REPRESENTATIONS OF ENGLISH WOMEN'S INTERACTIONS WITH ANIMALS, 1600-1750

by

POPPY FREEMAN-CUERDEN

A thesis submitted to the University of Birmingham for the Degree of

MA BY RESEARCH

Department of History

School of History and Cultures

College of Arts and Law

University of Birmingham

March 2022

Abstract

This thesis examines representations of lower and middling status women's interactions with animals in England in the period 1600-1750. Ballads, instructional guides, and recipe books are used to discuss the varied representations of these interactions. Representation here is used to specifically refer to how these sources depict these women and their interactions with animals. A gendered approach is taken to establish whether and how representations of lower and middling status women's interactions with animals were affected by the gender of the women depicted. The interactions examined here are women's work with living animals, their work preparing dead animals and their products as an ingredient in food or medicine, and women's emotional response, or lack thereof, to animals. Gender is found to be central to depictions of women's work with living animals as well as to stereotypes around certain emotional responses to animals. Representations of women's work with animals as an ingredient and other emotional responses are affected by gender in a more nuanced way if at all, with many of these interactions not depicted as affected by gender in these sources. This gendered lens reveals both the influence and the limits of gender on representations of women's daily interactions with animals.

Acknowledgements

This research has been funded by the AHRC Midlands4Cities funding group, for which I am grateful.

I would also like to thank both of my supervisors Karen Harvey and Kate Smith for all of their advice and support throughout this process.

I am also particularly grateful for the support of my family and my own animals.

Contents

Introduction

This thesis examines representations of lower and middling status women's interactions with animals in rural England in the period 1600-1750. This aspect of these women's lives has not been analysed in existing historiography, particularly for lower and middling status women. All types of animals with which lower and middling women are depicted as interacting will be examined here, ensuring a broad scope of analysis. Ballads, instructional guides and recipe books are used to address lower and middling status women's work caring for living animals, their work preparing dead animals and animal products as ingredients in food or medicine, and their emotional responses (or lack thereof) to animals. Crucially, the representation of these aspects of women's lives is examined through a gendered lens. Beyond merely what women are represented as doing or not doing, the core question here is whether and how their gender is depicted as relevant to their interactions with animals. The influence of gender on representations of women's interactions with animals varies significantly, with some interactions inextricably tied to women and others not depicted as affected by gender at all. Both the impact and limitations of gender on these depictions of women are thus demonstrated.

The gendered approach taken here is rooted in scholarship on gender history. There is no attempt to establish a new construction of early modern femininity here, rather existing understandings are applied to the representations of women depicted in the primary sources examined. The core conceptions of femininity relevant to these depictions of women are centred around women's inferiority, their role as housewife, and concerns over their sexuality. Women were conceived of as firmly inferior to men in this period, described as

"the weaker vessel" and subordinate to men in both the home and in society.[1] In practice, as will be seen here, this resulted in the undervaluing of women's work and a strict resistance to any inversion this gendered hierarchy. Women's role as housewife was extremely important in this period and central to many contemporary conceptions of femininity. Crucial here are ideas of women as providing care (daily sustaining as well as nursing) and their duty in provisioning for the household. In practice this meant that housewives were expected to manage the household, which included "virtually all of the cleaning, shopping, and cooking."[2] This work also extended to daily care for the animals owned by the household, a task which encompassed both conceptions of women's care role and their provisioning duty. Women's sexuality is less central to many of the representations depicted here than these housewifely duties, but is still significant in how these women are portrayed. In this period chastity was stressed as a feminine ideal and increasingly advocated for in conduct literature.[3] Simultaneously, women were perceived as sexually voracious in the seventeenth century – behaviour which contemporaries believed must be contained.[4] Women were thus expected to strive for the ideal of chastity but perceived as easily swayed from this virtue. All of these contemporary constructions of femininity represented an ideal, but they are useful in approaching the sources examined here, which equally depict ideals. These perceptions of women and their duties run throughout the representations discussed here and are central to the gendering of these representations.

[1] Antonia Fraser, *The Weaker Vessel: Woman's Lots in Seventeenth-Century England* (London: Phoenix Press, 2002), 1; Anthony Fletcher, *Gender, Sex and Subordination in England 1500-1800* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995), xv.
[2] Robert B. Shoemaker, *Gender in English Society 1650-1850: The Emergence of Separate Spheres* (Harlow: Pearson Education Limited, 1998), 116.
[3] Ibid, 21.
[4] Fraser, *The Weaker Vessel*, 5.

The focus here is specifically on representations. This approach is possible because of the richness of the sources examined, allowing for analysis centred around women's representation. The representations offered by the different sources here vary considerably, with ballads written to entertain an audience, often depicting inappropriate behaviour to make didactic points, and guide and recipe books written to instruct and inform. These sources, though varied, thus all present an ideal form of women's behaviour. These varying representations thus offer a broad window into contemporary conceptions and ideals of women and womanhood in this period. Representation here refers to a specific examination of how these sources depict these women and what we can gain about societal perception from this. Examining the representations of women's interactions with animals is a useful starting point to understand the context of women's lives and the ways in which their interactions with animals were invoked and understood in different contexts. The sources discussed here were designed to both present and shape thought in this period and thus representation gives access to what people thought as well as what authors wanted people to think.

Ballads, instructional guides, and recipe books are the core source base used here. Sources have been located using online databases, particularly Early English Books Online, Eighteenth Century Collections Online, and the English Broadside Ballad Archive. Search terms have been used to locate sources related specifically to women and to animals, as well as those targeted to a more general audience (whether the family as a whole or men specifically) to aid comparison and discover whether audience affects the ways women are represented. Search terms have also been selected to find sources on topics (such as cookery) related to each chapter. These terms vary from the specific (e.g. "milk" or "cat") to the broad (e.g. "recipe book") and include both gender specific terms such as "housewife" or

"dairymaid", "gentlewoman" and "gentleman", and more general, gender neutral terms such as "family". The sources located have then been examined and refined, with examples offering typical representations discussed here. Occasional unique representations have been acknowledged where they aid wider analysis on the portrayal of women's interactions with animals.

The source types examined here have been selected for their value in offering a broad range of representation, with both literary and practical instructional depictions of the feminine ideal and problematic female behaviour. In examining both prescriptive and literary depictions of women's interactions with animals, a wider sense of the cultural conception of these interactions can be attained. These sources were also produced for different audiences, with ballads aimed at a broad cross-section of society and, significantly, available (whether aurally or textually) to lower status individuals, and instructional guides and recipe books targeted towards middling and elite status people. The entire social range of women whose representation is examined here were thus also the intended audience for these sources when examined together. While other source types could have been selected to achieve a similar examination (such as prints or philosophical or scientific texts which discuss women and animals) ballads, instructional guides and recipe books have been selected to both maintain a clear focus on distinctive source types and as examples of specifically text-based primary sources which explicitly included lower and middling status women as (at least part of) their target audience. These other source types should not be dismissed but have not been selected for examination here.

Each of the sources examined here has its own values and limitations, with each seeking to represent different aspects of life. Instructional guides and recipe books were written for men, women, and for the family as whole in this period, with those targeting different audiences generally covering different topics and in varying depth. They depict an

ideal of womanhood and of work (including of food and medicine), rather than a lived 'reality' and must be treated as a representation of this ideal. However, it is important to remember the practical guidance which these texts intended to convey. Indeed, Jane Whittle and Elizabeth Griffiths stress the value of instructional guides in preparing women for their role as housewife.[5] Similarly, within food history recipe books have been praised for their unparalleled insight into what was eaten in the past.[6]

These texts were generally written by wealthy men (though sometimes women) for those of upper-middling status or higher to effectively emulate the elite or other members of the upper-middling sort. The middling sort, an increasingly emerging group in this period, is defined succinctly by Harvey as "those in the trading, commercial or professional middle ranks of society without land or title."[7] Overt representation of lower and middling women is often slim in these sources, yet the work they carried out is discussed at length. This work is presented in the context of informing wealthier women how to instruct their servants. It is rare to find representation of how lower status women lived their lives in these texts, beyond the work they would carry out as servants. Lower and most middling status women are thus neither represented explicitly within the pages of these texts, nor as their authors. However, much can be garnered about perceptions of these women and their work and their gendered associations with animals in an examination of the instructions written for them, to be delivered by elite mistresses.

Ballads do not offer a reflection of life in seventeenth- and eighteenth-century England, rather they present a deliberately constructed, often deliberately skewed and

[5] Jane Whittle and Elizabeth Griffiths, *Consumption and Gender in the Early Seventeenth-Century Household: The World of Alice Le Strange* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 48.
[6] Sarah Pennell and Michelle DiMeo, "Introduction" in *Reading and Writing Recipe Books, 1550–1800* ed. by Michelle DiMeo and Sarah Pennell (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2013), 2.
[7] Harvey, *The Impostress Rabbit-Breeder*, 30; more detailed analysis of this group can be found in Margaret R. Hunt, *The Middling Sort: Commerce, Gender, and the Family in England, 1680-1780* (Berkley, University of California Press, 1996).

fanciful version of events. They were intended to entertain an audience, as well as generally delivering a didactic message. Ballad writers were predominantly male and largely of middling and lower status.[8] These men constructed a narrative which reflected their own beliefs about society and those which they believed would sell. Indeed, Christopher Marsh notes the power of ballads as a "political tool" in early modern England.[9] However, it is through ballads' exaggeration that they reveal contemporary concerns and extreme stereotypes. Scholarship on ballads highlights their potential for demonstrating contemporary popular perceptions, with Sandra Clark noting their ability to give voice to "the communal values of the non-elite."[10] Similarly, Frances Dolan highlights their value as a source in demonstrating "popular knowledge, widely used language and tenacious associations."[11] Ballads must not be taken at face value, but rather have to be actively analysed to reveal valuable insight into popular culture and thought in early modern society.

Beyond the limitations of ballads as source themselves, Marsh has warned of the pitfalls of the common practice of selecting ballads which suit the subject of research rather than those which can be seen to reflect popular opinion due to their contemporary popularity, arguing that this results in a skewed image of early modern culture.[12] Marsh suggests that longevity and multiple surviving copies demonstrate contemporary popularity of ballads and thus that these ballads can be judged to accurately reflect contemporary conceptions and culture.[13] It is with Marsh's warnings in mind that the selection process for the ballads discussed in this chapter has taken place here. Most of the ballads examined here are not

[8] Christopher Marsh, *Music and Society in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 228; Ibid, 229.
[9] Ibid, 225.
[10] Sandra Clark, *Women and Crime in the Street Literature of Early Modern England* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), 76.
[11] Frances E. Dolan, "Mopsa's Method: Truth Claims, Ballads, and Print," *Huntington Library Quarterly* 79, no.2 (2016): 175.
[12] Christopher Marsh, "The Woman to the Plow; and the Man to the Hen-Roost: Wives, Husbands and Best-Selling Ballads in Seventeenth-Century England," *Transactions of the RHS* 28 (2018): 68-9.
[13] Ibid.

centred around animals or women's interactions with them. These animals and interactions are more commonly revealed through passing reference or comment. This suggests an assumption of the normalcy of these women's proximity to animals and offers insight into emotional responses (or lack thereof) which were perceived as so commonplace as to not deserve unique comment or attention. Rather these interactions were merely an element of scene setting in a ballad with a very different intended message. As a form of literature available to the lower and middling status women examined here, whether through printed copies or performance, ballads are a valuable source.[14] Indeed, the audience of ballads included those from all sections of early modern society, and Katherine Steele Brokaw refers to ballads as "the popular-culture item of early modern England" because of their ubiquity.[15] As a source which was both printed and sold and performed and sung aloud, they could reach an extremely wide audience. While not offering lower and middling women's own perspective, ballads provide a representation of these women and examples of common perceptions and stereotypes.

