Lover's heart" in "*An* Olio *drest for* Nature's *Dinner*" (158) to the "Self-conceited Pride" that forms part of "*A* Hodge-podge *for* Nature's *Table*" (160). These poems appear in part to depict the range of human passions through the conceit of cookery, which might explain the rather unwelcome nature of much of the food that Nature either eats or prepares. But her depictions frequently focus

on cutting away the disguise of surface appearance, naming "Death," for instance, as "Nature's *Cook*" (156-7) whose methods are described as cruel and remorseless:

> Some, *Death* doth *Roast* with *Feavers* burning hot:
>
> And some he *Boyls*, with *Dropsies* in a Pot;
>
> Some are Consum'd, for *Jelly*, by degrees,
>
> And some with *Ulcers*, *Gravy* out to *Squeeze*;
>
> Some, as with *Herbs*, he *stuffs* with *Gouts* and *Pains*,
>
> Others for tender Meat, he hangs in Chains; ...
>
> Some, Flesh and Bones he with the *Pox* chops small;
>
> And doth a *French* Fricassee make withall (ll. 3-8, 11-12).

If the different methods of human demise and suffering are revealed as part of Nature's design, another poem, "Nature's *Dissert*" declares pleasure as temporary, illusory, and even sinful (162). Taking metaphors from the banquet table, the joys of sweetness for the most part mask a much more sinister reality:

> Sugar-Plum-words, which fall Sweet from the Lips,
>
> And Wafer-promises, Mould'ring like Chips;
>
> Biskets of Love, which crumble all away,
>
> Gelly of Fear, which shak'd, and quivering lay:
>
> Then was a fresh Green-sickness Cheese brought in,
>
> And tempting Fruit, like that which *Eve* made Sin (ll.5-10).

Although Cavendish then turns to more pleasant dishes: "Cream of Honour," "Firm Nuts of sincere Friendship," and "Grapes of Delight," these form only a small part of Nature's

banquet, and only minimally make up for the decay and illness hidden under cover of otherwise tempting dainties.

Fanshawe's experience of hospitality from the Restoration court similarly finds surface performance at odds with reality; ceremony, as we will see, does not lead to generosity or friendship. The last few items of Nature's dessert table are sadly left off the menu when Fanshawe returns from Spain in the late 1660s, after her husband dies at the end of his 1664-66 ambassadorial posting. In her memoir, Fanshawe focuses extensively on the foods and hospitality they receive from the Spanish, setting up a distinct contrast with the hollow comforts she finds in England, which she reveals at the end.[21] While Mary Beth Rose sees Fanshawe's descriptions of her time in Spain as "a shallow catalogue of ceremonies and gifts" (258), these are, I believe, part of her more substantial project that presents these rituals both as symbols of political value and as contrasts to a world that no longer wishes to honour such traditional relationships and responsibilities.

The wealth of Spain is distinctive even in the context of the two years of the Fanshawes' posting, for England suffered its last major plague in 1665-66, the London fire occurred in 1666, and in 1665 Charles had declared war on the Dutch. The war isolated England internationally, with support only reluctantly coming from France, and also caused economic difficulties at home. Louis XIV pressured Charles to support him in the pursuit of the Spanish Netherlands in return for more military involvement, but Charles resisted this idea, instead signing a treaty with Spain in 1667, no doubt partly due to Richard Fanshawe's diplomacy. But Charles's relationship with Spain was continually undermined by his desire to be close to France; a return to the Dutch wars in 1673 found Charles acquiescing to Louis's demands, with Spain entering the war on the opposing

[21] Fanshawe's memoir, it should be noted, ends mid-sentence.

side. By the time Fanshawe was writing her memoir, Spain was at war with France, and Charles's court had "become closely-identified with French and Catholic interests," and thus viewed suspiciously by many of his subjects (Seaward).

The almost thirty pages that Fanshawe devotes to their two years in Spain is a paean to its kindness and civility. This is also, notably, a land in which Fanshawe herself can play a diplomatic role as she is received and entertained by the noblewomen in the towns and courts they visit on their way to Madrid. The overall impression of their posting is one of unstinting generosity and splendour, as they are banqueted and presented with items of silver, clothing, and chocolate. The entertainments they attend are without exception designed to impress with their richness and civility; Fanshawe writes in reference to a "feast of the bulls": "We had the aboundance of noble entertainment that was imaginable, and yet their civilitys and good manners exceeded it all" (161). It is this greatness of traditional hospitality, along with its necessary abundance and richness of food, that seems to impress Fanshawe most of all. Spain, she suggests quite overtly, is better than England when it comes to practising true hospitality. After averring that she "never eat any better in England," an understated way of implying Spain's superiority in this regard, she launches into a long digression regarding her husband's defence of a prisoner who "lived ... within the protection of my husband's barriers" (170). It is unclear what type of offences this man committed, but Richard appears to defend him because of his understanding of order and hospitable propriety, which Fanshawe previously records him as deeming "wholy essentiall for the constitution of England" (103), and which now leads him to protect those under his authority. Following long negotiations with the President of Castille and the "Catholick King," Richard succeeds in freeing the man. His

commitment to this ambassadorial role of hospitable protector made, according to Fanshawe, "a very great impression" on the Spanish; the English, on the other hand, were not so pleased: "the chief minister of state in our countrey did not value this nor give the incouragement to such a noble action as was due" (171). Fanshawe's record of her husband's actions seems explicitly designed to indicate the discrepancies between the English and Spanish courts, with England coming up short.

Indeed, England's deficiencies in this matter are emphasised by Fanshawe's immediate return to her unrestrained praise of Spain and the Spanish as she explains the excellence of the country's food and the fineness of the peoples' manners. Fighting against "received opinion" that believes "Spaine affords not food either good or plentifull," she asserts that those with money and knowledge can eat far better than they can in England:

> there is not in the Christian world better wines than their midland wines … Their water tastes like milk, their corne white to a miracle; and their wheat makes the sweetest and best bread in the world. Bakon beyond belief good; the Segovia veal, much larger, whiter and fatter than ours; mutton most excellent; capons much better than ours. … They have the best partridges I ever eat, and the best saucidges, and salmon, pikes, and sea-breams … The creame called nattuos is much sweeter and thicker than ever I saw in England. Their eggs much exceed ours; and so all sorts of sallets and roots, and fruits. … I have eat many sorts of biskets, cakes, cheese, and excellent sweetmeats. I have not here mentioned especially manger blanc. And they have olives which are no where so good. (171-2)

The excellence of the food folds neatly into the excellence of the court, which she claims

> without partiality … is the best established court but our own in the Christian world that I ever saw … All embassadours live in as great splendor as the most ambitious can desire, and if they are just and good, with as much love as they can deserve. In the palace none serves the King or Qween but the chiefest of the nobility and the antientest families; no, not in the meanest offices. (172)

Hospitality is one of the key virtues of the Spanish kingdom, with not only generosity on show, but also a belief in traditional hierarchies, that, as I have discussed in relation to Anne Clifford, were believed to sustain order and good government. These practices, symbolic of more essential Christian values, also appear to transcend religious and political differences that might otherwise prevent Fanshawe's overt enthusiasm. Although she half-heartedly includes the English court in the running with Spain for best court "in the Christian world," all her surrounding rhetoric identifies this statement as a necessary hedge. The foods she lists are almost all better than those found in England, the Spanish generosity towards ambassadors is beyond compare, and certainly greater than what she receives when she returns to England in 1666, and the Spanish court values its ancient nobility for its service and contribution to a regulated state. The Spanish nobility's knowledge of and comfort with their own positions lead them to model an open-handed hospitality perhaps even greater than that of Anne Clifford: "When they travell they are the most jolly people in the world, dealing their provisions of all sorts to every person they meet, when they are eating" (173).

Cultural Translation and Receipt Book Nostalgia

David Potter suggests that Fanshawe's memoir and her receipt book "might be seen as 'companion books,'" with her recipes reflecting many of the events and concerns of her autobiography (19). Fanshawe's foreign receipts reflect her gastronomic experiences, but more significantly, in the context of similar receipts in other manuscript books, they also provide a theoretical framework through which to understand her relationship to continental foods. Foreign recipes, like Fanshawe's descriptions of Spanish hospitality, frequently attempt to include a record of the time, place, and conditions of the recipe's transfer, partly through preserving the original language of these instructions. This linguistic crossover is indicative of the cultural translation inherent in such an exchange; the gaps that occur after any act of translation also appear once the receipt is recorded and read as a cultural memory. Not fully reproducible in the recorder's homeland, the knowledge of the foreign leads to a simultaneous awareness of its loss. In my reading of these receipts, I hope to establish this process of linguistic and cultural translation as a way of paralleling and elucidating the experiences Fanshawe records in her memoir, as her knowledge of Spain paradoxically feeds the alienation she encounters on her return to England.

Fanshawe's manuscript receipt book, Wellcome Western MS 7113, is necessarily a work of nostalgia, as, similarly to May and Rabisha, its contents continually look to past experiences in the hope of repeating them.[22] Written for the most part in a long italic hand by Joseph Auvrie, Fanshawe's scribe, Fanshawe frequently adds attributions, marginal notes, and consistently signs the recipes in the margin with her abbreviated signature, "A ffan." As inscribed by Auvrie in the front of the book, her receipts include a

[22] Due to its fragility, Fanshawe's receipt book is presently only available for viewing on microfilm.

wide range of "Physicke, Salues, Waters, Cordialls, Preserues and Cookery." Many of her Spanish recipes are for fine pastilles and perfumes, most of which are attributed to a Francisco Morenas. Some of these record the method of transmission; a pastille recipe, for example, is titled "To make the best Pastiles to burn in the world, taught me by a seruant of Francisco Morenas, who was his nephew & came & made them in my house before me this present 17th of Noue 1664 in our house at ye siete Chimenas at Madrid" (84r). A later Portuguese recipe, "A Receipt how to Make Paõdilo" appears in both English and Portuguese ("Receita de como sefas o paõ delo"), but with no specific attribution (151v). Another section of Madrid recipes, recorded on August 10, 1665, include "To make Lemonado," "To make Synamon Water," "To make Alman Milk called Garapiña de Leche de Amendas," "To dresse Chocolatte," and "To make an olla podrida," the latter two apparently deemed unsatisfactory as they are crossed out (154r-155r).[23]

In recording these recipes, Fanshawe is concerned with evoking a sense of authenticity: she includes a receipt in its original language, attributes the recipes, records their dates and occasionally the place where they were made, and makes sure to represent specialty items,[24] such as chocolate, olla podrida, and the perfumes, about which she says in her memoir: "Their perfums of amber excell all the world in their kind" (172). Reproducible souvenirs, these receipts are located in a place and time meant to recall the exact circumstance of the recipe's transcription. The authenticity communicated by these

[23] Fanshawe has obviously tried many of the receipts in her book, as several of them are crossed out with an "X," suggesting that these have been less successful in practice. A telling example of a failed receipt comes under the title "For the Breeding of Pheasants." Fanshawe not only crosses this out, but also writes "Lett this alone" under the title, and under her marginal signature, "To be placed with Experements" (138v).

[24] Other receipt books add foreign recipes seemingly for their inclusion of rare and expensive ingredients. The Boyle family book, for example, includes the technique for making "the Spanish Pastillos the richest sort." This detailed recipe is certainly rich, as it includes "a quarter of an ounce of Musk" and "half an ounce of the best Ambergreece" (measurements of these items are usually in grains) (64r).

instructions is magnified by allusion to the hospitable qualities that Fanshawe notes as particularly Spanish in her memoir. The pastille recipe is a case in point: Morenas's gift exemplifies the generosity of the country, as he transmits his knowledge through both practical and written instructions. But, like any translation, this receipt cannot fully reproduce the original; the context might be remembered, at least by Fanshawe herself, but the details are lacking. As William Gass puts it, "translation is a form of betrayal: … a reconstitution made of sacrifice and revision" (51). If this is true of literary works, it is also true of cookery, as the receipt is translated each time it is used, with the practitioner introducing changes, idiosyncratic choices, and short-cuts. Although Fanshawe hopes to record an aristocratic civility for importation to her less generous homeland in both her receipt book and memoir, the gaps brought to light by translation confirm the cultural divide she experiences on her return.