A wide range of scholarship is necessarily drawn on here to address the representation of a broad aspect of women's lives in this period, including gender history (discussed above), animal studies, women's work, food and medicine, companion animals, and the history of emotion. The human-animal divide is the central theme of the field of animal studies. While this divide is not the primary focus of my research, it is an important factor and a background to women's relationships and associations with animals. The human-animal divide is generally examined in terms of early modern philosophical and intellectual thought, with

[14] Ibid, 68.
[15] Katherine Steele Brokaw, "Popularity, Performance and Repetition," *Huntington Library Quarterly* 79, no.2 (2016): 339.

particular emphasis on the influence of the Aristotelian order of the world. The core distinction in this understanding was that humans have reason while animals do not. This is particularly interesting in examining women's relationships and associations with animals as, according to Aristotle, women did not have reason either. These perceptions of animals' lack of reason and women's at best inferior capacity to reason remained across the period examined here. While women were still positioned above animals as humans, in terms their capacity for reason they remained closer to the animal than men did. Significant shift in thinking about women and animals in this light did not occur until much later in the eighteenth century, though even then women's reasoning capabilities were not perceived as on par with men's. Both Erica Fudge and Karen Raber highlight an early modern perception of humanity as defined in opposition to animals, with this as the central tenet of the contemporary human-animal divide.[16] However, Fudge takes this further in demonstrating the fragility of this divide and contemporary perceptions of the blurred line between humanity and animals. This is particularly prominent in her article on Burton's argument that humans can literally become animals through lack of reason.[17] Indeed, she argues it is this blurred line which necessitates such strictly defined opposition between humans and animals. Women's supposed lack of or at least limited reason is thus a significant factor in blurring the lines between women and animals in early modern thought. This is emphasised in Adela Ramos' article on Mary Wollstonecraft's *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman*. While Wollstonecraft's book and arguments were written after the period examined here, she overtly addresses the perceptions of women and animals' blurred boundaries and reasoning

[16] Erica Fudge, *Perceiving Animals: Humans and Beasts in Early Modern English Culture* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2002); Karen Raber, "From Sheep to Meat, From Pets to People: Animal Domestication 1600-1800" in *A Cultural History of Animals in the Age of Enlightenment* ed. by Matthew Senior (Oxford: Berg, 2007).
[17] Erica Fudge, "How a Man Differs from a Dog" *History Today* 53, 6 (2003): 38-44.

capabilities which were held throughout the period 1600-1750.[18] Ramos thus succinctly summarises the gendered understandings inherent in the human-animal divide and how this positioned early modern women as closer to animals. This blurred line is further emphasised in the eighteenth century through concerns over women's lapdogs. Jonathan Lamb and Markman Ellis have highlighted these concerns in both literature and contemporary thought, with lapdogs frequently conflated with men, reflecting concerns around female sexuality.[19] Again, this explicitly highlights the ways contemporary perception of the human-animal divide influenced perception of women and, crucially, their relationships with animals.

Fudge is a particularly prominent historian in the field of animal studies and her work is almost unique in its approach to animals, considering them as individual and feeling beings far more so than almost any other scholarship. For example, her article "Milking Other Men's Beasts" centres around the experience of the cow being milked rather than the experience of the milker, highlighting contemporary understandings of the experiences of animals.[20] This approach offers a far more thorough and detailed analysis of contemporary perceptions of animals and the human-animal divide. More than merely examining which animals women interacted with, Fudge approaches animals as feeling beings capable of forming relationships, an approach she demonstrates was reflected in contemporary thought. Animal studies scholarship is a significant backdrop to the examinations of women's interactions with animals in my work, providing a context for the contemporary perception of humanity and animals.

[18] Adela Ramos, "Species Thinking: Animals, Women, and Literary Tropes in Mary Wollstonecraft's A Vindication of the Rights of Woman" *Tulsa Studies in Women's Literature* 37, no. 1 (2018): 41-66.
[19] Jonathan Lamb, "The Rape of the Lock as Still Life" in *The Secret Life of Things: Animals, Objects, and It-Narratives in Eighteenth-Century England* ed. by Mark Blackwell, 45-62 (Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press, 2007); Markman Ellis, "Suffering Things: Lapdogs, Slaves, and Counter-Sensibility" in *The Secret Life of Things: Animals, Objects, and It-Narratives in Eighteenth-Century England* ed. by Mark Blackwell, 92-116 (Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press, 2007).
[20] Erica Fudge, "Milking Other Men's Beasts," *History and Theory* 52, no. 4 (2013): 13-28.

In thinking through the nature of women's relationships to animals in this period, this thesis particularly explores how women interacted with animals in their working lives. Scholarship on women's work, even specifically rural and agricultural work, rarely addresses women's work with animals in any substantial way. The discussion of women's work with animals in Alice Clark's influential examination of seventeenth-century women's work, receiving passing mention as "management of the dairy" and poultry, female servants' role as dairymaids, and female ownership of pigs, is reflected in almost every piece of scholarship on women's work in the last hundred years.[21] Historiography on women and gender in general often alludes to women's work with animals in a similar depth to Clark. For example, Anthony Fletcher's reference to "the mistress of the dairy," and Cissie Fairchilds' description of a rural housewife's role in caring for "pigs, chickens and ducks and geese" as well as her management of the dairy "where she raised and milked cows and sometimes sheep and goats and made butter and cheese."[22] These descriptions form the extent of these authors' discussion of women's work with animals. Even in scholarship specifically focusing on women's work, this treatment of women's work with animals remains consistent. This work is generally acknowledged but is not examined in depth. For example, Whittle states that more women were employed in pastoral farming than in arable "because dairying provided more work for women" without going into any depth about this work itself, though she does stress that similar work was carried out by unpaid housewives.[23] Similarly, Pamela Sharpe refers to increased employment opportunities for women in the "pastoral west of England," but does not expand on this.[24] There is historiography on dairying, but this does not address

[21] Alice Clark, *Working Life of Women in the Seventeenth Century* (London: Frank Cass & Co. Ltd., 1968), 50; Ibid, 53.
[22] Fletcher, *Gender, Sex and Subordination*, 246; Cissie Fairchilds, *Women in Early Modern Europe, 1500-1700* (Harlow: Pearson Longman, 2007), 130.
[23] Jane Whittle, "Housewives and Servants in Rural England, 1440-1650: Evidence of Women's Work from Probate Documents" *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 15 (2005): 53.
[24] Pamela Sharpe, *Adapting to Capitalism: Working Women in the English Economy, 1700-1850* (Basingstoke: MacMillan Press Ltd, 2014), 73.

the questions around women's work discussed here. This scholarship generally focuses on dairying as an industry, or on the late-eighteenth-century shift from dairying as women's domain to increased male management. For example, Richard Blundell and Angela Treagar have traced the changes in dairying as an industry in 1650-1950, and similarly G. E. Fussell has examined the changes in equipment used over time.[25] Scholarship addressing women's work more explicitly has tended to focus on the late eighteenth-century and women's declining power in the dairy, as in Deborah Valenze's work.[26] Even where Valenze does discuss women's roles in dairying in the period covered here, the focus remains largely on dairying as an industry rather than on women's daily interactions with cows.[27] This scholarship is, however, still valuable in situating women's work with animals.

The majority of scholarship examining agricultural work is centred around arable agriculture, and scholarship focusing specifically on women's agricultural work generally particularly investigates the gendered division of arable labour.[28] In particular, much work centres around paid casual labour, rather than the long-term contracts of servants or unpaid housework, further limiting the potential for study of women's work with animals. Keith Snell's work on women's seasonal unemployment, Sharpe's examination of women's work on farms in early modern Essex, and Steve Hindle's investigation into a Nuneaton farm are all examples of this historiographical leaning towards paid casual labour in arable farming, as opposed to other forms of women's work, particularly women's work (whether paid or not)

[25] Richard Blundell and Angela Tregear, "From Artisans to "Factories": The Interpenetration of Craft and Industry in English Cheese-Making, 1650-1950" *Enterprise & Society* 7, no. 4 (2006): 705-739; G. E. Fussell, "The Evolution of Farm Dairy Machinery in England," *Agricultural History* 37, no. 4 (1963): 217-224.
[26] Deborah Valenze, "The Art of Women and the Business of Men: Women's Work and the Dairy Industry c. 1740-1840," *Past & Present*, 130 (1991): 142-169; Deborah Valenze, *The First Industrial Woman* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995).
[27] Deborah Valenze, *Milk: A Local and Global History* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2011), 120-123.
[28] E.g. Michael Roberts, "Sickles and Scythes: Women's Work and Men's Work at Harvest Time", *History Workshop* no. 7, 1 (1979): 3-28.

with animals.[29] This focus on arable casual labour is largely due to availability of sources, with women's casual paid employment far easier to trace than other forms of work, and the tasks they carried out more commonly detailed in account books than the work of servants, let alone housewives. Even scholarship specifically focusing on servants, such as Ann Kussmaul's influential text, is still very limited in its examination of women's work with animals, making similar passing reference to it as other scholarship does, despite the role of dairymaid being a major area of employment for female servants.[30] Kussmaul's assessment of the tasks of female servants is summed up in a single sentence: "Women generally ran the dairy, milked the cows, cared for small animals, especially poultry, weeded, and performed the principal tasks ancillary to agriculture, ale-making and cooking."[31]

Historians have also addressed women's work in attempts to explain changing economies and a perceived reduction in female agricultural employment in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries as labour became increasingly divided along gendered lines. Jan de Vries' influential work argues for a decrease in women's paid employment.[32] Others focus on shifts in technique as the root cause, for example, Michael Roberts' work on the increasing use of scythes (gendered masculine) instead of sickles (a relatively gender-neutral tool) in harvesting crops.[33]

Scholarship on women's work offers an important base for my research, crucial in identifying their roles and how these shifted as well as highlighting their contribution both to

[29] Keith Snell, 'Agricultural Seasonal Unemployment, the Standard of Living, and Women's Work in the South and East, 1690-1860', *Economic History Review*, 34, no. 3 (1981); Sharpe, *Adapting to Capitalism*; Steve Hindle, "Work, Reward and Labour Discipline in Late-Seventeenth-Century England" in *Remaking English Society: Social Relations and Social Change in Early Modern England,* ed. Steve Hindle, Alexandra Shepard and John Walter, (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2013).
[30] Ann Kussmaul, *Servants in Husbandry in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981).
[31] Ibid, 34.
[32] Jan de Vries, "The Industrial Revolution and the Industrious Revolution" *The Journal of Economic History*, Vol. 54, No. 2 (1994): 262.
[33] Roberts, "Sickles and Scythes".

the economy and to societal and cultural shifts. However, current scholarship does not address women's work with animals in depth, this could be credited to the only fairly recent rise in interest in animals in history. This omission is particularly true of the gendered approach that this project takes. There has been no significant attempt to understand the gendering of women's work with animals and how gender influenced perceptions of this work in the period 1600-1750. This project thus seeks to address this omission.

There is a reasonably thorough scholarship on food, medicine and the kitchen in the period 1600-1750. However, much of this scholarship does not address the questions of this project, particularly around women's relationship with the animal ingredients, nor the lower and middling women discussed here. Michelle DiMeo and Rebecca Laroche's book chapter on early modern women's medicinal recipes comes closest to discussing the relationship between women and animals as ingredients.[34] Their work is particularly useful in highlighting the difference in language towards the animal in recipes for food versus recipes for medicine and noting that in medicinal recipes animals are treated as objects much the same as plants. However, the focus of their work is analysing women's relationship with nature more generally, rather than specifically addressing their relationship with animals.

Women's role in nursing and medical care within the home across the social spectrum is well-established in historiography, addressed in general texts on women such as Anne Laurence's *Women in England* and in work-specific texts as early as Clark.[35] Similarly women's role in cooking is presented as somewhat of a given in scholarship, for example

[34] Michelle DiMeo and Rebecca Laroche, "On Elizabeth Isham's "Oil of Swallows": Animal Slaughter and Early Modern Women's Medical Recipes" in *Ecofeminist Approaches to Early Modernity,* ed. by Jennifer Munroe and Rebecca Laroche, 87-104 (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011).
[35] Clark, *Working Life of Women*, 243; Anne Laurence, *Women in England 1500-1760: A Social History* (London: Phoenix Press, 1996), 104;

Joan Thirsk describing cooks as "men in large kitchens of the rich, and women everywhere in the kitchens of the rest."[36]

Historiography on food and medicine as related to the lower and middling classes of women, however, is much more limited. Medicinal recipes have been acknowledged in scholarship as particularly important to women in this period, with Anne Stobart, for example, highlighting the value of this knowledge to early modern women.[37] However, her focus here remains largely on wealthier women and the value of these recipes as a form of social currency, rather than poorer or middling women who would often have relied on their own and their families' medical knowledge as a matter of survival. Similarly, historiography on food struggles to locate the poor and even the middling in sources and their eating habits are thus somewhat unclear. Karen Raber's work on meat is a clear example of scholarship which focuses the upper classes to avoid this problem.[38] Whittle and Griffiths' work on the Le Strange household in the seventeenth century is an excellent example of how the poorer and middling classes are beginning to be located in the historical record.[39] They specifically address the food which the household servants ate, noting whether or not it was the same as their wealthy masters and mistresses. Moreover, they take pains to point out that the food was prepared by these more ordinary individuals, not the elite who would eat it, thus highlighting the role of these ordinary people in food consumption even of the wealthy. This also gives further insight into the relationship between women and animals in both cooking and eating as well as between the animal as a creature and as food. Thirsk's work on food, however, is the most comprehensive in addressing class differences, as well as highlighting regional

[36] Joan Thirsk, *Food in Early Modern England: Phases, Fads, Fashions 1500-1760* (London: Hambledon Continuum, 2006), 227.
[37] Anne Stobart, *Household Medicine in Seventeenth-Century England* (London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2016).
[38] Karen Raber, "Animals at the Table: Performing Meat in Early Modern England and Europe," in *Interspecies Interactions: Animals and Humans Between the Middle Ages and Modernity* edited by Sarah Cockram and Andrew Wells, 107-122 (London: Routledge, 2018).
[39] Whittle and Griffiths, *Consumption and Gender in the Early Seventeenth-Century Household*.

differences in the food which people ate.[40] In particular, her work is useful as it explicitly discusses perceptions of food, significantly meat and animal products, for example describing the ways that different kinds of meat were eaten across the period examined here, discussing both class and regional difference.

This scholarship is again an extremely valuable context. While the interaction between women and animal ingredients has not been addressed in current scholarship, what is revealed is highly significant. Understanding what foods lower and middling class women ate, what animal ingredients they used in medicine and how they prepared this food and medicine is integral to understanding their relationship with the animals they used.

In examining women's emotional responses, or lack thereof, to animals in this period, scholarship on companion animals and the history of emotion is integral. The topic of companion animals or pets is a highly debated one in early modern historiography. Much of this work focuses on the eighteenth century and identifies a shift in attitudes to animals in this period. Defining an animal as a pet or companion animal is difficult, with different historians offering different conditions and categories. Keith Thomas offers a particularly popular definition of pets as named animals living in the home amongst humans and that are not eaten.[41] This definition has been taken as a foundation of the scholarship on these human-animal relationships, with Laura Brown referring to Thomas as "the major historian of human-animal relationships in European culture."[42] However, this is still contested, and, in her description of the difficulty of defining a pet or companion animal, Ingrid Tague argues that "pet keeping does not take the same form, or hold the same meaning, across all periods

[40] Thirsk, *Food in Early Modern England*.
[41] Keith Thomas, *Man and the Natural World: Changing Attitudes in England 1500-1800* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996).
[42] Laura Brown, "The Lady, the Lapdog, and Literary Alterity", *The Eighteenth Century* 52, no. 1, Animal, All Too Animal (2011): 31-45; Jodi L. Wyett, "The Lap of Luxury: Lapdogs, Literature and Social Meaning in the 'Long' Eighteenth Century," *Literature Interpretation Theory* 10 (2001): 33.

or cultures."[43] Even if Thomas' definition of pets or companion animals is accepted, there is still a blurred line between some working animals and pets. For example, the turnspit dog which lived in the home and was not eaten was still not perceived by contemporaries who used them as a pet or companion animal. Scholarship on the turnspit dog, such as Stanley Coren's work, has highlighted the lack of personal connection individuals felt with this animal and the poor treatment they received. For example, the cook would sometimes force them to run faster by putting hot coals in the wheel with them.[44] However, just because an animal was a working animal did not mean that the animal and the humans interacting with it had no personal relationship, as highlighted by Fudge in her article on milking cows.[45] Defining a companion animal is thus somewhat difficult and debates continue in historiography over what is the appropriate way to define a pet or companion animal and whether there is one definition that works in all circumstances.

Beyond definitions, there is much scholarship on companion animals, particularly eighteenth-century upper-class women and their pets. The majority of historiography on early modern companion animals focuses on the elite, often elite women. There was much contemporary concern about these wealthy women and their lapdogs, and this is reflected in the abundant historiography on the topic. For example, Brown stresses the contemporary association between women and lapdogs, while Jodi Wyett takes this further in arguing that the lapdog offered wealthy women power, agency and protection.[46] Indeed, Tague stresses the importance of companion animals to their owners in her analysis of animal elegies and epitaphs, highlighting both the role of satire and the sincerity it evolved from.[47] However,

[43] Ingrid H. Tague, *Animal Companions: Pets and Social Change in Eighteenth-Century Britain* (University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2015), 6.
[44] Stanley Coren, *Pawprints of History: Dogs and the Course of Human Events* (New York: Free Press, 2003), 171.
[45] Fudge, "Milking Other Men's Beasts".
[46] Brown, "The Lady, the Lapdog, and Literary Alterity".
[47] Ingrid H. Tague, "Satire and Sentiment in British Elegies and Epitaphs for Animals," *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 41, no. 3 (2008): 289-306.

again the focus remains on the elite, who could afford elegies and epitaphs for beloved companion animals, or who engaged in the satire mocking those who were sincere.

Work on companion animals is a useful context here, establishing how close relationships were perceived between people, significantly women, and animals in this period. This scholarship raises questions of what lower status women's (and people's more generally) relationships with animals were. The most overt discussion of this is in Tague's book where she discusses eighteenth-century concern around the poor having pets.[48] She describes a perception of companion animals as a luxury, present in concerns around elite women too, which here resulted in belief by some contemporaries that the poor should not have them. In the sources examined in chapter 3, these relationships are not found to fit into definitions of companion animal, or indeed to really fit the term 'relationship.' The definitions of pets or companion animals in existing scholarship are sound and can be seen to be reflected in some human-animal relationships in this period. However, in focusing solely on pets or companion animals and limiting this definition to apply to only those animals that were present solely for companionship, a huge number of animals and types of emotional response (or lack thereof) are left unexamined.

As definitions of companion animals in existing scholarship do not fit the kinds of interaction lower and middling status women had with animals in this period, instead their emotional responses (or lack thereof) to animals are examined here. Scholarship on emotion is thus particularly useful for grounding this analysis. A more thorough discussion of this scholarship will occur in the third chapter, with specific definition of emotion in the context of this piece and discussion of how this sits with existing scholarship. However, the work of

[48] Tague, *Animal Companions.*

Katie Barclay, Rob Boddice, and the edited collection by Susan Broomhall are particularly useful here in establishing how emotion was understood and conceived in this period.[49]

Historiography on witchcraft and monstrous births provides a wider context to women's interactions with animals in this period, though these interactions are not discussed at length in this thesis. Belief in witchcraft was a cultural norm in early modern England, though concern over witches did wane as the period progressed. Through these witchcraft beliefs, women were perceived to be supernaturally connected to animals, with the animal familiar particularly significant in English conceptions of witchcraft.[50] Familiars were thought to perform "malevolent deeds" on behalf of their witch, commonly taking the form of typical domestic animals such as cats.[51] Frances Dolan's description of witches as "act[ing] as mothers" to their familiars is especially noteworthy in consideration of women's relationships with animals, suggesting a bond between women and animals far beyond the acceptable or natural.[52] While this supernatural association between women and companion animals is not a focus of this thesis, these more sinister relationships form an important cultural context for understanding contemporary perceptions and representations of women's interactions with animals. In monstrous birth too women were "mother" to animals.

Monstrous birth, however, was not necessarily believed to be tied to malicious forces. Indeed, some believed it could be a sign from God, while others believed it was a natural phenomenon caused by the body's adverse reaction to some external stimulus.[53] Julie

[49] Katie Barclay, *The History of Emotions: A Student Guide to Methods and Sources* (London: Macmillan Education Limited, 2020); Rob Boddice, "The History of Emotions: Past, Present, Future" *Revista de Estudios Sociales* 62 (2017): 10-15; Susan Broomhall, ed., *Early Modern Emotions: An Introduction* (London: Routledge, 2017).
[50] Frances Dolan, *Dangerous Familiars: Representations of Domestic Crime in England, 1550-1700* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1994), 175.
[51] Greg Warburton, "Gender, Supernatural Power, Agency and the Metamorphoses of the Familiar in Early Modern Pamphlet Accounts of English Witchcraft" *Parergon* 20, no. 2 (2003): 95.
[52] Dolan, *Dangerous Familiars*, 175.
[53] Julie Crawford, *Marvelous Protestantism: Monstrous Births in Post-Reformation England* (Baltimore, The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2005), 2; Karen Harvey, *The Impostress Rabbit-Breeder: Mary Toft and Eighteenth-Century England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2020), 39.