Other manuscript receipt books containing foreign recipes also evince a desire to embody the moment of transmission within the recipe itself. The book attributed to Mary Granville and Anne (Granville) Dewes, Folger MS V.a.430, contains a small selection of receipts from Cadiz, dated between 1665-87. Mary Granville, mother to Anne, was the daughter of the English consul at Cadiz, Sir Martin Westcomb; these recipes would have been recorded during Westcomb's posting. A variety of hands populate this book; many of the recipes would have been recorded before Mary's birth, or before she would have been old enough to record them herself. Although her birth date is not known, she died in 1747, and recipes dated from 1646, for example, are clearly too early for Mary's involvement.[25] Several of the Cadiz recipes appear to be recorded by different individuals, possibly the owners of the original recipes, as a number of these are written

[25] Biographical information comes from the Folger catalogue.

in Spanish. There is frequently an attempt to situate the recipe in relation to its foreign source; a short medicinal recipe is titled "To Cure a quartan ore doble quartan ague giuen me for Excellens by a Portuges," for example (92). This book also records a recipe for chocolate, this delicacy being itself a foreign import to England.[26] The title attributes the instructions to an English man: "Mr Leonard Wilkes Receat for Good Chocolate and the mixture is oft to haue of things a Milliar ore 1000 Cacaus tosted & soe taken the husks off Beings Computted fower pounds Meat." But the following instructions emphasise the foreignness of the recipe through the mention of special equipment and procedures:

> Requires 3 Ounces of Synamon
>
> 6 Bynillas
>
> 3 pownd of Shugger
>
> Iff you please to put Musk to it a dram will serue for ffortye ore sixty pound to put it in yor chocolate you must beat it in a morter with some white shugger and when your chocolate is redy to bee taken of the stone you must mix it
>
> You must haue a great Care in the Tostinge of your Cacao perpetually stirringe of it while it is one the ffyre for not to burne which if it happen will giue it a badd tast
>
> you must tost it in a new Cassuela yt hath not been used befor for not to giue it a badd tast

[26] A few other manuscript books include recipes for chocolate. The two volume receipt book of Philip Stanhope, Earl of Chesterfield (although attributed to him, it might be more accurately named a family receipt book, as he assures the reader in an initial inscription that most receipts have been "tryed by my selfe or my Wife, or my Mother" (5r)), includes "The reseyte of Chocolate taught me by Mrs Dickenson, Mrs Leningtons daughter," which contains several ingredients from "the Indios" (1.298v). Lady Grace Castleton also has a chocolate recipe in her book: "To make Iocolate Almonds," a much less exotic recipe, but one that emphasises the rarity of this food with the inclusion of ambergris and musk (97).

yor Spyces must bee sifted ass fyne as possible to preuent any settlinge in yor cholate dish at the time when it is taken,

Coll In Belasyse

had of Receat wth <unclear> Cadiz 4th – 8ber 1665 (92)

This receipt is marked by its use of rare and expensive ingredients – cocoa, the three pounds of sugar, musk, and bynillas[27] – as well as by its use of Spanish tools: the cassuela. And like Fanshawe's recipes, it too is given a place and a time. There is an emphasis on procedure, with the warnings about careful toasting and the fine sifting of spices. An unsuccessful trial of these instructions would entail a considerable loss of money, yet despite the stress laid on care, to the modern reader the instructions appear too sparse for a successful result, suggesting that this recipe is as much memoir as instruction. A later recipe suggests a similar situation. Titled "Memoria Como sehace El Picadillo de Xigote de Carnero," it ends with an attribution as well as a record of the recipe as a gift: "Recta del Capittan fran. de Poco de Rota quela Remitio a Cadize al al Consul Sn Martin Biscomde a 22 de Agosto de 1682" (110). Written in its original language, this recipe is linguistically authenticated, whether the future owners of the book can read Spanish or not. It is a "memoria" of a time and place: the evocative nature of food, along with the record of the giver and recipient might contribute to generating an imaginative memory. But the instructional gaps in the chocolate recipe, and the lack of an English version of the Picadillo guidelines mean that these, too, likely remain in the past, as much a memory as Robert May's *Triumphs and Trophies of Cookery*. An example, perhaps, of the distance between the recorder of a foreign recipe and its reader appears in

[27] Likely refers to vanilla beans.

Martha Hodges's book, in which a recipe titled "To make an olian"[28] has a note added beside it, in a different hand: "a foolish French dish" (40). The enthusiasm of the original writer is dampened by the dismissive description provided by another and which reinforces a sense of the continued practice of translation that occurs in cookbooks.

A third receipt book, dated 1637 and attributed to Sarah Hughes, Wellcome Western MS 363, which contains a large variety of Spanish recipes, as well as several written in French, provides an even more explicit commentary on the practice and problems of linguistic and cultural translation. A large folio bound in half-calf, this book contains several hands and sections, with the second main section consisting of a series of dessert recipes that appear to belong to Sarah Hughes. The first section of the book, between folios 9-46, is in a different, unidentifiable italic hand, and is initiated by a drawn title page in red and black ink:

LIBRO

de Recetas de Portugal

para hacer

Puetes y Pastillas

y

adrecar

Guantes perfumados

Although the recipes are advertised as being Portuguese, they are, for the most part, written in Spanish; the last three recipes, however, are written in English, which is clearly the writer's first language as evidenced by orthographic mistakes as well as the need to define Spanish terms in the few English recipes. Measurements such as an "adarma" are

[28] Most likely an olio, which is more accurately Spanish and derives from the term olla podrida.

defined as "the 16th part of an ounce" (41r), for example; more telling instances make a separation between an undefined there and a "heere": "heere they vse to put some slices of the skin of an aple called the Camueça" (41v). The ingredients of the last three recipes – "Pastillas de boca de Juan Moreno," "Pomos de Olor para la Lumbre of John Moreno," and "To make Pastillas de fuego of John Moreno's fashion" – are of very high quality, and include civet, amber, ambergris, and musk. These are detailed enough recipes that they could be followed, with exact proportions given of the expensive ingredients, yet they also allow for a practitioner's variations, as is noted at the end of the final recipe: "The proportions herein mentioned make soe good, as any King need vse; yet you may adde thereto as you please; & soe may you take from it" (42r). Once again, the recipes recorded are culturally specific and identified by source, thereby implying the transmission of the recipes as a type of gift, and they retain the linguistic flavour of the original. The same hand that takes down these recipes also records a few sweet recipes in French at the end of the Sarah Hughes section (fol. 77r-78v), and comes in once again near the end of the folio with multilingual receipts that move back and forth between Spanish, French, English, and Italian, embodying the multiplicity of cultural exchange through language (190r).

A third section of the receipt book, folios 81v-100r, contains a translation of a selection of the Spanish recipes recorded in section one. The translator, the owner of a neat and legible secretary hand, appears more interested in the act of translating than he does in the recipes themselves, as he prefaces the translation with a description of his technique:[29]

[29] I have assumed the translator is male only because of the consistent use of secretary hand.

I'have exactly translated this Spanish coppy; & perused it ouer; so that there is nothing wanting in ye English, sauing theese words Ffollowing; which I'could not ffinde in the Dictionaries; but I'haue here sett them downe; & left an space in their proper places; as you shall ffinde;

[he lists the words and pages they correspond to]

it is to bee noted that, the Spanish Coppy is very ill poynted, or distinguished; & it hath Diuers ffalse orthographies; & this may bee an cause that theese names may not so easily appeare in the Dictionary.

A'n advertisement:

Note that all which is in the Spanish expressed (by the way of speaking vnto) in the third person; I'haue put & translated in the second; it beeing more vsuall, & familiar in our Idiom: all marginall notes, & wordes, & sentences underlined with an line in this manner _____ & are added, for the better explanation; for that ye Spanish translated in euery particle verbatim would sound harsh in English, & not bee so well, or all togeather intelligible:

Although this writer tries to make the pastille and perfume recipes more accessible to English readers, his explanation of his translation technique also explains what happens when a receipt leaves its homeland. This translator is more interested in finding fault with the original transcription than he is in making the recipes, and he has admitted, not unjustly, to taking liberties with the Spanish so that the English might read more smoothly. He has, of course, also selected the receipts most worthy of translation, and so has left out several items. How useful the translated recipe will be to someone who

wishes to make it is in question; it is possible that the translation has "Englished" the recipes in more ways than one.

A most pointed example of "Englishing" is delivered by Kenelm Digby, whose "Tea with Eggs" (108-9), a Chinese receipt passed down by a "Jesuite" who had been there, explains both the English deficiency in making tea, and provides a very English guideline for this endeavour: "Mr Waller … saith, we let the hot water remain too long soaking upon the Tea, which makes it extract into it self the earthy parts of the herb. The water is to remain upon it, no longer that whiles you can say the *Miserere* Psalm very leisurely" (109). If this instruction, like the pastille translations, brings the recipe into a familiar cultural context, it also distinguishes itself from the original and hints at the loss experienced by this act. Likewise, if Fanshawe's immediate purpose in recording the hospitality she experienced in Spain, both in her memoir and receipt book, was to acknowledge the nobility of the gifts she had received, its later effect is to expose the very real distance between two countries which, in 1676, were at war. The generosity that she posits as particular to Spain cannot be fully translated in England, where what is usual is loss, lack, and struggle against power structures that have minimal interest in her, her family, or the traditions of hospitality so well displayed in this continental place of nostalgia.

English Reality

Fanshawe's return to England is a direct contrast to her triumphal sojourn in Spain. Shortly after Richard is recalled as ambassador in 1666, he succumbs to an illness and dies before he can return home. Although the powerful Queen Mother offers Ann a

place at court, with "a pension of 30 thousand ducats a year, and to provide for my children" (186), this security comes with the price of conversion, which she refuses to undertake, and she accompanies Richard's body back to England in the fall. Her initial visit to the king is promising, as he "was pleased to receive me very gratiously" and promised payment of the considerable amount of £2000 back-pay for her husband, and another £5815 that Richard had spent "in His Majesty's service" (188). She herself is equally gracious, attending the queen and presenting generous gifts to the monarchs, the Duke of York, and several nobles at court. But she receives no money until the end of 1669, and never appears to receive her husband's salary. She is also forced to pay another £2000 for the embassy plate, which leads her to a ferocious outburst against Lord Shaftesbury "(the worst of men)," whom she blames for this particular indignity: "I have been told that he did this to have a bribe. Only I wish I had given one, though I had *poured* it down his throat, for the benefit of mankind" (189). Although she directs her anger at Shaftesbury rather than the king, Charles might have overridden his ministers in Fanshawe's favour had he so wished.

But Charles was more interested in outward performance than inward values; as Paul Seaward has noted, "Charles's commitment to anything could not really be relied upon. His ability to say one thing and do another was notorious" (*ODNB*). Fanshawe was certainly not the only woman to have undergone such a betrayal. Similar disappointment was experienced by Anne, Lady Halkett, whose memoir records a memory of her hospitality towards the young Duke of York (the future James II) in part, it seems, to encourage Charles's bounty towards her. Writing her memoirs in 1677-78, she spends most of her time depicting her participation in royalist activities during the civil war, and

was especially known for her role in the Duke of York's escape from St. James's palace in 1648 by ordering him a disguise in the form of women's clothing, and by feeding him before sending him away to safety:

> I dresed him in the wemen's habitt that was prepared, which fitted His Highnese very well and was very pretty in itt. Affter hee had eaten some thing I made ready while I was idle, lest His Highnese should be hungry, and having sentt for a Woodstreet cake (which I knew hee loved) to take in the barge, with as much hast as could bee His Highnese wentt crose the bridge to the staires where the barge lay. (25)

Despite Susan Wiseman's dismissal of Halkett's emphasis on feeding the young duke, with her suggestion that Halkett's "stuffing the narrative's most important drama with culinary detail" was merely a way of "corroborating" her "claim to have been there" ("Most considerable" 33), her record of this exchange provides important evidence of the physical and almost motherly tie she tries to establish. She dresses him, oversees his transformation, and provides food that she apparently prepares with her own hands, as well as a delicacy he particularly loves. This, of course, has everything to do with showing her support for Charles II, as revealed particularly by her later meeting with Charles in 1650 and her hopes for his personal recognition. Her expectations were both political and economic, as she was financially bereft, having "lost control of the property and revenues" she had inherited from her mother (Stevenson). More pointedly, at the time of her writing the memoir, Halkett had received less than she hoped from Charles following her petitions for compensation for property loss; she notes in a 1661 manuscript that "'I have given many petitions & requests but all I receave is Civilittys

that would incourage me to hope … yett I see others, of as litle merit as my selfe gett all they seek & more than they could expect'" (qtd. Wiseman 38). By foregrounding her personal involvement in the duke's escape through her care for his physical well-being and her hospitality in the shape of a cake, Halkett draws specific attention to the associations surrounding maternal nourishment. If only for an instant, she has the opportunity to shape the young man in a manner befitting her own child; her insistence on this act attempts to tie her fortunes incontrovertibly to those of the monarchy, claiming a level of kinship with the duke that might overcome Charles's indifference and lead to financial support.

The final few pages of Fanshawe's text express her own disappointment, delineating her family's suffering and loyalty to the crown, their own careful management of their household and accounts that left them debt-free in both England and Spain, and the final inability of these services to encourage the crown's feeling of commitment towards her. As she writes plaintively, this was not just her personal loss, but one that affected her entire family:

> Thus in the fourth generation of the chief of our family since the[y] came in to the south, they, for their sufferings for the crown, sold the flower of their estate and of near 2000 a year more; there remains but the Remembrancer place of the Exchequer office, and very patheticall is the moto of our armes for us: THE VICTORY IS IN THE CROSS. (191)

Made even more poignant by the fact that she could have remained at the Spanish court, Fanshawe returns home to a land that is no longer home at all. Charles cannot even demonstrate the loyalty to his religion that Fanshawe does; in 1669 he announced that,

like his brother, he "intended to make a public profession of the Roman Catholic faith" (Seaward). Although he did not convert until his death, this is yet another example of the distance between his and Fanshawe's understanding of loyalty, honour, and faith. The "betrayal" of translation operates here as well; Fanshawe's adherence to older values, that she eloquently reveals through her attention to hospitality and food, prevent her from understanding the new language of a court in which identities and loyalties could be shifted at will.