Crawford's work on monstrous birth particularly highlights the religious belief and conflict around monstrous births in early modern England, demonstrating the varied conceptions of their cause.[54] Monstrous births could take many forms, including human women supposedly giving birth to animals. Mary Toft is perhaps the most famous example of such a monstrous birth. In 1726 Toft claimed to have given birth to multiple rabbits, mostly parts of rabbits (such as their feet) rather than whole. Though eventually proven to be a hoax, Karen Harvey's work on Toft highlights the genuine belief in the phenomenon of monstrous birth in which this hoax was rooted and that this belief existed from the elite to the poorest in society.[55] Monstrous births were a literal unification of human women and animals, with the animal believed to have grown inside the woman's womb in place of a human child. These animals produced in monstrous births were perceived as a sign that something was wrong, particularly associated with some sin committed by the mother or her experience of something particularly heinous and shocking.[56] Associations between women and animals in witchcraft and belief and monstrous births were thus perceived as signifiers of something sinister and negative. These associations are not a focus of this thesis, which examines more quotidian interactions between women and animals, particularly centred around work. However, scholarship on contemporary supernatural belief provides a broader context for contemporary popular perception of women and animals.

These varied scholarships are drawn upon to analyse whether and how representations of lower- and middling-status women's interactions with animals were gendered in this period. Chapter 1 examines depictions of women's work with animals, addressing what work

[54] Crawford, *Marvelous Protestantism*.
[55] Harvey, *The Impostress Rabbit-Breeder*.
[56] Crawford, *Marvelous Protestantism*, 20; Ibid, 18.

women are depicted as performing; the gendering of this work; the impact of marital status on this work; what about this work is rooted in conceptions of femininity; and the cultural value placed on this work. This chapter finds that gender is extremely influential in representations of this work with animals. Gender is found to be integral to each area examined in this chapter. Chapter 2 examines portrayals of women's interactions with animals as an ingredient in food or medicine, discussing the impact of status on this work; the gendering of the work itself; the gendering of specific animals in this work; the gendering of the food or medicine produced; and representations of the skill involved in this work. Here gender's influence is far less strict, with the work of food and medicine production associated with women, but not exclusively presented as their domain. Moreover, gender does not impact the interactions with animals' parts and products, or the food or medicine produced as depicted in the sources examined here. This highlights the significance of the animal's death in the repositioning of its gendered (or ungendered) association with women. Chapter 3 examines representations of women's emotional responses to animals, or their lack thereof, analysing stereotypes of women's (and men's) positive emotional interactions with animals; women's positive emotional responses to animals beyond these stereotypes and the question of animals' capability to feel; women's negative emotional response to animals; and women's lack of emotional response to animals. The influence of gender here is particularly varied. While gender is central to stereotypes of women's (and men's) positive responses to animals, its influence on other positive emotional responses is much less significant, and gender does not impact depictions of women's negative emotional response or their lack of emotional response.

Overall, across the three chapters of this thesis, gender's influence on the representation of women's interactions with animals is therefore found to be extremely varied in the sources examined. Whereas in their work with living animals and in representations of

their positive emotional interactions with animals gender is extremely significant, in their work preparing animals as ingredient and their negative emotional and unemotional interactions with animals gender is not found to be a factor in the representation of their relationships. In examining these representations both the influence and the limits of gender are thus revealed in an area of women's lives not yet addressed in scholarship. Gender's impact on the fields of scholarship engaged with here is further nuanced, with current understandings built upon and expanded. While there is much scholarship on the gendering of women's work, for example, their work with animals and the role of and interaction with the animals specifically is not currently a part of this analysis. In this thesis, current analysis of women and gender is thus expanded to examine the ways gender specifically intersects with representations of women's interactions with animals. The result is a nuanced picture of the influence of gender on these representations. Not every aspect of women's lives, or specifically their relationships with animals, is thus represented as gendered. Yet in the areas where their interactions are depicted as gendered, contemporary conceptions of femininity are powerfully employed in these sources' depictions of ideal or transgressive women.

Work

Interactions and associations with animals permeated every aspect of women's lives in rural England in 1600-1750, and this connection between women and animals is most overt in examination of women's work. Women's work with animals is examined here through a gendered approach to investigate how gender operates in representations of women's work in ballads and instructional guides (defined here as texts written to instruct or inform the reader about specific tasks). Gender is found to be central in depictions of women's work with living animals, defining which roles they are presented as performing and underpinning the reasons why women performed these roles. The working relationship between women and animals warrants examination because thorough understanding of women's work in this period cannot be achieved without an assessment of their work (paid and unpaid) with animals. Focusing on lower and middling women allows for an exploration of the many different types of work performed by women, encompassing casual labourers, servants, and housewives responsible for households of varying size.

Jane Whittle's approach to work is central to the understanding of work discussed in this chapter, not limiting it to merely paid employment as in most scholarship, but broadening the definition to include "housework and care work," which she defines as "subsistence services," and highlighting household production as work itself.[57] When work is defined in this way it becomes clear that a significant proportion of women's work in this period involved animals, such as caring for poultry, pigs and cows, and milking and collecting eggs. As used here, care for animals does not include emotional any aspects or suggest any sort of affective bond with the animal. Instead, care is defined as work which maintained the health

[57] Jane Whittle, "A Critique of Approaches to 'Domestic Work': Women, Work and the Pre-Industrial Economy," *Past and Present* 243, no.1 (2019): 37-38.

and welfare of the animals, particularly feeding and nursing them. Care for animals was inherently linked to provisioning for the family, tying into conceptions of women's duty to their household. As discussed in the introduction, scholarship on women's work does little to thoroughly address their work with animals. This chapter thus builds on existing historiography to examine women's work with living animals as represented in ballads and instructional guides.

Six ballads have been selected for discussion here – selected from a broader examination of ballads depicting women's work and their quotidian interactions with animals – as representative of contemporary depictions of women's work with animals. These ballads are from the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, and the majority are from the British Library's and Harvard University's collections, with one ballad from the Bodleian collection. None of these collections are dedicated to or contain a large proportion of ballads about animals or women's work with animals. Indeed, in most of the ballads discussed here women's work with animals is not the subject, with only one ballad explicitly addressing it. That women's work with animals is frequently a background detail, rather than the central focus of these ballads highlights contemporary perceptions of the mundanity and acceptability of this work as well as its core ties to representations of rural women. This relatively limited discussion of women's work in ballads thus does not diminish what can be gained from examining how it is represented in these sources.

Five instructional guides have been selected for examination here, again ranging from the later seventeenth century to the early eighteenth century, with the exception one originally published in the sixteenth century. Other than the sixteenth-century text, these works focus primarily on the management of larger farms. The sixteenth-century *The Boke of Husbandry* (1540) is examined to offer insight into instruction for smaller households as well as a perspective of earlier advice. Andrew McRae has noted a significant shift in the style, tone,

and intended audience of agricultural instructional guides, highlighting the beginnings of a more "egalitarian tone" directed towards more middling farmers as the sixteenth century progressed, shifting into a focus on profit and individualism in the seventeenth century, all of which is clearly reflected in the instructional guides examined here.[58] All of these instructional books offer guidance on husbandry; though some have far more of a focus on animals than others. For example, Leonard Meager's *The Mystery of Husbandry* (1697) is almost entirely focused on arable agriculture, only addressing pastoral agriculture in terms of how fields and pastures should be set up and only discussing animals as pests or to hunt.[59] All of the other guides discussed here address animals in far more depth than this, though with varying focuses depending on both author and audience. *The Mystery of Husbandry* is explicitly targeted towards men, with Meager referring to his reader as "the Ingenious Countryman."[60] Henry Best's *Rural Economy in Yorkshire in 1641* (1857) is not explicitly stated to be written for men, but is written largely as an account of his own managerial tasks and contains limited explicit references to women's work.[61] Both John Fitzherbert's *The Boke of Husbandry* and John Worlidge's *Systema Agriculturae* (1687) are written for the family, offering guidance to both husbands and wives.[62] While both of these texts primarily address men's work with animals, there is acknowledgement of women's work, with Fitzherbert explicitly instructing women on which tasks they should perform, and Worlidge briefly addressing cows and dairying.[63] Ellis' *The Country Housewife's Family Companion* is

[58] Andrew McRae, *God Speed the Plough: The Representation of Agrarian England, 1500-1660* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 144; Ibid, 149; Ibid, 160.
[59] Leonard Meager, *The Mystery of Husbandry: Or, Arable, Pasture, and Wood-land Improved* (London: Printed by W. Onley, and are to be sold by Will. Majore, Bookseller, in Newport, Cornwall, 1697).
[60] Ibid, i.
[61] Henry Best, *Rural Economy in Yorkshire in 1641, Being the Farming and Account Books of Henry Best of Elmswell, in the East Riding of the County of York* (Durham: Published for The Society by George Andrews, 1857).
[62] John Fitzherbert, *The Boke of Husbandry*, 2nd edn. (London: In fletestrete in the house of Thomas Berthelet, nere to the condite at the sygne of Lucrece, 1540); J. W., *Systema Agriculturae; The Mystery of Husbandry Discovered*, 4th edn. (London: Printed for Tho. Dring, at the Harrow at the corner of Chancery-lane in Fleetstreet, 1687).
[63] Fitzherbert, *The Boke of Husbandry*, 62v-64; J. W., *Systema Agriculturae*, 172.

the only text examined here written explicitly for women, offering comprehensive guidance on a broad range of tasks with animals. These texts have been chosen deliberately to examine representations of women's work with various intended audiences.

The variety of these sources is useful in an examination of contemporary representation of women's work with animals. Ballads often seek to challenge and entertain through utilising exaggeration and humour, and instructional guides generally represent at the very least a middling ideal, if not an elite one. However, these sources are still extremely useful for understanding contemporary conceptions of women's work and interactions with animals in revealing popular attitudes and cultural ideals. The contrast between the sensationalism of ballads with the idealism of instructional guides offers greater insight into these cultural attitudes than merely examining one or the other. Moreover, that women's work is generally incidental in ballads suggests its representation is taken as a norm, forming part of the general context rather than the pivotal dramatic focus. This also highlights the devaluing of this work in these sources. These sources also reflect a relatively broad cross-section of seventeenth- and early-eighteenth-century society, with ballads bought, read and heard by a huge range of people, including the lower classes, and instructional guides generally written for the more middling members of society – the two key groups of women examined here.

In focusing on their work with animals, a very specific form of work with living beings can be examined. Animals were central within early modern economies and women's work with them was a significant economic contribution. Moreover, the physicality of work with living animals offers a particularly visceral sense of women's work with their hands. Most significantly, this work differs from women's work with inanimate objects, with a sense of power and control prominent between women and animals. Similarly, women's work with living people is also distinct from their work with animals. Though these animals are alive,

they cannot communicate with the women in the same way a human (even an infant) could. Women's work with animals presents a direct interaction, even relationship, with a living, non-human, being. Examining representations of women's work with animals specifically allows an examination of their work through a different lens, with their work with animals thus conceptually distinct from their work with inanimate objects or humans.

In examining the representations of lower and middling status women's working interactions with animals, this chapter will address several core research questions. First, what work with animals women are represented as performing in these sources is established and placed in the context of historiography on women's work. Next, the gendering of women's work with living animals in these sources is examined, finding that this work is firmly associated with women and presented as feminine work. How these sources depict work changing with marital status is then addressed, with a shift from paid to unpaid labour represented here. What in this work is depicted as rooted in femininity is then analysed, with these feminine depictions found to be rooted in contemporary conceptions of women as carers and provisioners for the household. The cultural value which these sources place on women's work with animals is then examined, with this work presented as inferior to men's. That these sources rarely depict any acknowledgement of women's knowledge or skill in performing this work is a core element of this cultural devaluing. Finally, the ways these sources represent the women who work with animals is examined, focusing on the stereotype of the dairymaid in ballads. These women are depicted explicitly in terms of their womanhood, used as examples of ideal and errant femininity, and their work with animals is presented as necessarily tied to their femininity in these sources. Gender is thus central in representations of women's work with living animals, underpinning depictions of each aspect of their interactions with these animals.

First, the work that women are presented as performing with animals in ballads and instructional guides must be established. Across these sources, this work is depicted consistently and aligns with existing historiographical accounts of women's work with animals in this period. These representations do not thus offer new insight into what women did, but the work that these sources depict must be established before deeper analysis can begin. The most frequently discussed animal-related task was milking cows and dairy work. While other forms of working with animals are not always represented in the primary sources examined here, almost every source mentions to some degree women's work with cows, their responsibilities in milking them and working in the dairy. Generally in ballads this is just a passing reference, with a female character described as a dairymaid, for example in *The Country-Man's Delight* (1670-96), or even more offhandedly described as "going then a Milking" as in *The Wiltshire Wedding* (1700).[64] Indeed, that women perform this task is unquestioned in the sources examined here, and it is represented as the default form of lower-class female work. Evidence of women's other work with animals is much more sparing in ballads from the period, though not altogether unmentioned, and is more commonly found in instructional guides on husbandry. Work with poultry, particularly their care, reproduction and upbringing, is discussed in depth in instructional guides. William Ellis's *The Country Housewife's Family Companion* (1750), significantly explicitly written for women, dedicates seventeen pages to discussion of various poultry and their eggs.[65] As well as cows and poultry, contemporary instructional guides also describe women as working with pigs, with

[64] *The Country-Man's Delight: or, The Happy Wooing. Being the Successful Love of John the Serving-Man, in his Courting of Joan the Dary-Maid* (London: Printed for P. Brooksby at the Golden-Ball, near the Hospital-Gate, in West-Smithfield, 1670-1696); *The Wiltshire Wedding, Between Daniel Do-Well, and Doll the Dairy-Maid. With the Consent of her Old Father Leather-Coat, and her Dear and Tender Mother Plodwell* (London: Printed and sold in Bow-Church Yard, 1700).

[65] William Ellis, *The Country Housewife's Family Companion: or Profitable Directions for Whatever Relates to the Management and Good Oconomy of the Domestick Concerns of a Country Life* (London: Printed for James Hodges, at the Looking-Glass, facing St. Magnus Church, London-Bridge; and B. Collins, bookseller, at Salisbury, 1750), 152-169.

"The best Way to breed and fatten Hogs" listed on the title page of Ellis' book. [66] Its positioning here suggests that this information was particularly interesting and important to his intended audience of female housewives, with this guidance presented as interesting enough to draw readers in. It should, however, be noted that these are representations reflecting a purpose (dependent on each specific source) and do not necessarily reflect or give an account of women's actual working lives. For example, work with sheep is not mentioned in any of the ballads or instructional books discussed here, but some historians, such as Anne Laurence, have noted women's role as sheep shearers.[67] While women's work with animals was thus not necessarily strictly limited to these tasks or even these animals in practice, it is significant that these are the most frequently discussed in both ballads and instructional guides. The work depicted in these sources is more directly related to household provisioning, perhaps explaining why this is the only work discussed in instructional guides on housekeeping, though this does not explain its omission from ballads. That representations of women's work with animals are consistently limited to these tasks and animals across ballads and instructional guides, however, suggests a deeper cultural presentation and perception of this work as appropriate for women and conforming to standards of acceptable femininity.

Both ballads and instructional guides depict a strict gender divide in work with animals. Work involving caring for animals, milking, and collecting eggs is presented as women's work, while working with draught animals to plough fields, management of herds, and the purchase of animals is presented as men's work. This gendered divide in agricultural labour and husbandry is well-established in historiography, but it is the harshness of this

[66] Ibid.
[67] Laurence, *Women in England*, 117.

divide in these representations which is noteworthy.[68] These presentations go deeper than merely assigning these tasks to men or women and directly limit this work to each gender. These sources thus depict this work as not only women's work, but so firmly associated with women that only women could do this work. Though this divide may have been less strict in practice than is suggested in these sources, it is significant that the same tasks are consistently characterised as masculine or feminine across all sources discussed here. For example, the ballad *The Down-Right Country-Man* (1670-96) assumes that all country girls are milk maids, presenting a stereotype as a fact and typical of its genre.[69] *The Boke of Husbandry*'s instructions for wives detail how to care for and ensure the best eggs from various fowl, offering practical advice which Fitzherbert assumes his audience (the family, significantly including housewives) will want to know.[70]. Both of these sources present this work as a norm inherently associated with women.

The strict gendering of work with animals is most explicit in the ballad *The Woman to the Plow and the Man to the Hen-Roost* (1675), in which a husband and wife swap their usual tasks.[71] The entire ballad mocks the idea that men and women could carry out each other's daily work, describing the story as a "merry Iest." Written to entertain, the core humour in this ballad lies in the suggestion that women would be capable of performing men's work (largely ploughing and sowing fields) and that men would be capable of performing women's work of milking cows and working in the dairy, and caring for cows, poultry, and pigs, as well as brewing and baking. Both of their attempts go awry in various ways, whether simply performing these tasks poorly – "not as it should be done, poor man" – or having disastrous

[68] E.g. Fairchilds, *Women in Early Modern Europe*, 130.
[69] *The Down-Right Country-Man; or, The Faithful Dairy-Maid* (London: Printed for Philip Brooksby, at the Golden-Ball, near the Hospital-gate, in West-Smithfield, 1670-1696).
[70] Fitzherbert, *The Boke of Husbandry*, 61-61v.
[71] *The Woman to the Plow and the Man to the Hen-Roost, or, A Fine Way to Cure a Cot-Quean* (S.I.: Printed for J. Wright, J. Clarke, W. Thakeray and T. Passinger, 1675).

consequences such as being attacked by a cow – "Besides she hit him a blost o'th face / Which was scant well in six weeks space" – and ruining the fields to the extent that "He been better have given five pound." It is particularly in working with animals that this man's and woman's attempts fail, with both of them killing animals that they should not be looking after – the wife "broke the Cart and kill'd a Horse" and the husband "let in the Sow and kill'd a Duck." While these escapades were intended to be funny to a contemporary audience, listeners would also have understood the economic impact of all these disasters, particularly the deaths of the animals, heightening the stakes of the tale. Beyond providing food for their own family, animals offered a source of income often separate from the professions of both husband and wife, with the selling of excess dairy produce and eggs to neighbours common for individual households in this period.[72] Indeed, the importance of animals for individuals, particularly for women, is highlighted by the contemporary practice of the parish purchasing a cow for poor women to provide them with subsistence and income.[73] Animals were also essential for all types of farming, with draught animals necessary for ploughing and cows, goats, sheep, poultry, and pigs valuable for both their products and their meat. The value of these animals would have been clear to contemporaries, who would have thus understood this story as both humorous and as demonstrating the real familial provisioning consequences (both in terms of food and finance) of ignoring the gendered divide of labour.

More than just demonstrating contemporary ideals of the gendered divide of work with animals, this ballad highlights just how integral gender was to conceptions of work and human-animal relationships. The idea of a woman working with a horse or a man working with a cow, chickens, geese, or a pig is presented as hilarious, but it also inherently undermined their femininity and masculinity. The wife's feminine subservience is

[72] Valenze, *First Industrial Woman*, 50.
[73] Valenze, *Milk*, 121.

immediately shown to be flouted, with her suggesting "Let's change our work" due to mutual dissatisfaction with the other's competence. Far more dramatic is the demasculinisation of the husband, who is described as a "Cot-quean fool" and whose incompetence is emphasised far more than his wife's. This insult plays on contemporary concerns about the threat of female power, encouraging the audience to laugh at a man who has allowed his wife to take on his role and failed in performing hers. It also emphasises the extent to which the animals with which women worked (in this case cows, ducks, hens, geese, and pigs) were perceived as tied to women by contemporaries. In presenting this work as exclusively women's work, both the animals and the work associated with them are inherently linked to women in the popular imagination, emasculating any man who took on this work. The image of the gendered divide of work with animals presented in this ballad is strict, but the apparent humour drawn from the central moral of the story told here – that there are set forms of work for men and women – suggests that this strict gendered divide was part of commonly held ideas about gender, men, women, and animals. The humour and entertainment of this ballad would only work if these gendered ideals of work were already well-established in society and culture. Work with animals is thus presented as firmly divided along gendered lines in the sources examined here, with women's work with animals depicted as inherently tied to women regardless of who performs it.

Scholarship on women's work as a whole has highlighted a distinction between the work of single women and married or widowed women.[74] This distinction is somewhat reflected in women's work with animals as represented in the sources examined here. However, this distinction is generally only present in the sources to the extent of whether or

[74] E.g. Whittle, "Housewives and Servants in Rural England"; Alexandra Shepard, "Crediting Women in the Early Modern English Economy" *History Workshop Journal* 79 (2015): 5.

not women performed this work as paid servants of an employer or for their own households. *The Wiltshire Wedding* (1700) tells a love story wherein the suitor promises to a dairymaid "I'll plow and sow, and reap and mow / Whilst thou shalt sit and spin" once they are married.[75] It is significant that he tells the dairymaid that when they are married she can "sit and spin" rather than milk cows. Alexandra Shepard's work on early modern married women has revealed a huge variety of tasks and occupations carried out by both married women and widows, including finding that 17% earned a living by making and mending clothes and 9% worked in textile manufacture (aligning with the reference to spinning in *The Wiltshire Wedding*) while 83% of single women were in domestic service.[76] Indeed, Kussmaul describes work as a servant as "a transitional occupation" employing unmarried young adults, and crucially stating that service in husbandry was particularly rigid in its "status and occupation of youths."[77] Employment as a servant, particularly in husbandry, has thus been shown to be limited largely to younger, single women, adding further nuance to simple gendered distinction in work with animals. Crucially, long-term paid employment carrying out the tasks of caring for animals and working in the dairy was generally limited to single women.[78] Married women of lower ranks who could not afford their own animals could also continue to be paid to carry out this work with animals, with wealthier women commonly employing poorer wives on a more casual basis to produce cheese, make candles from beeswax and tend geese.[79]

The distinction arises particularly with those women who could afford their own animals (or who were provided with them by the community, as discussed above) with these

[75] *The Wiltshire Wedding.*
[76] Alexandra Shepard, "The Worth of Married Women in the English Church Courts, c.1550– 1730" in *Married Women and the Law in Premodern Northwest Europe*, ed. Cordelia Beattie and Matthew Frank Stevens (Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 2013), 204.
[77] Kussmaul, *Servants in Husbandry*, 4; Ibid, 31.
[78] Ibid, 34.
[79] Ibid, 135.

women not being paid for their labour. While married women were not usually employed to carry out work with animals, those who had their own animals would have been responsible for performing these tasks for their own household, and for selling any surplus they created.[80] Indeed, Whittle aptly highlights contemporary perception of women's work as servants as "training" for management of their own households, however small.[81] The suitor in *The Wiltshire Wedding* is thus likely not promising that his wife will never have to milk a cow again, but rather offering her a future where she is not employed by someone else to do so. *The Country-Man's Delight* (1670-96) is even more explicit in this promise, with the suitor offering his future wife "my Cow" and "three fat Pigs penn'd up in a Stye."[82] Whittle's broader definition of work beyond simply paid employment is crucial here as wives' work with animals was largely a continuation of the work they performed as single women. This continued work with animals is also highlighted in *The Woman to the Plow and the Man to the Hen-Roost.*[83] As discussed above, this ballad explicitly lists the various tasks performed by husbands and wives, and notably on their own land, with no servants mentioned. Even as a married woman, the wife in this ballad is still responsible for milking the cow and running the household dairy, and for caring for the poultry and pigs. The unpaid subsistence work of housewives is thus acknowledged in this ballad and presented as a norm. That this lines up with historiographical understandings of women's work in this period suggests the stereotypes and association of this work with women depicted in ballads served to reflect contemporary cultural norms in this way.