Fanshawe's experience might also reflect back on that of Anne Clifford to elucidate how an everyday act such as hospitality might become a political statement of value in the right context. If the Restoration was greeted by receipt books that recalled Elizabethan and even earlier practices as models for the new regime, by the end of the first decade these receipt books indicated no longer hopefulness but remonstrance. Clifford's lifelong loyalty to Elizabethan practice, announced by her nostalgic introduction to her diaries, as well as her careful records of her ability to carry those policies out for herself, becomes an equal remonstrance to a bankrupt and selfish regime. As Clifford affirmed, the generous feeding of one's people demonstrated the ruler's loyalty and secured that of dependents. Fanshawe's lingering nostalgia for her Spanish experience exemplifies the loss of that traditional exchange so embedded in royalist understandings of hospitable relations.

CHAPTER 6

Conclusion

In this discussion of receipt books and women's literary writings, I have attempted to show both that a political discourse of food existed in early modern England, and that women were participants in this discourse. As I have argued, food discourse was not exclusive to women; on the contrary, receipt books confirm men's interest in developing this domestic-political language. But domestic practice was undeniably part of a woman's domain, and food and its discourses were differently accessible to women, who actually participated in and oversaw the feeding of children, guests, and family members.[1] As receipt books and other food-related writing demonstrated a growing engagement with domestic politics over the course of the seventeenth century, women also turned to food to express their own dissatisfaction with current regimes and policies. From James I to Charles II, women appear to have gained authority to communicate dissent because of this language that derives from the authority they had in their own homes.

[1] Cookbooks such as Robert May's, which name male patrons as the source of hospitality, suggest that men might have collaborated with women in providing grand displays of hospitality in particular. However, as the majority of printed cookbooks imply, with their specific focus on women as readers, the organization of food and feeding, as well as the creation of fine banqueting stuff, was left to women to perform, even if their efforts were subsumed under their husband's names. Such receipt book implication is also confirmed by documents such as Margaret Hoby's diary, in which she identifies herself clearly as the estate manager, as well as manuscript receipt books that provide detailed evidence of women's practical and creative engagement with food and cookery.

From my investigation of receipt books and food discourse in women's writing, it has become clear that the language of food combines with a range of discursive practices. Many of the women I have discussed – Dorothy Leigh, Elizabeth Clinton, Mary Wroth, Sarah Wight, and Anna Trapnel – unite food discourse with biblical and other religious references. Breastfeeding, for example, is seen as symbol of the transmission of love and faith between God and his people, and an important aspect of national education that might establish England as the new Jerusalem under God. Sweet foods, of which the English were enamoured, and which were promoted in many receipt books, lent themselves to religious interpretation as well. As Dorothy Leigh, Mary Wroth, and Anna Trapnel reveal, sweetness is not only pleasurable, but also a gift from God, and an important aspect of virtuous dining habits. But all three women draw attention to courtly dysfunction through allusions to the false sweetness that might be found at the hands of the devil, or those under his sway, thus establishing their own type of sweet critique.

Clinton and Leigh also partake of the discourse that finds a distinct relationship between food and the nation. Mother's milk is local food, symbolic of the alleged purity of the homegrown and untainted by importation from religiously opposed sources.[2] In a similar vein, Wroth's advocacy of simplicity is based on country-grown foods; the bounty found on the island of the lady of Robollo in the *Urania*, for instance, is indicative of the virtues of local nourishment, with these foods reminiscent of the fecundity found in Eden. Anne Clifford's hospitable table also establishes the importance of food to local order and prosperity; her actions evoke memories of Queen Elizabeth's generosity during the seemingly less orderly and bountiful reign of Charles II. And as Ann Fanshawe

[2] Although many wet nurses would have also been English, breastfeeding pamphlets implied that their milk was not actually local, as it did not have the blood tie to the child that mother's milk had. The demonization of wet nurses, was more likely rooted in class than religious stereotypes.

demonstrates, the nation might sometimes be defined negatively in relation to foreign foods and hospitality. Instead of looking to an earlier century, as does Clifford, Fanshawe looks to another country to provide her with rhetorical ballast against Charles's neglectful and self-indulgent reign.

The use of hospitality as a means to communicate disapproval is also taken up by Anna Trapnel, for whom protectorate over-eating and selfishness is proof of Cromwell's inability to mirror the generous hospitality of God. Such inability is harmful to the health of the nation, and the people are left to starve as its rulers consume the nation's riches. Concerns for national health are raised, as well, by Wroth, whose prescriptions for simple, virtuous, yet bountiful dining are revealed to improve a ruler's ability to govern, with the faculties of reason and moderation improved by a complementary diet. Sarah Wight, on the other hand, chooses fasting as a method of bringing the nation back to a healthy state; this performance of faith – as she relies only on God's food for her survival – becomes a reflection of the return of the Israelites to God's table. Refreshed and reformed by her submission, she models the way to a renewed covenant with God in her interpretation of national health.

Alongside my discussions of the politics of female food discourse, I have also tried to chart the politicization of food through readings of receipt books themselves. If Elizabethan writers such as John Partridge and Thomas Dawson subversively spread the knowledge of courtly dining to middling women and their families, Jacobean writers more actively promoted their own support for or detraction from the monarchy through prefatory and other contextual material that drew on the language of fashion, science, and puritanism. The comparatively forthright announcement of political views in the pages of

Jacobean receipt books paved the way for the overtly political adoption by royalists of the receipt book genre in the 1650s. Communicating support for the deposed monarchy through a recollection of royalist figures and fine dining, these books cultivated memories of pre-civil war and Elizabethan values of hospitality and courtesy. Restoration receipt books adopted a similar stance, promoting the values of hospitality in particular as they looked forward to the re-ordering of the nation's household under Charles II.

In my parallel and overlapping investigations of receipt books and early modern women's writing, I have hoped to establish that women used food discourse for political ends, and in doing so, that they also partook of a wider cultural discourse that concurrently used commentary on food to establish political alliance and provide guidance not simply for the domestic household but for England itself. Taking cues from previous scholarship on receipt books and the domestic, I have expanded on critical perspectives that have remained focused primarily on the voices of men. By concentrating on women's literary and polemical works, I have established that food was not simply a locus of domestic skill and control, but a language that women adopted to communicate political ideas that have only recently been critically acknowledged to be within the purview of women. As a result of this focus, I have spent less time addressing the sensual enjoyment that food does and can provide, and which the recipes within printed and manuscript receipt books constantly reiterate for the reader. As I discussed in Chapter 2, women were encouraged to adopt and pursue the pleasurable in receipt books. This endorsement of pleasure countered the dour instructions delivered by early modern conduct books in particular. The true pleasures of food are best expressed in the writings of Ann, Lady Fanshawe, as she lingers over details of meals and foodstuffs in a manner

that reveals her active interest in the gastronomic arts even as she deploys her enjoyment of food for political ends.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A.W. *A Book of Cookrye. Very necessary for all such as delight therin. Gathered by A.W. And now newlye enlarged with the seruing in of the Table. With the proper Sauces to each of them conuenient*. London: Edward Allde, 1591.

Abate, Corinne S., ed. *Privacy, Domesticity, and Women in Early Modern England.* Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003.

Acheson, Katherine Osler. "The Modernity of the Early Modern: The Example of Anne Clifford." Comensoli and Stevens 27-51.

Achinstein, Sharon. "Women on Top in the Pamphlet Literature of the English Revolution." *Feminism and Renaissance Studies*. Ed. Lorna Hutson. Oxford and New York: Oxford UP, 1999. 339-72.

Acton, Grace. *Medical and cookery receipts. c.* 1621. Wellcome Western MS 1. Wellcome Library for the History and Understanding of Medicine, London, England.

Adelman, Janet. "'Anger's My Meat': Feeding, Dependency, and Aggression in *Coriolanus*." *Representing Shakespeare: New Psychoanalytic Essays*. Eds. Murray M. Schwartz and Coppélia Kahn. Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins UP, 1980. 129-49.

Albala, Ken. *Eating Right in the Renaissance*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: U of California P, 2002.

Alexander, Gavin. "Constant Works: A Framework for Reading Mary Wroth." *Sidney Newsletter and Journal* 14.2 (1996): 5-32.

Althusser, Louis. *Lenin and Philosophy and other Essays*. Tr. Ben Brewster. New York and London: Monthly Review, 1971.

Amussen, Susan Dwyer. *An Ordered Society: Gender and Class in Early Modern England.* Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1988.

Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. Rev. ed. London and New York: Verso, 1991.

Andrea, Bernadette. "Pamphilia's Cabinet: Gendered Authorship and Empire in Lady Mary Wroth's *Urania*." *ELH* 68 (2001): 335-58.

Anonymous. *A Book of Fruits & Flowers. Shewing the Nature and Use of them, either in Meat or Medicine*. London: M.S. for Thomas Jenner, 1653.

Anonymous. *A Bottle of Holy Tears, Or, Jeremies Threnes and Lamentations for Israels misery and Jerusalems woefull desolation.* York: Thomas Broad, 1645.

Anonymous. *The Court and Kitchin of Elizabeth, Commonly called Joan Cromwel, The Wife of the late Usurper*. London: Thomas Milbourn for Randal Taylor, 1664.

Anonymous. *A Discoverie of Six Women-Preachers, in Middlesex, Kent, Cambridge, and Salisbury. With A Relation of their Names, Manners, Life, and Doctrine.* London, 1641.

Anonymous. *Englands Remembrancer, Or, A Warning From Heaven.* London: Thomas Paine for Francis Eglesfield, 1644.

Anonymous. *The Generals Dinner At the Lady Crispes, with His Lady, and Officers of the Armie. How his Excellency was invited by a Cook. The Manner of the Dinner, Their great danger of being all poysoned; and remedies used to preserve them. And The Cooke who was the Chiefe Actor, Committed.* Printed in the Yeere, 1647.

Anonymous. *The Ladies Companion.* London: W. Bentley, 1653.

Anonymous. *The Office of Christian Parents: Shewing how children are to be gouerned throughout all ages and times of their life*. Cambridge: Cantrell Legge, 1616.

Anonymous. *A Trve Description of the Pot-Companion Poet: Who Is the Founder of all the Base and Libellous Pamphlets lately spread abroad. Also, A Character of the Swil-bole Cook.* London: R.W., 1642.

Appelbaum, Robert. *Aguecheek's Beef, Belch's Hiccup, and Other Gastronomic Interjections: Literature, Culture, and Food Among the Early Moderns*. Chicago and London: U of Chicago P, 2006.

---. "Rhetoric and Epistemology in Early Printed Recipe Collections." *Journal for Early Modern Cultural Studies* 3.2 (2003): 1-35.

---. "Eve's and Adam's 'Apple': Horticulture, Taste, and the Flesh of the Forbidden Fruit in *Paradise Lost*." *Milton Quarterly* 36.4 (2002): 221-39.

Archer, Jayne. "The Queens' Arcanum: Authority and Authorship in *The Queens Closet Opened* (1655)." *Renaissance Journal* 1.6 (2002): 14-26.

Arpad, Susan S. "'Pretty Much to Suit Ourselves': Midwestern Women Naming Experience Through Domestic Arts." *Making the American Home: Middle-Class Women and Domestic and Material Culture 1840-1940*. Eds. Marilyn Ferris Motz and Pat Browne. Bowling Green, OH: Bowling Green State U Popular P, 1988. 11-26.

Ashton, Robert, ed. *James I by his Contemporaries: An account of his career and character as seen by some of his contemporaries*. London: Hutchinson, 1969.

Barish, Jonas A. "Feasting and Judging in Jonsonian Comedy." *Renaissance Drama* New Series V (1972): 3-35.

Barroll, Leeds. *Anna of Denmark, Queen of England: A Cultural Biography*. Philadelphia: U of Pennsyvania P, 2001.

Barthes, Roland. "Toward a Psychosociology of Contemporary Food Consumption." Counihan and Esterik 20-27.

Bate, Jonathan. "Introduction." *Titus Andronicus*. Arden Shakespeare. London and New York: Routledge, 1995. 1-121.

Beal Peter. *In Praise of Scribes: Manuscripts and their Makers in Seventeenth-Century England*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1998.

Beilin, Elaine. "'Some Freely Spake Their Minde': Resistance in Anne Dowriche's *French Historie*." Burke et al 119-40.

---. "Winning 'the harts of the people': The Role of the Political Subject in the *Urania*." King 1-17.

---. *Redeeming Eve: Women Writers of the English Renaissance*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1987.

Bellany, Alastair. *The Politics of Court Scandal in Early Modern England: News Culture and the Overbury Affair, 1603-1610*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2002.

Best, Michael R. "Introduction." *The English Housewife*. Kingston and Montreal: McGill-Queen's UP, 1986. xi-lviii.

The Bible: Authorized King James Version. Introduction and notes by Robert Carroll and Stephen Prickett. Oxford and New York: Oxford UP, 1997, 1998.

Blith, Walter. *The English Improver*. London: John Wright, 1649.

---. *The English Improver Improved*. London: John Wright, 1652.

Boehrer, Bruce Thomas. *The Fury of Men's Gullets: Ben Jonson and the Digestive Canal*. Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 1997.

Boose, Lynda E. "The Family in Shakespeare Studies; or – Studies in the Family of Shakespeareans; or – The Politics of Politics." *Renaissance Quarterly* 40.4 (1987): 707-42.

Boro, Joyce. "Partridge, John (*fl.* 1566-1582)." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Oxford UP, 2004. http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/21483. Accessed 21 Feb. 2007.

Bourdieu, Pierre. *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*. Tr. Richard Nice. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1984.

Bowden, Peter J. "Agricultural prices, wages, farm profits, and rents." Thirsk 1-118.