This work did alter somewhat higher up the social scale, with more middling couples who owned larger farms employing servants performing managerial roles. However, these

[80] Fairchilds, *Women in Early Modern Europe*, 130.
[81] Whittle, "Housewives and Servants in Rural England", 61.
[82] *The Country-Man's Delight.*
[83] *The Woman to the Plow.*

roles were still largely reflective of the animals with which men and women usually worked, with middling status wives responsible for managing the servants who cared for the animals which lower status women worked with. Thus even the most elite of women examined here would thus have been involved in care for animals and the running of the dairy, though in a far less hands-on way, with Amanda Vickery describing genteel women's management of servants as a "full-time job."[84] This responsibility for servants, particularly in their work with animals, is demonstrated in the pamphlet *The Red Cow's Speech, to a Milk-Woman* (1750). While the story told in the pamphlet is fictional and likely a joke, published for "C. Heffer," it is significant that it depicts only a dairymaid and the mistress of the farm ever interacting with the cow, even after this cow speaks.[85] When the dairymaid is alarmed by the talking cow she immediately "run [*sic*] to her Mistress" who then visits the cow herself. Women's interactions with these animals are thus not presented as ceasing entirely when they performed more managerial roles. Even wealthier women are still depicted as interacting with the same animals associated with lower status women's work. Similarly, in all of the guidance for men on husbandry in contemporary instructional books, there is no detailed information on milking or daily care for cows, poultry or pigs, with the focus remaining either on more general care (such as how to lay out their pastures) or on animals such as sheep, as in Best's book, which devotes thirty-one pages to the subject of their keeping and shearing.[86] Ellis' text for women, directed at housewives managing servants, gives detailed and explicit instruction on how to milk cows and care for poultry, however. [87] This highlights a presentation of these animals and work with them as firmly associated with women across

[84] Amanda Vickery, *The Gentleman's Daughter: Women's Lives in Georgian England* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999), 135.
[85] *The Red Cow's Speech, to a Milk-Woman, in St. J-----s's P----k* (London: Printed for C. Heffer, the Royal Exchange, 1750).
[86] Best, *Rural Economy in Yorkshire in 1641*, 1-31.
[87] Ellis, *The Country Housewife's Family Companion*, 169-198; Ibid, 152-169.

social and marriage status, even if these women were not depicted as directly performing the tasks related to their care.

Wives' work with animals is also clear through their role in selling animal products, with Shepard noting that 19% of wives in her study sold goods for their living, specifically listing butter and eggs as particularly common items.[88] Contemporary instructional guides highlight the task of selling surplus goods as a feminine one, as in *The Boke of Husbandry* which specifically details that wives should "go or ride to the markey, to sel butter, chese, mylke, egges, chekyns, capons, hennes, pygges, gese, and all manner or cornes."[89] While this text was published in the sixteenth century, it was reprinted into the seventeenth century and is particularly useful for offering the perspective of a smaller household rather than a large farm as is often the case in later husbandry guides. Generally on larger farms neither the housewife in her managerial role nor the employed servants sold this produce at the market themselves, as was the case on Best's farm, which he describes in detail in his book, where the foreman was sent to buy and sell at the market.[90] The insight into smaller household production provided by *The Boke of Husbandry* is thus invaluable in highlighting women's roles that are otherwise hidden due to the focus on more wealthy households and farms in later texts. While the later instructional guides focus on larger farms, the emphasis on ensuring that any eggs laid, milk collected, and dairy products produced are superior is indicative of a continued representation of the housewife's role in ensuring profit from the animal products she is responsible for, whether in a direct or managerial capacity. This is particularly emphasised in *The Country Housewife's Family Companion*, which repeatedly stresses the monetary advantages of various techniques and animals, for example describing

[88] Shepard, "The Worth of Married Women," 204.
[89] Fitzherbert, *The Boke of Husbandry*, 62v.
[90] Best, *Rural Economy in Yorkshire in 1641*, 105.

turkeys as "the most profitable Sort" of fowl.[91] Indeed, in de Vries' argument for an industrious revolution he highlights housewives' continued household production and role in market-selling throughout the period 1600-1750, mapping a shift to reliance on larger scale consumer production from the end of the eighteenth century.[92] As discussed above, recent scholarship has shown that women's work with animals did not cease after marriage, and traditional historiographical prioritisation of paid employment in examinations of women's work has suggested a harsher distinction than is represented in the sources examined here. Whether single, married, or widowed, women are depicted as responsible for the same animals and their care. The chief distinction was between poorer and wealthier women, with poorer wives still employed casually for this work and wealthier wives either performing these tasks unpaid themselves or responsible for the management and instruction of servants. Despite this distinction, across both class and marital status women worked in some capacity with the same animals (cows, poultry, and pigs) and were responsible for their care and produce. That the work represented in these sources reflects scholarship on women's lived experience is significant. It suggests that this incidental detail of women's work is depicted in a way which contemporaries would expect to see in their daily lives and is not a representation of extreme or unusual behaviour. This further highlights the quotidian nature of this work in these representations and the cultural perception this expresses of this work as a norm for women in this period. That the work women are depicted as performing remains consistent across marital and social status further highlights the consistency of the association of this work with women.

[91] Ellis, *The Country Housewife's Family Companion*, 160.
[92] De Vries, "The Industrial Revolution," 262.

In examining what was presented as feminine about women's work with animals in ballads and instructional guides, a common core characteristic becomes clear – it was caring work involving individual animals. This work reflects contemporary perceptions of women as inherently caring (in a practical sense in terms of their work with animals) and maternal. Conduct literature described women as "usually taxed with an excess in" compassion, and conceptions of ideal femininity frequently centred around motherhood.[93] This "excessive" compassion was perceived as resulting in women's natural prowess at and patience with caring and provisioning work. In practice, this meant that women dominated childcare and midwifery throughout this period, with Shepard finding 20% of wives employed in these areas. Even outside of paid work, women were responsible for childcare and provisioning within their households. Women were also responsible for nursing the sick, and were integral to the dying process, carrying out daily deathbed care.[94] This contemporary perception of feminine compassion and natural caring ability is also reflected in women's work with animals, where their role is centred around daily care and nursing. *The Country Housewife's Family Companion* goes into detail about day-to-day care and nursing for animals, for example describing "Poultry and their Eggs" as "immediately under the Care and Management of our Country Housewife" and dedicating forty-six pages to guidance on care for poultry and cows.[95] In work with animals this care is presented as practical, unemotional and centred around provisioning for the family. That a significant section of Ellis' text is devoted to this work highlights its perception in these sources as the duty of women. Notably these instructions are focused on how to achieve profit from animals, boasting, for example, "The best Method of making butter and Cheese," rather than offering an introduction to these

[93] Richard Allestree, *The Ladies Calling in Two Parts* (Oxford: At the theatre in Oxford, 1673), 49.
[94] Shepard, "The Worth of Married Women," 204; Clark, *Working Life of Women*, 251; Elizabeth A. Hallam, "Turning the Hourglass: Gender Relations at the Deathbed in Early Modern Canterbury," *Mortality* 1, no. 1 (1996): 69.
[95] Ellis, *The Country Housewife's Family Companion*,152; Ibid, 152-198.

tasks.[96] As McRae has noted, this profit-focused style is typical of instructional guides by this period.[97] This suggests an assumption that the reader already knows how to collect eggs and milk cows, highlighting the practical, experience-based knowledge which women were expected to have before turning to such a guide. This caring work is also represented as paralleling the maternal in instructional guides, for example *The Boke of Husbandry* groups together the feminine tasks: "milke thy kye, fede thy calves, lye up thy mylke, take upp thy children, and araye theym," explicitly depicting a connection between care for animals and maternal care for children.[98] That women's work caring for their children is paired with their work caring for animals in this way is significant. Beyond this work's association with women because women perform it, this highlights an underlying perception of the natural feminine suitability of women for these tasks. It was this suitability which results in its presentation not just as the work of women, but as the duty of women. Moreover, the guidance on nursing and remedies for animals in instructional guides highlights the proximity and physicality of women's work with animals, for example describing "How to cure a Cow that by straining has her Bearing come out behind."[99] This again reflects the messy, physical work expected of women in their other caring roles, with raising children, nursing the sick and dying, and assisting in childbirth all involving similarly messy, close, and physical tasks. Representations of women's work caring for animals do not separate this work from women's other household duties, notably their work caring for children and nursing the sick. All of this work is rooted in these sources in contemporary perceptions of women's natural aptitude for more caring (with animals in a practical sense) work.

[96] Ibid.
[97] McRae, *God Speed the Plough*, 160.
[98] Fitzherbert, *The Boke of Husbandry*, 61.
[99] Ellis, *The Country Housewife's Family Companion*, 360.