Bower, Anne L. ed. *Recipes for Reading: Community Cookbooks, Stories, Histories*. Amherst: U of Massachusetts P, 1997.

---. "Cooking Up Stories: Narrative Elements in Community Cookbooks." Bower 29-50.

Bowerbank, Sylvia. *Speaking for Nature: Women and Ecologies of Early Modern England*. Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins UP, 2004.

Boyle family. *Collection of 712 medical, with a few cookery receipts. c.* 1675-*c.*1710. Wellcome Western MS 1340. Wellcome Library for the History and Understanding of Medicine. London, England.

Brannigan, John. *New Historicism and Cultural Materialism*. New York: St. Martin's, 1998.

Bray, Alan and Michel Rey. "The body of the friend: continuity and change in masculine friendship in the seventeenth century." *English Masculinities 1660-1800*. Eds. Tim Hitchcock and Michèle Cohen. London and New York: Longman, 1999. 65-84.

Brears, Peter. "Introduction." *The Boke of Keruynge*. Lawes, East Sussex: Southover, 2003. 1-23.

Brodzki, Bella and Celeste Schenck, eds. *Life/Lines: Theorizing Women's Autobiography*. Ithaca and London: Cornell UP, 1988.

---. "Introduction." Brodzki and Schenck 1-15.

Bright, Timothy. *A Treatise: wherein is declared the sufficiencie of English Medicines, for cure of all diseases, cured with Medicine*. London: Henrie Middleton for Thomas Man, 1580.

Brown, Sylvia. "'Over Her Dead Body': Feminism, Poststructuralism, and the Mother's Legacy." Comensoli and Stevens 3-26.

Bryson, Anna. *From Courtesy to Civility: Changing Codes of Conduct in Early Modern England*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1998.

Bulkeley, Elizabeth. *Book of herbs and receipts*. 1627. Wellcome Western MS 169. Wellcome Library for the History and Understanding of Medicine, London, England.

Burke, Mary E., Jane Donawerth, Linda L. Dove, and Karen Nelson, eds. *Women, Writing, and the Reproduction of Culture*. Syracuse: Syracuse UP, 2000.

Butler, Charles. *The Feminine Monarchie Or A Treatise Concerning Bees and the Dve Ordering of Them*. Oxford: Joseph Barnes, 1609.

Bynum, Caroline Walker. *Holy Feast and Holy Fast: The Religious Significance of Food to Medieval Women*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: U of California P, 1987.

Camden, Vera J. "Attending to Sarah Wight: 'Little Writer of God's Wonders.'" *Bunyan Studies* 11 (2003): 94-131.

Campbell, Gordon. "Phillips, John (1631-1706?)." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Oxford UP, Sept. 2004. Online edition, May 2006. http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.library.dal.ca/view/article/22161. Accessed 27 June 2007.

Candido, Joseph. "Dining in Ephesus: Food in *The Comedy of Errors*." *SEL* 30.2 (1990): 217-41.

Capp, B.S. *The Fifth Monarchy Men: A Study in Seventeenth-century English Millenarianism*. London: Faber and Faber, 1972.

Carleton, Dudley. *Dudley Carleton to John Chamberlain 1603-1624: Jacobean Letters*. Ed. Maurice Lee, Jr. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers UP, 1972.

Carrell, Jennifer Lee. "A Pack of Lies in a Looking Glass: Lady Mary Wroth's *Urania* and the Magic Mirror of Romance." *SEL* 34.1 (1994): 79-107.

Cary, Mary. *A Word in Season to the Kingdom of England. Or, A precious Cordiall for a distempered Kingdom*. London: R.W. for Giles Calvert, 1647.

Castleton, Lady Grace. *Cookery and medical receipt book*. 17th c. Folger MS Add. 940. Folger Shakespeare Library, Washington, D.C.

Cavanagh, Shiela T. "Romancing the Epic: Lady Mary Wroth's *Urania* and Literary Tradition." *Approaches to the Anglo and American Female Epic, 1621-1982*. Ed. Bernard Schweizer. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006. 19-36.

---. "'She is but enchanted': Christianity and the Occult in Lady Mary Wroth's *Urania*." *Things of the Spirit: Women Writers Constructing Spirituality*. Ed. Kristina K. Groover. Notre Dame: U of Notre Dame P, 2004. 69-89.

---. "Mystical Sororities: The Power of Supernatural Female Narratives in Lady Mary Wroth's *Urania*." Abate 151-65.

---. "Prisoners of Love: Cross-Cultural and Supernatural Desires in Lady Mary Wroth's *Urania*. " *Prose Fiction and Early Modern Sexualities in England 1570-1640*. Eds. Constance C. Relihan and Goran V. Stanivukovic. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003. 93-110.

---. *Cherished Torment: The Emotional Geography of Lady Mary Wroth's* Urania. Pittsburgh: Duquesne UP, 2001.

---. "'The Great Cham': East Meets West in Lady Mary Wroth's *Urania*." Wallwork and Salzman 87-103.

Cavendish, Margaret, Duchess of Newcastle. *Poems, and Phancies, Written By the Thrice Noble, Illustrious, And Excellent Princess The Lady Marchioness of Newcastle*. London: William Wilson, 1664.

Cerasano, S.P. and Marion Wynne-Davies, eds. *Gloriana's Face: Women, Public and Private, in the English Renaissance*. Hemel Hempstead, UK: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1992.

Certain Sermons or Homilies Appointed to be Read in Churches. 1562. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1908.

Chamberlain, John. *The Letters of John Chamberlain*. 2 vols. Ed. Norman Egbert McClure. Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1939.

Charles, Amy M. "Mrs. Herbert's Kitchin Booke." *ELR* 4 (1974): 164-173.

Chedgzoy, Kate. "Female prophecy in the seventeenth century: the instance of Anna Trapnel." *Writing and the English Renaissance*. Eds. William Zunder and Suzanne Trill. London and New York: Longman, 1996. 238-54.

Cheney, Patrick and Lauren Silberman, eds. *Worldmaking Spenser: Explorations in the Early Modern Age*. Lexington: UP of Kentucky, 2000.

Christensen, Ann. "Playing the Cook: Nurturing Men in *Titus Andronicus*." *Shakespeare Yearbook* 6 (1996): 327-54.

---. "Private supper/public feast: Gender, power, and nurture in early modern England." Diss. University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1991.

Clarke, Danielle. *The Politics of Early Modern Women's Writing*. Harrow, Essex: Longman, 2001.

Cleaver, Robert and John Dod. *A Godly Forme of Hovsehold Government: For the Ordering of priuate Families, according to the direction of Gods word*. London: Thomas Creede for Thomas Mann, 1603.

Clifford, Lady Anne, Countess of Pembroke, Dorset, and Montgomery. *The Diaries of Lady Anne Clifford*. Ed. D.J.H. Clifford. Phoenix Mill: Sutton, 1990.

Clinton, Elizabeth, Countess of Lincoln. *The Covntess of Lincolnes Nvrserie*. Oxford: John Litchfield and James Short,1622.

Cole, J.A. "Sunday Dinners and Thursday Suppers: Social and Moral Contexts of the Food Imagery in *Women Beware Women*." *Jacobean Miscellany* 4 (1984): 86-98.

Coleman, Patrick, Jayne Lewis, and Jill Kowalik, eds. *Representations of the Self from the Renaissance to Romanticism*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2000.

---. "Introduction: life writing and the legitimation of the modern self." Coleman et al. 1-15.

Collinson, Patrick. "Biblical rhetoric: the English nation and national sentiment in the prophetic mode." *Religion and Culture in Renaissance England*. Eds. Claire McEachern and Debora Shuger. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1997. 15-45.

Comensoli, Viviana. *"Household Business": Domestic Plays of Early Modern England*. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1996.

Comensoli, Viviana and Paul Stevens, eds. *Discontinuities: New Essays on Renaissance Literature and Criticism*. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1998.

Considine, John. "Wolley, Hannah (*b.* 1622?, *d.* in or after 1674)." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Oxford UP, 2004. http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.library.dal.ca/view/article/29957. Accessed 19 July 2007.

---. "Rabisha, William (*fl.* 1625-1661)." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Oxford UP, 2004. http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy. library.dal.ca/view/article/50472. Accessed 19 June 2006.

Cooper, Joseph. *The Art of Cookery Refin'd and Augmented.* London: R. Lowndes, 1654.

Cotter, Colleen. "Claiming a Piece of the Pie: How the Language of Recipes Defines Community." Bower 51-74.

Counihan, Carole and Penny Van Esterik, eds. *Food and Culture: A Reader*. New York and London: Routledge, 1997.

Cox, Lee Sheridan. "Food-Word Imagery in *Paradise Regained.*" *ELH* 28.3 (1961): 225-43.

Crab, Roger. *The English Hermite, or Wonder of this Age. Being a relation of the life of Roger Crab*. London, 1655.

Craig, Martha J. "'Write it upon the walles of your houses': Dorothy Leigh's *The Mothers Blessing*." *Women's Life-Writing: Finding Voice/Building Community*. Ed. Linda S. Coleman. Bowling Green, OH: Bowling Green State U Popular P, 1997. 191-208.

Dailey, Barbara Ritter. "The Visitation of Sarah Wight: Holy Carnival and the Revolution of the Saints in Civil War London." *Church History* 55.4 (1986): 438-55.

David, Elizabeth. "A True Gentlewoman's Delight." *Petits Propos Culinaires* 1 (1979): 43-53.

Davies, H. Neville. "Jacobean *Antony and Cleopatra*." *Shakespeare Studies* 17 (1985): 123-58.

Davies, Stevie. *Unbridled Spirits: Women of the English Revolution: 1640-1660.* London: Women's Press, 1998.

Davis, Lloyd. "Redemptive Advice: Dorothy Leigh's *The Mother's Blessing*." Wallwork and Salzman 59-71.

Dawson, Thomas. *The Second part of the good Hus-wiues Iewell. Where is to be found most apt and readiest wayes to distill many wholsome and sweet waters. In which likewise is shewed the best maner in preseruing of diuers sorts of Fruits, & making of Sirrops. With diuers conceits in Cookerie with the Booke of Caruing*. London: E. Allde for Edward White, 1597.

---. *The good huswifes Iewell. Wherein is to be found most excellent and rare Deuises for Conceites in Cookerie, found out by the practise of Thomas Dawson. Whereunto is adioyned sundry approued reseits for many soueraigne Oyles, and the way to distill many precious waters, with diuers approued medicines for many diseases. Also certaine approued points of husbandry, very necessarie for all Husbandmen to know*. London: John Wolfe for Edward White, 1587.

Daybell, James. "Introduction: Rethinking Women and Politics in Early Modern England." Daybell 1-20.

--- ed. *Women and Politics in Early Modern England.* Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004.

de Certeau, Michel. *The Practice of Everyday Life*. 1984. Tr. Steven Rendall. Berkeley and Los Angeles: U of California P, 1988.

de Certeau, Michel, Luce Girard, and Pierre Mayol. *The Practice of Everyday Life Volume 2: Living and Cooking*. Tr. Timothy J. Tomasik. Ed. Luce Girard. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1998.

de Certeau, Michel and Luce Girard. "A Practical Science of the Singular." de Certeau, Girard, Mayol 251-56.

de la Bere, Ann and Hester. *Medical and cookery receipts*. 17th c. Wellcome Western MS 7577. Wellcome Library for the History and Understanding of Medicine, London, England.

de Worde, Wynkyn. *The Boke of Keruynge*. Intro. and ed. Peter Brears. Lawes, East Sussex: Southover, 2003.

Digby, Kenelm. *The Closet of the Eminently Learned Sir Kenelme Digbie Kt. Opened (1669)*. Eds. Jane Stevenson and Peter Davidson. Totnes: Prospect, 1997.

Dodds, Lara. "Margaret Cavendish's Domestic Experiment." Dowd and Eckerle 151-68.

Dollimore, Jonathan. "Shakespeare, Cultural Materialism, Feminism and Marxist Humanism." *New Literary History* 21.3 (1990): 471-93.

Dollimore, Jonathan and Alan Sinfield. "Culture and textuality: debating cultural materialism." *Textual Practice* 4 (1990): 91-100.

--- eds. *Political Shakespeare: New essays in cultural materialism*. Manchester: Manchester UP, 1985

Douglas, Mary. "Deciphering a Meal." Counihan and Esterik 36-53.

Dove, Linda L. "Mary Wroth and the Politics of the Household in 'Pamphilia to Amphilanthus. '" Burke et al 141-56.

Dowd, Michelle M. and Julie A. Eckerle. *Genre and Women's Life Writing in Early Modern England*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007.

Drummond, J.C. and Anne Wilbraham. *The Englishman's Food: A History of Five Centuries of English Diet*. London: Jonathan Cape, 1958.

Dunford, Terrance. "Consumption of the World: Reading, Eating and Imitation in *Every Man Out of His Humor*." *ELR* 14.2 (1984): 131-47.

Eamon, William. *Science and the Secrets of Nature: Books of Secrets in Medieval and Early Modern Culture*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1994.

Elias, Norbert. *The Civilizing Process: Sociogenetic and Psychogenetic Investigations*. Rev. ed. Tr. Edmund Jephcott. Eds. Eric Dunning, Johan Goudsblom, and Stephen Mennell. Oxford: Blackwell, 2000.

Elyot, Thomas. *The Castel of Helthe*. London: Thomas Berthelet, 1539.

Erasmus, Desiderius. "The New Mother." Tr. Craig Thompson. *Erasmus on Women*. Ed. Erika Rummel. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1996. 156-73.

Ezell, Margaret J.M. "Domestic Papers: Manuscript Culture and Early Modern Women's Life Writing." Dowd and Eckerle 33-48.

---. *Social Authorship and the Advent of Print*. Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins UP, 1999.

---. *Writing Women's Literary History*. Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins UP, 1993.

---. "The Myth of Judith Shakespeare: Creating the Canon of Women's Literature." *New Literary History* 21.3 (1990): 579-92.

Fanshawe, Ann. "The Memoirs of Ann, Lady Fanshawe." *The Memoirs of Anne, Lady Halkett and Ann Lady Fanshawe*. Ed. John Loftis. Oxford: Clarendon, 1979. 101-92.

---. *Book of cookery and medical receipts*. Begun 1651. Wellcome Western MS 7113. Wellcome Library for the History and Understanding of Medicine, London, England.

---. *Memoirs of Lady Fanshawe*. 1676. Add. MS 41161. British Library, London, England.

Feroli, Teresa. "'*Infelix Simulacrum*': The Rewriting of Loss in Elizabeth Jocelin's *The Mothers Legacie*." *ELH* 6.1 (1994): 89-102.

Field, Catherine. "'Many hands hands': Writing the Self in Early Modern Women's Recipe Books." Dowd and Eckerle 49-63.

Fienberg, Nona. "Mary Wroth's Poetics of the Self." *SEL* 42.1 (2002): 121-36.

Fitzpatrick, Joan. *Food in Shakespeare: Early Modern Dietaries and the Plays*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007.

---. "Food and Foreignness in *Sir Thomas More*." *Early Theatre* 7.2 (2004): 33-47.

Fowler, Elizabeth. *Cookery book also containing medical receipts, sermons, a hymn and a poem*. 1684. Folger MS V.a.468. Folger Shakespeare Library, Washington, D.C.

Frye, Susan and Karen Robertson, eds. "Introduction." *Maids and Mistresses, Cousins and Queens: Women's Alliances in Early Modern England*. New York and Oxford: Oxford UP, 1999. 3-17.

Fumerton, Patricia. *Cultural Aesthetics: Renaissance Literature and the Practice of Social Ornament*. Chicago and London: U of Chicago P, 1991.

---. "Introduction: A New New Historicism." *Renaissance Culture and the Everyday*. Eds. Patricia Fumerton and Simon Hunt. Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 1999. 1-17.

Gallagher, Catherine. "Embracing the Absolute: The Politics of the Female Subject in Seventeenth-Century England." *Genders* 1 (1988): 24-39.

Gallagher, Catherine and Stephen Greenblatt. *Practicing New Historicism*. Chicago and London: U of Chicago P, 2000.

Gass, William H. *Reading Rilke: Reflections on the Problems of Translation*. New York: Knopf, 1999.

The Geneva Bible: A facsimile of the 1560 edition. Introduction Loyd E. Berry. Madison: U of Wisconsin P, 1969.

Gigante, Denise. *Taste: A Literary History*. New Haven and London: Yale UP, 2005.

Gil, Daniel Juan. "The Currency of the Beloved and the Authority of Lady Mary Wroth." *Modern Language Studies* 29.2 (1999): 73-92.

Gillespie, Katharine. *Domesticity and Dissent in the Seventeenth Century: English Women Writers and the Public Sphere*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2004.

---. "Elizabeth Cromwell's Kitchen Court: Republicanism and the Consort." *Genders* 23 (2001). http://www.genders.org/g33/g33_gillespie.txt. Accessed 4 September 2006.

---. "Anna Trapnel's Window on the Word: The Domestic Sphere of Public Dissent in Seventeenth-Century Non-conformity." *Bunyan Studies* 7 (1997): 49-72.

Girard, Luce. "Doing-Cooking." de Certeau, Girard, Mayol 151-247.

Goldberg, Jonathan. *James I and the Politics of Literature: Jonson, Shakespeare, Donne, and their Contemporaries*. Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins UP, 1983.

Goldman, Jack. "Perspectives of Raphael's Meal in *Paradise Lost*, Book V." *Milton Quarterly* 11.2 (1977): 31-37.

Goldstein, David B. "Recipes for Authorship: Indigestion and the Making of Originality in Early Modern England." Diss. Stanford U, 2005.

Gouge, William. *Of Domesticall Dvties Eight Treatises*. London: John Haviland for William Bladen, 1622.

Graham, Elspeth. "Women's writing and the self." Wilcox 209-33.

Granville, Mary and Anne (Granville) Dewes. *Receipt book. c.*1640-*c.*1750. Folger MS V.a. 430. Folger Shakespeare Library, Washington, D.C.

Gray, Catharine. "Feeding on the Seed of the Woman: Dorothy Leigh and the Figure of Maternal Dissent." *ELH* 68.3 (2001): 563-92.

Greenblatt, Stephen. *Renaissance Self-Fashioning: From More to Shakespeare*. Chicago and London: U of Chicago P, 1980.

Greville, Fulke. *The Life Of the Renowned Sr Philip Sidney. With The true Interest of England ... Together with a short Account of the Maximes and Policies used by Queen Elizabeth in her Government*. London: Henry Seile, 1651.

---. *The Five Yeares of King Iames, Or, The Condition of the State of England, and the Relation it had to other Provinces*. London: W.R., 1643.

Grey, Elizabeth, Countess of Kent. *A Choice Manval of Rare and Select Secrets in Physick and Chyrurgery*. London: G.D., 1653.

---. *A True Gentlewomans Delight*. London: G.D., 1653.

Grossman, Marshall. *Aemilia Lanyer: Gender, Genre, and the Canon*. Lexington: UP of Kentucky, 1998.

Gutierrez, Nancy A. *"Shall She Famish Then?": Female Food Refusal in Early Modern England*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003.

---. "Double Standard in the Flesh: Gender, Fasting, and Power in English Renaissance Drama." *Disorderly Eaters: Texts in Self-Empowerment*. Eds. Lilian R. Furst and Peter W. Graham. Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania State UP, 1992. 79-93.

Hackett, Helen. *Women and Romance Fiction in the English Renaissance*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2000.

---. "'A book, and solitariness': Melancholia, Gender and Literary Subjectivity in Mary Wroth's *Urania*." *Renaissance Configurations*. Ed. Gordon McMullan. London: Macmillan, 1998. 64-85.

---. "The Torture of Limena: Sex and Violence in Lady Mary Wroth's *Urania*." *Voicing Women: Gender and sexuality in early modern writing*. Ed. Kate Chedgzoy, Melanie Hansen and Suzanne Trill. Keele, UK: Keele UP, 1996. 93-110.

---. "'Yet Tell Me Some Such Fiction': Lady Mary Wroth's *Urania* and the 'Femininity' of Romance." *Women, Texts and Histories 1575-1760*. Eds. Clare Brant and Diane Purkiss. London and New York: Routledge, 1992. 39-68.

Halkett, Anne. "The Memoirs of Anne, Lady Halkett." *The Memoirs of Anne, Lady Halkett and Ann Lady Fanshawe*. Ed. John Loftis. Oxford: Clarendon, 1979. 3-99.

Hall, Jennifer Wallace. *"something more exactly related then a fixion": Lady Mary Sidney Wroth's* Urania *and Jacobean Religio-political Controversy*. Diss. U of Tennessee, 2001.

Hall, Kim F. "Culinary spaces, colonial spaces: the gendering of sugar in the seventeenth century." *Feminist Readings of Early Modern Culture: Emerging Subjects*. Eds. Valerie Traub, M. Lindsay Kaplan, and Dympna Callaghan. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1996. 168-90.

---. *Things of Darkness: Economies of Race and Gender in Early Modern England.* Ithaca and London: Cornell UP, 1995.

---. "'I rather would wish to be a black-moor': Beauty, race, and rank in Lady Mary Wroth's *Urania*." *Women, "Race," and Writing in Early Modern England*. Eds. Margo Hendricks and Patricia Parker. London and New York: Routledge, 1994. 178-94.

Hammer, Paul E.J. "Devereux, Robert, second earl of Essex (1565-1601)." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Oxford UP, 2004. Online 2006. http://www.oxforddnb.com/view /article/7565. Accessed 21 Feb. 2007.

Hannay, Margaret P. "'Your vertuous and learned Aunt': The Countess of Pembroke as a Mentor to Mary Wroth." Miller and Waller 15-34.

Hanson, Ellis. "Sodomy and Kingcraft in *Urania* and *Antony and Cleopatra*." *Homosexuality in Renaissance and Enlightenment England: Literary Representations in Historical Context*. Ed. Claude J. Summers. New York: Harrington Park, 1992. 135-51.

Harington, Sir John. *The Letters and Epigrams of Sir John Harington together with The Prayse of Private Life*. Ed. Norman Egbert McClure. Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 1930.

Harrison, William. *The Description of England.* 1587. Ed. Georges Edelen. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1968.

Harvey, Elizabeth D. and Katharine Eisaman Maus, eds. *Soliciting Interpretation: Literary Theory and Seventeenth-Century English Poetry.* Chicago and London: U of Chicago P, 1990.

Haselkorn, Anne M. and Betty S. Travitsky, eds. *The Renaissance Englishwoman in Print: Counterbalancing the Canon.* Amherst: U of Massachusetts P, 1990.

Hawthorn, Jeremy. *Cunning Passages: New Historicism, Cultural Materialism and Marxism in the Contemporary Literary Debate.* New York and London: Arnold, 1996.

Heal, Felicity. *Hospitality in Early Modern England.* Oxford: Clarendon, 1990.

Hedrick, Don K. "Cooking for the Anthropophagi: Jonson and His Audience." *SEL* 17.2 (1977): 233-45.

Helgerson, Richard. *Forms of Nationhood: Elizabethan Writing of England.* Chicago and London: U of Chicago P, 1992.

Herbert, George. *The Complete English Works.* Ed. Ann Pasternak Slater. New York and Toronto: Alfred A. Knopf, 1995.

Herbert, William. *Herberts Child-bearing Woman From the Conception To the Weaning Of the Child. Made in a Devotion Containing above CLX. Meditations, Prayers & Songs: For the use of Mrs Frances Herbert.* London: R.A. & J.M., 1648.

Hill, Christopher. *The World Turned Upside Down: Radical Ideas during the English Revolution.* London: Temple Smith, 1972.

Hillman, David. "The Gastric Epic: *Troilus and Cressida.*" *Shakespeare Quarterly* 48.3 (1997): 295-313.

Hinds, Hilary. "Sectarian Spaces: The Politics of Space and Gender in Seventeenth-Century Prophetic Writing." *Literature and History* 13.2 (2004): 1-25.

---. "Soul-Ravishing and Sin-Subduing: Anna Trapnel and the Gendered Politics of Free Grace." *Renaissance and Reformation* 25.4 (2001): 117-37.

---. *God's Englishwomen: Seventeenth-century radical sectarian writing and feminist criticism.* Manchester and New York: Manchester UP, 1996.

Hirst, Derek. "Reading the Royal Romance: Or, Intimacy in a King's Cabinet." *The Seventeenth Century* 18 (2003): 211-29.

---. *Authority and Conflict: England, 1603-1658*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1986.

Hobby, Elaine. "'Come to Live a Preaching Life': Female Community in Seventeenth-Century Radical Sects." *Female Communities 1600-1800: Literary Visions and Cultural Realities*. Eds. Rebecca D'Monté and Nicole Pohl. Houndmills: Macmillan; New York: St. Martin's, 2000. 76-92.

---. "A woman's best setting out is silence: the writings of Hannah Wolley." MacLean 179-200.

Hoby, Margaret. *The Private Life of an Elizabethan Lady: The Diary of Lady Margaret Hoby 1599-1605*. Ed. Joanna Moody. Phoenix Mill: Sutton, 1998.

Hodges, Martha et al. *Book of cookery and medical receipts, plus religious extracts and poems*. (*c*.1675-1725). Wellcome Western MS 2844. Wellcome Library for the History and Understanding of Medicine, London, England.

Holmes, Michael Morgan. "The Love of Other Women: Rich Chains and Sweet Kisses." Grossman 167-90.

Holstun, James. *Ehud's Dagger: Class Struggle in the English Revolution*. London and New York: Verso, 2000.

Horrox, Rosemary. "Edward IV (1442-1483)." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Oxford UP, 2004. http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/8520. Accessed 9 Aug. 2007.

Howard, Jean E. "The New Historicism in Renaissance Studies." *ELR* 16.1 (1986): 13-43.

Howell Jr., Roger. "'That Imp of Satan': the Restoration image of Cromwell." *Images of Oliver Cromwell: Essays for and by Roger Howell, Jr*. Ed. R.C. Richardson. Manchester and New York: Manchester UP, 1993. 33-47.

Huebert, Ronald. *The Performance of Pleasure in English Renaissance Drama*. Houndmills and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003.

Hughes, Sarah. *Book of medical and cookery receipts*. *c*.1637. Wellcome Western MS 363. Wellcome Library for the History and Understanding of Medicine, London, England.

Hunter, Lynette. "Books for daily life: household, husbandry, behaviour." *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain, Vol. IV: 1557-1695*. Eds. John Barnard and D.F. McKenzie with Maureen Bell. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2002. 514-32.

---. "Women and Domestic Medicine: Lady Experimenters, 1570-1620." Hunter and Hutton 89-107.