This is in complete contrast to men's work with animals which, as laid out by Kussmaul, chiefly involved "the draught animals, cattle, and sheep" – all larger groups of animals or those directly related to men's work in ploughing fields.[100] This work is depicted as far more impersonal and not framed as caring work. Indeed, guidance for men focuses entirely on an impersonal managerial role, detailing how to set up pastures and the value of owning various animals. For example, pigs are described as "of a very considerable advantage to the Husbandman, the Flesh being a principal support to his Family," with texts for men detailing the layout of pig styes but providing no information on their daily care.[101] Cows are a particularly useful animal for demonstrating the perceived femininity of caring work. Men are presented as responsible for their overall management and for driving them as a herd, while women are depicted as interacting with each cow individually in milking them and, significantly, as responsible for an individual cow's welfare. Ellis details numerous ailments and cures for cows in his text and explicitly labels their care as women's work, stating "the Management of them, generally belongs to and comes under the Woman's Province."[102] It is noteworthy that here the word care is absent, though it was used along with management to describe women's responsibilities to poultry. This use of management is perhaps because the book is directed at middling housewives who would have a more detached role and generally assumes that the audience has servants, particularly dairymaids. To this end, Ellis gives explicit instructions on finding good servants, for example describing the terrible consequences of "keeping a lazy sluttish Dairy-maid."[103] Although poorer housewives on smaller farms or who owned only enough animals to sustain their own family could also find valuable instruction in this book, the intended audience was wealthier middling women who owned larger farms and were responsible for their management and the

[100] Kussmaul, *Servants in Husbandry,* 34.
[101] J. W., *Systema Agriculturae*, 172.
[102] Ellis, *The Country Housewife's Family Companion*, 171-198; Ibid, 171.
[103] Ibid, 313.

instruction of servants rather than those who would be milking the cows themselves. Despite this omission of the verb "care" in describing housewives' responsibilities for cows, it is significant that instruction on this care is still prevalent in this text, suggesting that even those responsible for managing servants were expected to know how to care for these animals, if only to be able to instruct their servants. This caring work for cows was perceived as so inherently related to women and femininity that Worlidge does not even discuss it, stating "As for their breeding, rearing, breaking, curing of their Diseases, and other ordering of them, and of Milk, Butter, Cheese, &c, I refer you to such Authors that do more largely handle that Subject than this place admit of."[104] He lists no other authors or texts, but the implication here seems to be that he is referring the reader to texts specifically written for women or books about dairying and that he does not view his text, written for the household, as an appropriate or necessary venue for such discussion. Ellis explicitly comments on this general absence of cows in other texts, stating "many of them have slipt the Notice of most Authors," and praises them as "necessary," taking it upon himself to note their worth "I am an Owner of Cows, and find them pay me well."[105]

Men's far more distant relationship with cows is also clear in ballads. For example, in *The Country-Man's Delight* the suitor mentions owning a cow, but only to demonstrate his wealth, also listing "my House and Rents," and with the implication that this piece of property would be of particular interest to his future wife.[106] Similarly, in *The Country-Mans Lamentation for the Death of his Cow* (1674-83) brief mention is made of the amount of milk the cow produced and the repeated refrain laments that the cow "will give me / no more milk now," but as with everything else in the ballad, this is only referred to in relation to how

[104] J. W., *Systema Agriculturae*, 172.
[105] Ellis, *The Country Housewife's Family Companion*, 171.
[106] *The Country-Man's Delight.*

much money the cow was earning him, just as her calves "fetcht me a pound."[107] There is nothing in this ballad to suggest that this country man ever personally cared for or milked his cow. Any mention of ways the cow can offer profit is framed as someone being hired to get the resource from the cow – "in comes the Tanner," "in comes the Tallow-chandler," "in comes the Tripe-woman." Indeed, no care work is mentioned at all in this ballad – perhaps logical since the cow in question is now dead, but also indicative of his lack of care-related interaction with his cow. The ballad initially mocks this man for his over-emotional reaction to his cow's death (in this case an emotional form of caring absent even in depictions of women's work), but then quickly clarifies that his only real concern is the loss of potential profit, with his first regret being that he "had better have kept her, / till fatter she had been." Caring for his cow, whether emotionally or physically, is thus never presented as a realistic possibility for a man in this ballad. Women's work with animals was thus presented as specifically tied to contemporary conceptions of feminine practical care and duty. The perceived femininity of caring was enacted in many tasks performed by women, from childrearing to nursing and deathbed care. The feminine roots of caring work are clearly seen in representations of women's work with animals in these sources, with women depicted as responsible for both the daily care and the nursing of the animals they worked with.

With women's work with animals presented as firmly associated with women and tied to conceptions of femininity, its cultural worth as represented in these sources and whether this was affected by these gendered associations must be examined. Women's work is presented as having monetary value in ballads and instructional guides, for example *Systema Agriculturae* describes cows as "worthy Beasts" and pigs as "of a very considerable

[107] *The Country-Mans Lamentation for the Death of his Cow* (London: Printed for C. Passinger, at the seven stars in the new buildings on London-bridge, 1674-1683).

advantage" in an economic sense.[108] Indeed the profit which could be gained from the animals that women cared for (as with all animals in these texts) was often emphasised in instructional guides. However, the examination of value here addresses cultural value – attitudes to its importance and status – rather than monetary value. This definition of value as status rather than income or profit is particularly crucial when examining women's work, affording the same opportunity for analysis to both paid labour and unpaid subsistence work. There is extensive historiography examining women's wages in this period, particularly wages for casual labour. Study of women's wages is important, particularly in demonstrating a practical outcome of contemporary cultural devaluing of women's work, with women generally paid half to two-thirds of what men were paid for their labour.[109] However, focus only on the monetary value of work both limits the women whose work is examined, with all subsistence labour and its cultural value ignored, and diminishes the contributions of housewives. Even in his emphasis on wives' household production, de Vries diminishes this contribution by recentring his assessment of the worth of women's work around wages, stressing that women's wages were only 25% of household income.[110] Whittle's crucial redefinition of work, highlighting the subsistence tasks of wives as work, is again central here. Indeed, examining the cultural value of work, rather than defining work merely in terms of monetary gain, is far closer to early modern definitions of work as "opposition to leisure or idleness". [111]

Women's work with animals is presented as less culturally valued than men's in these sources and perceived as inferior by its association with women. Women's labour in early modern ballads and instructional guides was represented as lesser not because it was

[108] J. W., *Systema Agriculturae*, 171; Ibid, 172.
[109] Laurence, *Women in England*, 118.
[110] Jan de Vries, *The Industrious Revolution: Consumer Behaviour and the Household Economy, 1650 to the Present* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), 107.
[111] Whittle, "A Critique of Approaches to 'Domestic Work'," 35.

perceived as merely "chores" rather than work. Women's work was undervalued precisely because it was women's work. Again, *The Woman to the Plow and the Man to the Hen-Roost* is a clear example of this.[112] The wife's tasks are positioned as work in exactly the same way that the husband's tasks are, yet even in this source, which above all others demonstrates an appreciation for the importance and difficulty of women's work, women's tasks are presented as lesser due to their association with women. The husband is not mocked for his inability to milk a cow because it is a task not worth doing or one that does not contribute economically. Indeed, the ballad highlights the economic importance of both men's and women's work with animals, with the husband described as "grieved at his heart" and "His eyes did with salt water run" over the aftermath of economic the destruction they each caused. He is mocked because he is attempting to carry out women's work and failing, so much so that "all his Neighbours did him scoff." The inversion of the natural order is the humour in this ballad, and the very fact that a husband is attempting this work is intended to make the audience laugh. Public mockery of men who were aligned with or placed beneath women was common in this period. This is particularly clearly seen in the practice of charivaris, which most commonly took place to belittle a man who had been beaten or in some way "dominated" by his wife.[113] Either the man himself or a neighbour acting as substitute was paraded through the town and ridiculed. Often the punishment similarly reflected an inversion of norms, for example involving crossdressing or riding backwards on a mount.[114] Significantly, the wife in this ballad is not mocked for carrying out her husband's work in the same way that the husband is mocked. The audience is encouraged to laugh at the incompetence of both husband and wife, but the entire ballad is a criticism of the husband's foolishness and ends with the didactic warning: "Take heed of this you husband-men, / Let Wives alone to grope

[112] *The Woman to the Plow.*
[113] Martin Ingram, 'Ridings, Rough Music and the "Reform of Popular Culture" in Early Modern England', *Past and Present* 105 (1984): 86.
[114] Ibid.

the Hen, / And meddle you with the Horse and Ox / And keep your Lambs safe from the Fox, / So shall you live Contented lives, / And take sweet pleasure in your Wives." These final lines firmly establish the accepted norms which the couple in this ballad flout. In highlighting that this is how to live "Contented lives" the ballad presents these norms of work and behaviour not only as what is right but what is best.

More nuanced undervaluing of women's labour is seen in ballads depicting love stories. For example, in *The Wiltshire Wedding* once the dairymaid has agreed to the proposal she abandons her work entirely – "Now there we left the Milk-pail, / And to her Mother went."[115] As discussed above, this depicts a stereotype reflected in Kussmaul's work that women were rarely employed as servants once they married, instead expected to establish their own household.[116] However, more than this, there is a clear symbolic devaluing of her employed labour. The woman depicted in this ballad is employed to milk these cows, yet the prospect of marriage offers so great an opportunity to her that she would immediately abandon her employment and any contract (verbal or written) she had with her employer. This suggests a privileging of the role of housewife and of the unpaid work that role entails over paid employment for another. While housewives' work with animals is thus culturally undervalued, it is still privileged over their paid employment as servants.

Representation of women's work as beneath men and less significant than men's work is also reflected in instructional guides. Those written for men understandably do not address women's work at all, but even those written for the family largely assign discussion of women's work to other authors or make only brief mention of it. This is most prominent in *The Mystery of Husbandry* which focuses entirely on farm management and hunting, with no reference whatsoever to the work done with animals once their pastures have been

[115] *The Wiltshire Wedding.*
[116] Kussmaul, *Servants in Husbandry*.

established, let alone any reference to the work of women.[117] However, even *The Boke of Husbandry*, which does address women's work, still clearly represents it as inferior to men's work. The book contains 180 pages of advice, but discusses women's work on only seven of those 180 pages, concluding this section with "I leve the wyves, to use theyr occupations at theyr owne discreation."[118] While women's work is thus addressed more here than in *The Mystery of Husbandry*, there is still a clear attitude of women's work as beneath the male author and beneath in-depth discussion in texts for the family. This could reflect an assumption that women's knowledge was learned through experience and passed down, but this does not entirely account for the difference. Much of men's work would similarly have been learnt by experience in this period, yet it is addressed and discussed in serious depth in these guides. Across these sources, the cultural value of women's work is consistently presented as lesser. Women's work is perceived as inferior due to its association with women, resulting in the explicit mocking of men for engaging in feminine tasks.

Tied to the presentation of the value of women's work with animals is the representation of women's skill in this work. The women performing work with animals in these sources are largely represented as broadly competent, though in instructional guides (as can be assumed from the genre) as in need of advice to achieve the best results. However, women's skill is almost never explicitly acknowledged in these sources. With one notable exception, the most acknowledgement that women's skill receives in these sources is the husband's failure to perform his wife's tasks in *The Woman to the Plow and the Man to the Hen-Roost*.[119] However, this failure is presented as due to the unnatural gender swapping of these tasks rather than a suggestion that this work takes great skill which the husband lacks. While both husband and wife make many mistakes in carrying out each other's tasks, this is

[117] Meager, *The Mystery of Husbandry*.
[118] Fitzherbert, *The Boke of Husbandry*, 63v.
[119] *The Woman to the Plow*.

framed more as the natural consequence of men attempting to do women's work and women attempting to do men's rather than highlighting the skill necessary to complete this work.

The Country Housewife's Family Companion is the only source directed explicitly at women and the only one which explicitly acknowledges the skill of the women carrying out this work. It is significant that none of the other sources examined here acknowledge the skill of women's work with animals in any substantial way, depicting a cultural perception of this work as less worthy and less skilled. Ellis' explicit acknowledgement of this skill is thus rare and noteworthy. Ellis draws from others' knowledge to compile a comprehensive guide to housewives, usually offering multiple methods of carrying out a task and suggesting which are the best. This framing of his instruction suggests an assumption of the pre-existing skill and experience of the reader, which his guidance builds on. A core source of his information is female servants within his own household, and he repeatedly references them as advising him and telling him their methods. Indeed, Ellis occasionally describes his female servants' advice as the best method of completing the task. For example, when explaining how to caponise cocks, Ellis states "This Way of caponizing a Cock, I have had done at my House for my Information, by a Woman deemed to be one of our best Capon Cutters."[120] He often acknowledges his own lack of skill or knowledge in the area about which he is writing, stating in this case "it would have been a difficult Matter for me to give a Description of it" without the assistance of his female servant. This demonstrates his deference to the skill of women, acknowledging their superior knowledge and admitting his own ignorance of the work, which many male authors fail to do even in instructions on women's tasks. Ellis' description of caponising cocks as a "Science" is particularly noteworthy as an explicit lauding of the skills of women in their work with animals.