---. "'Sweet Secrets' from Occasional Receipt to Specialized Books: The Growth of a Genre." Wilson *Banquetting* 36-59.

---. "Cookery Books: A Cabinet of Rare Devises and Conceits." *Petits Propos Culinaires* 5 (1980): 19-34.

Hunter, Lynette and Sarah Hutton, eds. *Women, Science and Medicine 1500-1700: Mothers and Sisters of the Royal Society*. Phoenix Hill: Sutton, 1997.

James I, King of England. *Basilikon Doron, Or His Maiesties Instrvctions To His Dearest Sonne, Henry The Prince*. London: Felix Kyngston for John Norton, 1603.

---. "The Trew Law of Free Monarchies." *The Political Works of James I*. Ed. Charles Howard McIlwain. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1918. 53-70.

Jeanneret, Michel. *A Feast of Words: Banquets and Table Talk in the Renaissance*. Tr. Jeremy Whiteley and Emma Hughes. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1991.

Jelinek, Estelle C. ed. "Introduction: Women's Autobiography and the Male Tradition." *Women's Autobiography: Essays in Criticism*. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1980.1-20.

Jones, Ann Rosalind and Peter Stallybrass. *Renaissance Clothing and the Materials of Memory*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2000.

Jonson, Ben. *The Complete Poems*. Ed. George Parfitt. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin, 1975.

---. "Pleasure Reconciled to Virtue." *Selected Masques*. Ed. Stephen Orgel. New Haven and London: Yale UP, 1970. 161-74.

Jessey, Henry. *The exceeding Riches of Grace Advanced By the Spirit of Grace, in an Empty Nothing Creature, viz. Mris Sarah Wight*. London: Matthew Simmons for Henry Overton and Hannah Allen, 1647.

Joscelin, Elizabeth. *The Mothers Legacy to her Vnborn Childe*. 1624. Ed. Jean LeDrew Metcalfe. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 2000.

Keeble, N.H. "Obedient subjects? The loyal self in some later seventeenth-century Royalist women's memoirs." MacLean 201-18.

Kendall, Rose, Anne Kendall Cater, Elizabeth Clarke, and Anna Maria Wentworth. *Cookery and medical receipt book*. (*c*.1675-*c*.1750). Folger MS V.a.429. Folger Shakespeare Library, Washington, D.C.

Key, Newton E. "The Political Culture and Political Rhetoric of County Feasts and Feast Sermons, 1654-1714." *The Journal of British Studies* 33.3 (1994): 223-56.

King, Sigrid, ed. *Pilgrimage for Love: Essays in Early Modern Literature in Honor of Josephine A. Roberts*. Tempe, AZ: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 1999.

Knoppers, Laura Lunger. "Opening the Queen's Closet: Henrietta Maria, Elizabeth Cromwell and the Politics of Cookery." *Renaissance Quarterly* 60.2 (2007): 464-99.

Korda, Natasha. *Shakespeare's Domestic Economies: Gender and Property in Early Modern England*. Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 2002.

Kunin, Aaron. "From the Desk of Anne Clifford." *ELH* 71.3 (2004): 587-608.

Kusunoki, Akiko. "Female Selfhood and Male Violence in English Renaissance Drama: A View from Mary Wroth's *Urania*." *Women, Violence, and English Renaissance Literature: Essays Honoring Paul Jorgensen*. Eds. Linda Woodbridge and Sharon Beehler. Tempe, AZ: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 2003. 125-48.

La Varenne, Pierre de. *The French Cook*. Tr. I.D.G. London: Charles Adams, 1653.

Lamb, Mary Ellen. "The Biopolitics of Romance in Mary Wroth's *The Countess of Montgomery's Urania*." *ELR* 31.1 (2001): 107-30.

---. "Patronage and Class in Aemilia Lanyer's *Salve Deus Rex Judaeorum*." Burke et al. 38-57.

---. "The Agency of the Split Subject: Lady Anne Clifford and the Uses of Reading." *ELR* 22.3 (1992): 347-68.

---. "Women Readers in Mary Wroth's *Urania*." Miller and Waller 210-27.

---. *Gender and Authorship in the Sidney Circle*. Madison: U of Wisconsin P, 1990.

Lanyer, Aemilia. *The Poems of Aemilia Lanyer: Salve Deus Rex Judaeorum*. Ed. Susanne Woods. New York and Oxford: Oxford UP, 1993.

Larkin, James F. and Paul L. Hughes. *Stuart Royal Proclamations Vol. 1: Royal Proclamations of King James I 1603-1625*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1973.

Lee Huey-ling. "The Devil or the Physician: The Politics of Cooking and the Gendering of Cooks in Jonson and Massinger." *ELR* 36.2 (2006): 250-77.

---. "Eat, Drink, Man, Woman: Food, Eating, and Social Formations in Renaissance Culture and Drama." Diss. Rice University, 2003.

Lefebvre, Henri. *Critique of Everyday Life*. Vol. 1. Tr. John Moore. London and New York: Verso, 1991.

Leigh, Dorothy. "The Mothers Blessing." 1616. *Women's Writing in Stuart England: The Mothers' Legacies of Dorothy Leigh, Elizabeth Joscelin, and Elizabeth Richardson*. Ed. Sylvia Brown. Phoenix Mill: Sutton, 1999. 15-87.

Leonardi, Susan J. "Recipes for Reading: Summer Pasta, Lobster a la Riseholme, and Key Lime Pie." *PMLA* 104.3 (1989): 340-47.

Lévi-Strauss, Claude. *The Origin of Table Manners: Introduction to a Science of Mythology: 3*. Tr. John and Doreen Weightman. New York: Harper and Row, 1978.

Lewalski, Barbara. "Seizing Discourses and Reinventing Genres." Grossman 49-59.

---. *Writing Women in Jacobean England*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1993.

Loewenstein, David. *Representing Revolution in Milton and his Contemporaries: Religion, Politics, and Polemics in Radical Puritanism*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2001.

Loftis, John, ed. "Introduction." *The Memoirs of Anne, Lady Halkett and Ann, Lady Fanshawe*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1979. ix-xxi.

Longe, Sarah. *Receipt book. c.*1610. Folger MS V.a.425. Folger Shakespeare Library, Washington, D.C.

Longfellow, Erica. *Women and Religious Writing in Early Modern England*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2004.

Love, Harold. *Scribal Publication in Seventeenth-Century England*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1993.

Low, Anthony. "Angels and Food in *Paradise Lost*." *Milton Studies* 1 (1969): 135-45.

Luckens, Carola Scott. "Propanganda or Marks of Grace?: The Impact of the Reported Ideals of Sarah Wight in Revolutionary London." *Women's Writing* 9.2 (2002): 25-32.

Luckyj, Christina. "The Politics of Genre in Early Women's Writing: The Case of Lady Mary Wroth." *English Studies in Canada* 27.3 (2001): 253-82.

Luecke, Marilyn. "The Reproduction of Culture and the Culture of Reproduction in Elizabeth Clinton's *The Countess of Lincolnes Nurserie*." Burke et al 238-52.

Mack, Phyllis. *Visionary Women: Ecstatic Prophecy in Seventeenth-Century England*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: U of California P, 1992.

MacLean, Gerald, ed. *Culture and Society in the Stuart Restoration: Literature, Drama, History*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1995.

Magro, Maria. "Spiritual Autobiography and Radical Sectarian Women's Discourse: Anna Trapnel and the Bad Girls of the English Revolution." *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 34.2 (2004): 405-37.

Mahon, John W. "'For now we sit to chat as well as eat': conviviality and conflict in Shakespeare's meals." *"Fanned and Winnowed Opinions": Shakespearean Essays Presented to Harold Jenkins*. Eds. John W. Mahon and Thomas A. Pendleton. London and New York: Methuen, 1987. 231-48.

Marcus, Leah S. *The Politics of Mirth: Jonson, Herrick, Milton, Marvell, and the Defense of Old Holiday Pastimes*. Chicago and London: U of Chicago P, 1986.

Markham, Gervase. *The English Housewife*. 1615, 1631. Ed. Michael R. Best. Kingston and Montreal: McGill-Queen's UP, 1986.

Marnette, Mounsieur. *The Perfect Cook*. London: Nathaniel Brook, 1656.

Marotti, Arthur F. *Manuscript, Print, and the English Renaissance Lyric*. Ithaca and London: Cornell UP, 1995.

Marotti, Arthur F. and Michael D. Bristol. "Introduction." *Print, Manuscript, Performance: The Changing Relations of the Media in Early Modern England*. Eds. Arthur F. Marotti and Michael D. Bristol. Columbus: Ohio State UP, 2000. 1-29.

Martin, Randall, ed. *Women Writers in Renaissance England*. London and New York: Longman, 1997.

Mason, Mary G. "The Other Voice: Autobiographies of Women Writers." Brodzki and Schenck 19-44.

Matchinske, Meagan. "Serial Identity: History, Gender, and Form in the Diary Writing of Lady Anne Clifford." Dowd and Eckerle 65-80.

May, Robert. *The Accomplisht Cook, Or the Art and Mystery of Cookery*. 1660, 1685. Introduction and glossary Alan Davidson, Marcus Bell, and Tom Jaine. Totnes: Prospect, 2000.

Mayerne, Sir Theodore. *Archimagirus Anglo-Gallicus: or, Excellent & Approved Receipts and Experiments in Cookery*. London: G. Bedell and T. Collins, 1658.
McBride, Kari Boyd. "Sacred Celebration: The Patronage Poems." Grossman 60-82.

---. "Remembering Orpheus in the Poems of Aemilia Lanyer." *SEL* 38.1 (1998): 87-108.

McBride, Kari Boyd and John C. Ulreich. "Answerable Styles: Biblical Poetics and Biblical Politics in the Poetry of Lanyer and Milton." *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 100.3 (2001): 333-54.

McEachern, Claire. *The poetics of English nationhood, 1590-1612*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1996.

McGrath, Lynette. *Subjectivity and Women's Poetry in Early Modern England: "Why on the ridge should she desire to go."* Aldershot: Ashgate, 2002.

McJannet, Linda. *The Sultan Speaks: Dialogue in English Plays and Histories about the Ottoman Turks*. Houndmills and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006.

McMahon, Elise-Noël. "*Gargantua, Pantagruel*, and Renaissance Cooking Tracts: Texts for Consumption." *Neophilologus* 76.2 (1992): 186-97.

McRae, Andrew. "Husbandry Manuals and the Language of Agrarian Improvement." *Culture and Cultivation in Early Modern England: Writing and the Land*. Ed. Michael Leslie and Timothy Raylor. Leicester and London: Leicester UP, 1992. 35-62.

Meads, Chris. *Banquets set forth: Banqueting in English Renaissance Drama*. Manchester and New York: Manchester UP, 2001.

Mennell, Steven. *All Manners of Food: Eating and Taste in England and France from the Middle Ages to the Present*. Oxford and New York: Basil Blackwell, 1985.

Mildmay, Grace. *With Faith and Physic: The Life of a Tudor Gentlewoman Lady Grace Mildmay 1552-1620*. Ed. Linda Pollock. London: Collins & Brown, 1993.

Miller, Jacqueline T. "Ladies of the Oddest Passion: Early Modern Women and the Arts of Discretion." *Modern Philology* 103.4 (2006): 453-73.

---. "The Passion Signified: Imitation and the Construction of Emotions in Sidney and Wroth." *Criticism* 43.4 (2001): 407-21.

---. "Lady Mary Wroth in the House of Busirane." Cheney and Silberman 115-24.

Miller, Naomi J. *Changing the Subject: Mary Wroth and Figurations of Gender in Early Modern England*. Lexington: UP of Kentucky, 1996.

---. "Engendering Discourse: Women's Voices in Wroth's *Urania* and Shakespeare's Plays." Miller and Waller 154-72.

---. "'Not Much to Be Marked': Narrative of the Woman's Part in Lady Mary Wroth's *Urania*." *SEL* 29.1 (1989): 121-37.

Miller, Naomi J. and Gary Waller, eds. *Reading Mary Wroth: Representing Alternatives in Early Modern England.* Knoxville: U of Tennessee P, 1991.

Miller, Shannon. "'Mirrours More Then One': Edmund Spenser and Female Authority in the Seventeenth Century." Cheney and Silberman 125-47.

Milton, John. *Paradise Lost.* Ed. Scott Elledge. New York and London: Norton, 1993.

Mintz, Sidney W. *Sweetness and Power: The Place of Sugar in Modern History.* New York: Viking Penguin, 1985.

Mintz, Susannah B. "The Specular Self of *Anna Trapnel's Report and Plea.*" *Pacific Coast Philology* 35.1 (2000): 1-16.

Montrose, Louis. "Renaissance Literary Studies and the Subject of History." *ELR* 16.1 (1986): 5-12.

Morgan, John. *Godly Learning: Puritan Attitudes towards Reason, Learning, and Education 1560-1640.* Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1986.

Moss, Ann. *Printed Commonplace-Books and the Structuring of Renaissance Thought.* Oxford: Clarendon, 1996.

Murrell, John. *A Delightfull daily exercise for Ladies and Gentlewomen.* London: Theodore Dewe, 1621.

---. *A Daily Exercise for Ladies and Gentlewomen.* London: Widow Helme, 1617.

---. *A New Booke of Cookerie.* London: John Browne, 1615, 1617.

N.F. *The Frviterers Secrets: Containing directions, for the due time, and manner, of gathering all kindes of fruite ... Enterlaced with diuerse other secrets (and their naturall causes) touching trees, and their fruite.* London: R.B., 1604.

Neely, Carol Thomas. "Constructing the Subject: Feminist Practice and the New Renaissance Discourses." *ELR* 18.1 (1988): 5-18.

Nevitt, Marcus. *Women and the Pamphlet Culture of Revolutionary England, 1640-1660.* Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006.

Norbrook, David. *Poetry and Politics in the English Renaissance.* Rev. ed. Oxford and New York: Oxford UP, 2002.

---. "'The Masque of Truth': Court Entertainments and International Protestant Politics in the Early Stuart Period." *The Seventeenth Century* 1.2 (1986): 81-110.

O'Connor, Mary. "Representations of intimacy in the life-writing of Anne Clifford and Anne Dormer." Coleman et al. 79-96.

Orgel, Stephen. "Jonson and the Amazons." Harvey and Maus 119-39.

---. "Introduction." *Ben Jonson: Selected Masques*. New Haven and London: Yale UP, 1970. 1-39.

Osborne, Francis. *The Works of Francis Osborn Esq.; Divine. Moral. Historical. Political. In Four several Tracts. Viz. 1. Advice to a Son, in two Parts. 2. Political Reflections on the Government of the Turks, &c. 3. Memoires on Q. Elizabeth and K. James. 4. A Miscellany of Essays, Paradoxes, Problematical Discourses, Letters, Characters, &c.* 7th edition. London: R.D., 1673.

Oxford English Dictionary Online. Oxford UP, 2007. http://dictionary.oed.com.ezproxy.library.dal.ca/entrance.dtl.

Packer, Katherine. *Medical and culinary receipt book.* 1639. Folger MS V.a.387. Folger Shakespeare Library, Washington, D.C.

Parish, John E. "Milton and the Well-Fed Angel." *English Miscellany* 18 (1967): 87-109.

Parker, Jane. *Book of cookery and medical receipts*. 1651. Wellcome Western MS 3769. Wellcome Library for the History and Understanding of Medicine, London, England.

Partridge, John. *The Widdowes Treasure*. 1582. London: I. Roberts for Edward White, 1595.

---. *The Treasury of commodious Conceits, and hidden Secrets, Commonly called The good Huswiues Closet of prouision, for the health of hir housholde*. 1573. London: Henry Car, 1584.

Patterson, Annabel. "'Under … Pretty Tales': Intention in Sidney's *Arcadia*." *Sir Philip Sidney: An Anthology of Modern Criticism*. Ed. Dennis Kay. Oxford: Clarendon, 1987. 265-85.

---. *Censorship and Interpretation: The Conditions of Writing and Reading in Early Modern England*. Madison: U of Wisconsin P, 1984.

Patterson, W.B. *King James VI and I and the Reunion of Christendom*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1997.

Payne, Helen. "Aristocratic Women, Power, Patronage and Family Networks at the Jacobean Court, 1603-1625." Daybell 164-80.

Payne, Paula Harms. "Finding a Poetic Voice of Her Own: Lady Mary Wroth's *Urania* and *Pamphilia to Amphilanthus*." King 209-20.

Peck, Linda Levy. *Consuming Splendor: Society and Culture in Seventeenth-Century England*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2005.

---. "Benefits, Brokers and Beneficiaries: The Culture of Exchange in Seventeenth-Century England." *Court, Country and Culture: Essays on Early Modern British History in Honor of Perez Zagorin*. Eds. Bonnelyn Young Kunze and Dwight D. Brautigam. Rochester: U of Rochester P, 1992. 109-127.

---. *Court Patronage and Corruption in Early Stuart England*. Boston: Unwin Hyman, 1990.

Pennell, Sara. "Perfecting Practice?: Women, Manuscript Recipes and Knowledge in Early Modern England." *Early Modern Women's Manuscript Writing: Selected Papers from the Trinity/Trent Colloquium*. Eds. Victoria E. Burke and Jonathan Gibson. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004. 237-55.

Perkins, William. *Christian Oeconomie: Or, A Short Svrvey Of The Right Manner Of erecting and ordering a Familie, according to the Scriptures*. London: Felix Kyngston, 1609.

Perry, Curtis. *The Making of Jacobean Culture: James I and the renegotiation of Elizabethan literary practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1997.

Philippes, Dorothy. *Sermons, receipts and family records*. 1616-1617. Folger MS V.a.347. Folger Shakespeare Library, Washington, D.C.

Plat, Sir Hugh. *Floraes Paradise, Beautified and adorned with sundry sorts of delicate fruites and flowers*. London: H.L. for William Leake, 1608.

---. *Certaine Philosophical Preparations of Foode and Beuerage for Sea-men, in their long voyages: with some necessary, approoued, and Hermeticall medicine: and Antidotes, fit to be had in readiness at sea, for preuention or cure of diuers diseases*. London, 1607.

---. *A new, cheape and delicate Fire of Cole-balles, wherein Seacole is by the mixture of other combustible bodies, both sweetened and multiplied. Also a speedie way for the winning of any Breach: with some other new and seruiceable Inuentions answerable to the time*. London: Peter Short, 1603.

---. *Delightes for Ladies*. 1602, 1609. Intro. and ed. G.E. Fussell and Kathleen Rosemary Fussell. London: Crosby Lockwood & Son, 1948.

---. *Sundrie new and Artificiall remedies against Famine*. London: P.S., 1596.

---. *The Iewell House of Art and Nature*. London: Peter Short, 1594.

Poole, Kristen. *Radical Religion from Shakespeare to Milton: Figures of Nonconformity in Early Modern England*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2000.

---. "'The fittest closet for all goodness': Authorial Strategies of Jacobean Mothers' Manuals." *SEL* 35 (1995): 69-88.

Potter, David. "The Household Receipt Book of Ann, Lady Fanshawe." *Petits Propos Culinaires* 80 (2006): 19-32.

Potter, Lois. *Secret rites and secret writing: Royalist literature 1641-1660*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1989.

Pratt, Kathryn. "'Wounds still curelesse': Estates of Loss in Mary Wroth's *Urania*." Abate 45-62.

Prineas, Matthew. "The Discourse of Love and the Rhetoric of Apocalypse in Anna Trapnel's Folio Songs." *Comitatus* 28 (1997): 90-110.

Purkiss, Diane. "What we leave out." *TLS* 5402 (Oct. 13, 2006): 11-12.

---. *Literature, Gender and Politics During the English Civil War*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2005.

---. "Producing the Voice, Consuming the Body: Women Prophets of the Seventeenth Century." *Women, Writing, History 1640-1740*. Eds. Isobel Grundy and Susan Wiseman. Athens: U of Georgia P, 1992. 139-58.

Quilligan, Maureen. "The Constant Subject: Instability and Female Authority in Wroth's *Urania* Poems." Harvey and Maus 307-35.

---. "Lady Mary Wroth: Female Authority and the Family Romance." *Unfolded Tales: Essays on Renaissance Romance*. Eds. George M. Logan and Gordon Teskey. Ithaca and London: Cornell UP, 1989. 257-80.

Rabisha, William. *The whole Body of Cookery Dissected*. London: R.W. for Giles Calvert, 1661.

Rainbowe, Edward, Bishop of Carlisle. *A Sermon Preached At the Funeral of the Right Honorable Anne Countess of Pembroke, Dorset, and Montgomery*. London: R. Royston and H. Broom, 1677.

Raymond, Joad. *Pamphlets and Pamphleteering in Early Modern Britain*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2003.

Richards, Jennifer and Alison Thorne, eds. *Rhetoric, Women and Politics in Early Modern England.* London and New York: Routledge, 2007.

Roberts, Josephine A. "Critical Introduction." *The First Part of The Countess of Montgomery's Urania.*1995. Tempe, AZ: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 2005. xv-xcviii.

---. "Labyrinths of Desire: Lady Mary Wroth's Reconstruction of Romance." *Women's Studies* 19.2 (1991): 183-92.

---. "'The Knott Never to Bee Untide': The Controversy Regarding Marriage in Mary Wroth's *Urania.*" Miller and Waller 109-32.

---. "Radigund Revisited: Perspectives on Women Rulers in Lady Mary Wroth's *Urania.*" Haselkorn and Travitsky 187-207.

--- ed. *The Poems of Lady Mary Wroth.* Baton Rouge: Louisiana State UP, 1983.

Robinson, James Harvey. *Readings in European History.* Vol. II. Boston and New York: Ginn & Co., 1906.

Romines, Ann. *The Home Plot: Women, Writing and Domestic Ritual.* Amherst: U of Massachusetts P, 1992.

Rose, Mary Beth. "Where are the Mothers in Shakespeare? Options for Gender Representation in the English Renaissance." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 42.3 (1991): 291-314.

---. "Gender, Genre and History: Seventeenth-Century English Women and the Art of Autobiography." *Women in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance: Literary and Historical Perspectives.* Ed. Mary Beth Rose. Syracuse: Syracuse UP, 1986. 245-78.

Ross, Daniel W. "'What a Number of Men Eats Timon': Consumption in *Timon of Athens. Iowa State Journal of Research* 59.3 (1985): 273-84.

Ruthven, Lord. *The Ladies Cabinet Enlarged and Opened.* London: T.M. for M.M.G. Bedell and T. Collins, 1654.

Saltonstall, Wye. *Picturæ Loquentes, Or Pictvres Drawne forth in Characters. With a Poeme of a Maid.* London: Thomas Cotes, 1635

Salzman, Paul. "The Strang[e] Constructions of Mary Wroth's *Urania*: Arcadian Romance and the Public Realm." *English Renaissance Prose: History, Language, and Politics.* Ed. Neil Rhodes. Tempe, AZ: Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1997. 109-24.

---. *English Prose Fiction 1558-1700: A Critical History*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1985.

---. "Contemporary References in Mary Wroth's *Urania*." *The Review of English Studies* New Series 29.114 (1978): 178-81.

Sandy, Amelia Zurcher. "Pastoral, Temperance, and the Unitary Self in Wroth's *Urania*." *SEL* 42.1 (2002): 103-19.

Sauer, Elizabeth. "Maternity, Prophecy, and the Cultivation of the Private Sphere in Seventeenth-Century England." *Explorations in Renaissance Culture* 24 (1998): 119-48.

Schnell, Lisa. "Breaking 'the rule of *Cortezia*': Aemilia Lanyer's Dedications to *Salve Deus Rex Judaeorum*." *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 27.1 (1997): 77-101.

---. "'So Great a Difference Is There in Degree': Aemilia Lanyer and the Aims of Feminist Criticism." *Modern Language Quarterly* 57.1 (1996): 23-35.

Schoenfeldt, Michael C. *Bodies and Selves in Early Modern England: Physiology and Inwardness in Spenser, Shakepeare, Herbert, and Milton*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1999.

---. "George Herbert's Consuming Subject." *George Herbert Journal* 18.1-2 (1994-95): 105-32.

---. *Prayer and Power: George Herbert and Renaissance Courtship*. Chicago and London: U of Chicago P, 1991.

---. "'The Mysteries of Manners, Armes, and Arts': 'Inviting a Friend to Supper' and 'To Penshurst.'" *"The Muses Common-Weale": Poetry and Politics in the Seventeenth Century*. Columbia: U of Missouri P, 1988. 62-79.

Schreiber, Roy. E. "Hay, James, first earl of Carlisle (*c*.1580-1636)." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Oxford UP, 2004. http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/12723. Accessed 20 Feb 2007.

Schwoerer, Lois. "Women's public political voice in England: 1640-1740." H. Smith 56-74.

Scott, Joan Wallach. *Gender and the Politics of History*. Rev. ed. New York: Columbia UP, 1999.

Seaward, Paul. "Charles II (1630-1685)." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Oxford UP, 2004. Online edn. May 2006. http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article 5144. Accessed 9 Aug. 2007.

Shami, Jeanne. *John Donne and Conformity in Crisis in the Late Jacobean Pulpit.* Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 2003.

Sharpe, Kevin and Steven N. Zwicker. "Politics of Discourse: Introduction." *Politics of Discourse: The Literature and History of Seventeenth-Century England.* Eds. Kevin Sharpe and Steven N. Zwicker. Berkeley and Los Angeles: U of California P, 1987. 1-20.

Shaver, Anne. "Agency and Marriage in the Fictions of Lady Mary Wroth and Margaret Cavendish, Duchess of Newcastle." King 177-90.

---. "A New Woman of Romance." *Modern Language Studies* 21.4 (1991): 63-77.

Shaw, Jane. "Fasting women: the significance of gender and bodies in radical religion and politics 1650-1813." *Radicalism in British Literary Culture, 1650-1830: From Revolution to Revolution.* Eds. Timothy Morton and Nigel Smith. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2002. 101-15.

Shea, Colleen. "Literary Authority as Cultural Criticism in Aemilia Lanyer's *The Authors Dreame.*" *ELR* 32.3 (2002): 386-407.

Shuger, Debora. "Life-writing in seventeenth-century England." Coleman et al. 63-78.

Sidney, Philip. *The Countess of Pembroke's Arcadia.* Ed. Maurice Evans. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin, 1977.

Sim, Alison. *Food and Feast in Tudor England.* Phoenix Mill: Sutton, 1997.

Simon, André L. ed. *The Star Chamber Dinner Accounts being some hitherto unpublished Accounts of Dinners provided for the Lords of the Privy Council in the Star Chamber, Westminster, during the reigns of Queen Elizabeth I and King James I of England with a Forward and Commentary.* London: Wine and Food Society, 1959.

Sinfield, Alan. *Faultlines: Cultural Materialism and the Politics of Dissident Reading.* Berkeley and Los Angeles: U of California P, 1992.

Smith, Hilda L. "Introduction: Women, intellect, and politics: their intersection in seventeenth-century England." H. Smith 1-14.

--- ed. *Women Writers and the early modern British political tradition.* Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1998.

Smith, Katharine Capshaw. "'*Bisket* of *Love*, which crumbles all away': The Failure of Domestic Metaphor in Margaret Cavendish's Poetic Fancies." *Domestic Arrangements in Early Modern England.* Ed. Kari Boyd McBride. Pittsburgh: Duquesne UP, 2002. 48-73.

Smith, Nigel. *Literature and Revolution in England 1640-1660*. New Haven and London: Yale UP, 1994.

---. *Perfection Proclaimed: Language and Literature in English Radical Religion 1640-1660*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1989.

Smith, Rosalind. "'I thus goe arm'd to field': *Lindamira's Complaint*." Wallwork and Salzman 73-85.

---. "Lady Mary Wroth's *Pamphilia to Amphilanthus*: The Politics of Withdrawal." *ELR* 30.3 (2000): 408-31.

Smuts, R. Malcolm. "Howard, Thomas, fourteenth earl of Arundel, fourth earl of Surrey, and first earl of Norfolk (1585-1646)." Oxford UP, 2004. http://www.oxforddnb.com/view /article/13943. Accessed 12 Aug. 2007.

Snook, Edith. "'Soveraigne Receipts' and the Politics of Beauty in *The Queens Closet Opened*." *Early Modern Literary Studies* Special Issue 15 (2007): 7.1-19. http://purl.oclc.org/emls/si-15/snooksov.htm. Accessed January 2, 2008.

---. *Women, Reading, and the Cultural Politics of Early Modern England*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2005.

Spargo, Tamsin. "The Fathers' Seductions: Improper Relations of Desire in Seventeenth-century Nonconformist Communities." *Tulsa Studies in Women's Literature: Political Discourse/British Women's Writing 1640-1867* 17.2 (1998): 255-68.

Spence, Richard T. "Clifford, Anne, countess of Pembroke, Dorset, and Montgomery (1590-1676)." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Oxford UP, 2004. http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy. library.dal.ca/view/article/5641. Accessed 31 Jan. 2006.

Standish, Arthur. *The Commons Complaint. Wherein Is Contained Two Speciall Grievances*. London: William Stansby, 1611.

Stanhope, Philip, Earl of Chesterfield. *A Booke of severall receipts*. 2 vols. *c*.1635. Wellcome Western MS 761, MS 762. Wellcome Library for the History and Understanding of Medicine. London, England.

Steggle, Matthew. "Markham, Gervase (1568?-1637)." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Oxford UP, 2004. Online 2006. http://www.oxforddnb.com/view /article/18065. Accessed 20 Feb. 2007.

Stevenson, David. "Halkett, Anne, Lady Halkett (1623-1699)." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Oxford UP, 2004. http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy. library.dal.ca/view/article/11934. Accessed 31 Jan. 2006.

Strong, Roy. *Food: A History of Grand Eating*. London: Pimlico, 2003.

Stubbes, Philip. *The Anatomie of Abuses*. 1583. Ed. Margaret Jane Kidnie. Tempe, AZ: Renaissance English Text Society, 2002.

Summit, Jennifer. *Lost Property: The Woman Writer and English Literary History 1380-1589*. Chicago and London: U of Chicago P, 2000.

Suzuki, Mihoko. "Anne Clifford and the Gendering of History." *Clio* 30.2 (2001): 195-229.

Swift, Carolyn Ruth. "Feminine Identity in Lady Mary Wroth's Romance *Urania*." *ELR* 14.3 (1984): 328-46.

Talbot, Alethea, Countess of Arundel. *Natura Exenterata: Or Nature Unbowelled By the most Exquisite Anatomizers of Her*. London: H. Twiford, G. Bedell, N. Ekins, 1655.

Taverner, John. *Certaine Experiments Concerning Fish And Frvite*. London: William Ponsonby, 1600.

Tebeaux, Elizabeth. "Women and Technical Writing, 1475-1700: Technology, Literacy, and Development of a Genre." Hunter and Hutton 29-62.

Theophano, Janet. *Eat My Words: Reading Women's Lives through the Cookbooks They Wrote*. New York: Palgrave, 2002.

Thick, Malcolm. "A Close Look at the Composition of Sir Hugh Plat's *Delights for Ladies*." White 55-71.

Thirsk, Joan. *Food in Early Modern England: Phases, Fads, Fashions 1500-1760*. London: Hambledon Continuum, 2007.

---. "Agricultural Policy: Public Debate and Legislation." Thirsk 298-388.

--- ed. *The Agrarian History of England and Wales: Agrarian Change 1640-1750*. Vol. 5.2. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1985.

Thomas, Keith. "The Meaning of Literacy in Early Modern England." *The Written Word: Literacy in Transition, Wolfson College Lectures 1985*. Ed. Gerd Baumann. Oxford: Clarendon, 1986. 97-131.

---. *Man and the Natural World: Changing Attitudes in England 1500-1800*. 1983. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1996.

---. "Women and the Civil War Sects." *Past and Present* 13 (1958): 42-62.

Townshend family. *Cookery and medical receipts*. *c*.1636-1647. Wellcome Western MS 744. Wellcome Library for the History and Understanding of Medicine, London, England.

Trapnel, Anna. *Anna Trapnel's Report and Plea*. London: Thomas Brewster, 1654.

---. *The Cry of a Stone. Or A Relation Of Something spoken in Whitehall*. London, 1654.

Travitsky, Betty S. "Clinton, Elizabeth, countess of Lincoln (1574?-1630?)." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Oxford UP, 2004. http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.library.dal.ca/view/article/40933. Accessed 31 Jan. 2006.

Trevor-Roper, Hugh. "Mayerne, Sir Theodore Turquet de (1573-1655)." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Oxford UP, 2004. Online edn. May 2006. http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.library.dal.ca/view/article/18430. Accessed 27 June 2006.

Underdown, David. *Pride's Purge: Politics in the Puritan Revolution*. 1971. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1985.

Vaughan, William. *Directions for Health, both Naturall and Artificiall*. London: T.S. for Roger Jackson, 1617.

W.M. *The Queens Closet Opened*. London: Nathaniel Brook, 1655.

---. *The Compleat Cook*. London: Nathaniel Brook, 1655.

Walker, Kim. *Women Writers of the English Renaissance*. New York: Twayne, 1996.

Wall, Wendy. *Staging Domesticity: Household Work and English Identity in Early Modern Drama*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2002.

---. "Renaissance National Husbandry: Gervase Markham and the Publication of England." *Sixteenth Century Journal* 27.3 (1996): 767-785.

---. *The Imprint of Gender: Authorship and Publication in the English Renaissance*. Ithaca and London: Cornell UP, 1993.

Waller, Gary. *The Sidney Family Romance: Mary Wroth, William Herbert, and the Early Modern Construction of Gender*. Detroit: Wayne State UP, 1993.

---. "Mary Wroth and the Sidney Family Romance: Gender Construction in Early Modern England." Miller and Waller 35-63.

Wallwork, Jo and Paul Salzman, eds. *Women Writing 1550-1750*. Bundoora, Australia: Meridan, 2001.

Wayne, Don. E. *Penshurst: The Semiotics of Place and the Poetics of History*. Madison: U of Wisconsin P, 1984.

---. "Power, politics, and the Shakespearean text: recent criticism in England and the United States." *Shakespeare Reproduced: The text in history and ideology*. Eds. Jean E. Howard and Marion F. O'Connor. New York and London: Methuen, 1987. 47-67.

Wayne, Valerie. "Advice for women from mothers and patriarchs." Wilcox 56-79.

Weidmann, Heather L. "Theatricality and Female Identity in Mary Wroth's *Urania*." Miller and Waller 191-209.

Weigall, Rachel. "An Elizabethan Gentlewoman: The Journal of Lady Mildmay, circa 1570-1617 (unpublished)." *Quarterly Review* 215 (1911): 119-138.

Wheale, Nigel. *Writing and Society: Literacy, print and politics in Britain 1590-1660*. New York and London: Routledge, 1999.

White, Eileen, ed. *The English Cookery Book: Historical Essays: Leeds Symposium on Food History "Food and Society" Series*. Totnes, Devon: Prospect, 2004.

---. "Domestic English Cookery and Cookery Books, 1575-1675." White 73-97.

Wilcox, Helen, ed. *Women and Literature in Britain, 1500-1700*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1996.

---. "Private Writing and Public Function: Autobiographical Texts by Renaissance Englishwomen." Cerasano and Wynne-Davies 47-62.

Willen, Diane. "Godly Women in Early Modern England: Puritanism and Gender." *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 43.4 (1992): 561-80.

Williams, Raymond. *The Country and the City*. London: Chatto & Windus, 1973.

Williamson, George C. *Lady Anne Clifford Countess of Dorset, Pembroke & Montgomery. 1590-1676. Her Life, Letters and Work*. 2nd ed. Wakefield: S.R. Publishers, 1967.

Wilson, C. Anne. *Food and Drink in Britain: From the Stone Age to the Nineteenth Century*. 1973. Chicago: Academy Chicago, 2003.

--- ed. *"Banquetting Stuffe": The fare and social background of the Tudor and Stuart banquet*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 1991.

---. "Introduction: The Origin of 'Banquetting Stuffe. '" Wilson *Banquetting* 1-8.

---. "The Evolution of the Banquet Course: Some Medicinal, Culinary and Social Aspects." Wilson *Banquetting* 9-35.

Wilson, Scott. *Cultural Materialism: Theory and Practice*. Oxford and Cambridge, MA: Blackwell, 1995.

Winter, Salvator and Francisco Dickinson. *A Pretious Treasury: Or A New Dispensatory*. London: Thomas Harper for Richard Harper, 1649.

Wiseman, Susan. "Knowing her place: Anne Clifford and the politics of retreat." *Textures of Renaissance Knowledge* Eds. Philippa Berry and Margaret Tudeau-Clayton. Manchester and New York: Manchester UP, 2003. 199-221.

---. "'The most considerable of my troubles': Anne Halkett and the Writing of Civil War Conspiracy." Wallwork and Salzman 25-45.

---. "Margaret Cavendish among the Prophets: performance ideologies and gender in and after the English Civil War." *Women's Writing* 6.1 (1999): 95-111.

---. "'Unsilent instruments and the devil's cushions': authority in seventeenth-century women's prophetic discourse." *New Feminist Discourses: Critical Essays on Theories and Texts*. Ed. Isobel Armstrong. London and New York: Routledge, 1992. 176-96.

Woodbridge, Linda. "Dark Ladies: Women, Social History, and English Renaissance Literature." Comensoli and Stevens 52-71.

Woolley, Hannah. *The Ladies Delight: Or, A Rich Closet Of Choice Experiments & Curiosities*. London: T. Milbourn for R. Crouch, 1672.

---. *The Queen-Like Closet; Or, Rich Cabinet*. London: R. Lowndes, 1670.

---. *The Cooks Guide: Or, Rare Receipts For Cookery*. London: Peter Dring, 1664.

---. *The Ladies Directory, In Choice Experiments & Curiosities*. London: T.M. for Peter Dring, 1662.

Woolrych, Austin. *Britain in Revolution 1625-1660*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2002.

Wootton, David. "Francis Bacon: Your Flexible Friend." *The World of the Favourite*. Eds. J.H. Elliott and L.W.B. Brockliss. New Haven and London: Yale UP, 1999. 184-204.

Worden, Blair. *The Sound of Virtue: Philip Sidney's* Arcadia *and Elizabethan Politics*. New Haven and London: Yale UP, 1996.

Woudhuysen, H.R. *Sir Philip Sidney and the Circulation of Manuscripts 1558-1640.* Oxford: Clarendon, 1996.

Wright, Abraham. *Parnassus Biceps. Or Severall Choice Pieces Of Poetry.* London: George Eversden, 1656.

Wright, Stephen. "Jessey, Henry (1601-1663)." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.* Oxford UP, 2004. http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/14804. Accessed 4 July 2007.

Wrightson, Keith. *Earthly Necessities: Economic Lives in Early Modern Britain.* New Haven and London: Yale UP, 2000.

Wroth, Lady Mary. *The First Part of The Countess of Montgomery's Urania.* 1995. Ed. Josephine A. Roberts. Tempe, AZ: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 2005.

---. *The Second Part of The Countess of Montgomery's Urania.* Eds. Josephine A. Roberts, Suzanne Gossett, and Janel Mueller. Tempe, AZ: Renaissance English Text Society/Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 1999.

Wynne-Davies, Marion. "'So Much Worth': Autobiographical Narratives in the Work of Lady Mary Wroth." *Betraying Our Selves: Forms of Self-Representation in Early Modern English Texts.* Eds. Henk Dragstra, Sheila Ottway, and Helen Wilcox. Houndmills: Macmillan; New York: St. Martin's, 2000. 76-93.

---. "The Queen's Masque: Renaissance Women and the Seventeenth-century Court Masque." Cerasano and Wynne-Davies 79-104.