[120] Ellis, *The Country Housewife's Family Companion*, 158.

It is, however, important to note that Ellis far more commonly refers to men's methods and skill in various instruction, for example deferring to "Sir Kenelm Digby," "Mr. Bradley," and "Dr. Godfrey" for guidance.[121] Indeed, where men have written on a subject, Ellis generally cites them rather than referring to the practices of his female servants. However, this does not diminish his praise of women's skills. Even when citing men's texts, it is clear that Ellis recognises the skill involved in the tasks which he instructs on.[122] Moreover, that he acknowledges women's own skill and knowledge outright at all is significant, even if this acknowledgement is in the minority. The other instructional guides and ballads examined here do not praise women's skills in their work with animals, suggesting a general cultural under-valuing of the skill involved. *The Country Housewife's Family Companion* is thus significant and striking in its lauding of the skill of women's work. Women's work with animals is overall consistently culturally undervalued in comparison to men's work in these sources. Across the period the value and skill of women's work is largely dismissed and unacknowledged in ballads and instructional guides, with men's work and skill privileged. Explicitly in its association with women, the cultural value of this work is diminished in these depictions.

The representation of the women who perform this work with animals in ballads requires further examination. Particularly significant, and the focus here, is the stereotypes presented around the dairymaid. Representations of the dairymaid are the most expansive and consistent representation of the women who work with animals in these sources, especially in ballads. Dairymaids are a key character in ballads from this period, used to depict a stereotype of the vulnerable woman, presented as chaste and pure but simultaneously

[121] Ibid, 156; Ibid, 167; Ibid, 168.
[122] E.g. Ibid, 168.

inherently corruptible. In using the dairymaid in this way, these sources do place some cultural value on women who work with animals. However, this value is in their ease of use as a stereotype, not in the women themselves or in the work they performed. While historiography notes contemporary praise of dairymaids specifically for their work, this praise is not present in the ballads and instructional guides examined here.[123] That the women chosen by ballad writers to embody this trope were dairymaids is significant and these representations and stereotypes cannot be separated from these women's work with animals.

Predicated on the single status of those women employed as dairymaids, this trope figures young dairymaids as a microcosm of contemporary ideals and concerns around women's virtue. This trope was neither originated nor ended in this period, rather a continuation of the expression of societal conceptions of femininity and sexuality discussed in the introduction. This depiction of dairymaids' purity is clear in *The Down-Right Country-Man*, which equates country girls with dairymaids and praises their physical presence – "See how the Rose and Lilly fair, / upon their Cheeks do grow, / Mind how their breath perfume the ayr, / wherever they do go: / And what they touch imediately, / fresh Odours on them breed, / They patterns are of constancy" – as well as their general demeanour – "how sweetly she doth sing, / She never knits an angry Brow, / but welcomes in the Spring" – and finally describing them as "fair and Chaste."[124] This representation of dairymaids as beautiful and virtuous is intended to emphasise criticism of single women living in cities, who the ballad presents as immoral. The ballad states that a London woman "every minute lends a Kiss," stating "this is a Whore indeed." These city women are not presented as having been corrupted, as a dairymaid may be, but as being inherently less moral than country girls.

[123] E.g. Fletcher, *Gender, Sex and Subordination*, 246; Valenze, "The Art of Women", 147.
[124] *The Down-Right Country-Man*.

That dairymaids are the chosen contrast is significant. This is part of a wider cultural representation of the purity of dairymaids, who were traditionally celebrated at May Day.[125] Though by the beginning of the eighteenth century this celebration was no longer common, the spirit of the celebration of dairymaid is still clear in contemporary ballads. For example, the 1683 ballad *Praise of the Dairy-Maid* lauds all the dairy products produced by dairymaids, describing cheese as "Britains chief Meat" and hailing "the Virtues of Milk."[126] This ballad traces dairying back to Eve, adorning dairymaids with a religious reverence, but crucially also highlighting their corruptibility – a key theme of this didactic ballad. While dairymaids themselves are still presented as pure and honest, there is a much stronger sense in this ballad that they are vulnerable to the sexual corruption of men. This is particularly overt in the verse describing a milkmaid's "fall," which is used as an example for the other dairymaids to "take warning." The purity of dairymaids within ballads is inherently fragile and corruptible, reflecting contemporary perceptions of femininity as a whole as pure yet easily corrupted. Dairymaids are thus figured as the personification of these conceptions of femininity.

It is, however, still significant that dairymaids are figured as purer and more feminine than other women. This is likely partially reflective of contemporary ideals around rural communities and popular concern about women in urban areas, where women were perceived to be far more vulnerable to corruption. However, that dairymaids specifically are so celebrated in these ballads, rather than countrywomen in general, suggests there are further factors. Indeed, work in the dairy itself was hailed as a feminine ideal in this period.[127] Perceptions of dairymaids' purity were partially rooted in the strict cleanliness of the dairy

[125] Valenze, *Milk*, 134-135.
[126] *Praise of the Dairy-Maid, with a Lick at the Cream-Pot, or Fading Rose* (London: Printed for the use of the Milk-Maids on May-day for ever, 1683).
[127] Amanda Herbert, *Female Alliances: Gender, Identity, and Friendship in Early Modern Britain* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2014), 99.

itself. Both the dairy and the dairymaid's work in it were expected to be clean in this period to ensure the safe consumption of the food produced there.[128] In this stereotype of the pure and chaste dairymaid this literal, physical cleanliness is extended into a metaphorical sexual purity. Morever, the animals with which these women worked cannot be ignored in examining this trope. Cows were strongly associated with women due to women's constant intimate work with them. But more than this, cows were female themselves and were associated directly with fertility, reproduction, and milk, all of which were core elements of the feminine ideal in this period, with women's milk described as "the greatest Nourisher of all liquid things whereon we feed."[129] Dairymaids' constant proximity to and work with these animals thus enhanced associations with fertility and nourishment, influencing representations of the dairymaid as the purest of women. However, much like Eve, the scale of this purity makes corruption that much more of a threat, with dairymaids having further to fall than other women. The city women depicted in *The Down-Right Country-Man* are presented as immoral and loose with multiple men, but typical, while the dairymaid's fall described in *Praise of the Dairy-Maid* entails one illicit affair with one man, yet is just as, if not more, damaging to her reputation. The representation of dairymaids in these sources is thus as figures which encapsulate contemporary ideals and concerns around women's purity and corruption. They are presented as purer and thus more fragile than other women, and in this way are used as a prism to reflect these conceptions of women. Dairymaids' work with animals is significant in this representation, strengthening their ties to feminine conceptions of maternal nourishment and provisioning as well as to sex and fertility.

[128] Valenze, "The Art of Women", 160.
[129] J. W., *Systema Agriculturae*, 173.

Representations of women's work with animals in instructional guides and ballads thus give rise to many findings. Whittle's approach to work as a far broader category than merely paid employment has been adopted here as an essential framework for examining and understanding early modern women's lives and work. Women's labour included an array of unpaid (or subsistence) tasks, and this is particularly true of housewives' work with animals. Due in part to a historiographical lack of focus on these subsistence tasks, as well as the privileging of other areas of labour, particularly arable agriculture and casual employment, there has not been sufficient examination of women's work with animals in scholarship.

Ballads and instructional guides present an image of a strict gender division of work with animals. Women are represented as largely working with cows, poultry, and pigs, and were responsible for their daily care and nursing, milking and running the dairy, and collection of eggs. This gendered depiction of work largely remained consistent across marital status and whether paid or unpaid, though there was a definite shift into representations of more managerial roles for middling women running their own households, while poorer women continued to be depicted working in a much more hands-on capacity with animals. It is, however, significant that even in this managerial role, women were still presented as responsible for the same tasks with the same animals. This work is presented as tied to the feminine by both ballads and instructional guides due to its revolving around care. Contemporary perception of women as responsible for care and provisioning fed into many aspects of women's daily lives, including their work with animals. The perceived feminine associations of this work as well as its direct association with women in these sources is responsible for the representation of the cultural valuing women's work with animals as inferior. While this work is still represented as important, it is simultaneously perceived as beneath men and lesser due to its ties to women. This cultural undervaluing is also reflected in a general lack of acknowledgement of the skills and knowledge of women working with

animals. The notable exception is Ellis' *The Country Housewife's Family Companion*, which explicitly recognises women's ability within this area. Finally, the representation of women who work with animals in these sources is most overt in examination of dairymaids, who receive most expansive representation. They are presented as an encapsulation of contemporary conceptions of women and femininity, figured as both pure and chaste and vulnerable and easily corrupted. In choosing dairymaids to represent this stereotype, there is some sense of the cultural valuing of these women. However, this does not extend to a valuing of their work in the sources examined. Dairymaids' work with animals cannot be ignored in understanding this representation, with cows an inherently female animal, linked with reproduction, and maternal milk being central to dairymaids' work with the animal.

These sources thus present women's work with living animals as firmly gendered. Women's gender is depicted as dictating which animals they worked with, what work they performed and how that work was perceived and represented. The association of women with this work inherently tied this work to women and womanhood in the representations examined here and directly impacted how this work was represented in these sources. This examination moves beyond existing scholarship, establishing not just what work women are depicted as performing, but how and why that work was gendered.

Food and Medicine

This chapter explores representations of women's interactions with animals as a food or ingredient, examining the preparation of both food and medicine to establish the contemporary gendered perception of women and animals in this form of interaction. In examining preparation, it is important to note that this chapter does not necessarily address the food or medicine lower and middling women consumed themselves. In its examination of women's work with animals this chapter is a continuation of the previous one. However, a distinction is drawn between work with the living and with the deceased animal as both the work and the relationship were altered with the ending of the animal's life. It is noteworthy that none of the sources examined here represent women doing any butchering of animals; only as caring for them in their life and then preparing them for consumption after their death. This is not to say that no women ever butchered any animals in this period, but that this work was not represented in the sources examined here. This break between the care of living animals and the preparation of animals' bodies is a further reason for the chapter split in examination of women's work with animals. The interactions that women were depicted as having with animals as meat are thus different from those they were depicted as having with living animals. Significantly, the gendered connotations and expectations were shifted by the death of the animal. While the work of food and medicine preparation was not exclusively performed by women in this period, there was significant association between this work and women as presented in these sources, and within the household this work tended to fall under housewifely duties. However, the animals' parts and products and the food and medicine produced are not presented as feminine in the way that the living animals women worked with were.

This chapter uses recipe and guidance books on both food and medicine production to examine women's interactions with animals as an ingredient. The sources examined here provide written instruction on that which was commonly passed down through experience and oral teaching, offering a representation of quotidian interactions with animals as ingredient. These texts fall under a broader category of the popular genre of instructional guides, with countless books and pamphlets printed across this period to impart knowledge both basic and complex. Using a variety of search terms including "cookery," "medicine," "physic," "housewife," and "meat," fifty such texts have been located through the Early English Books Online database. Almost all search terms used were not related to any gender to avoid skewing results to only reflect those works directed at women. The majority of these texts are aimed explicitly at women (twenty-nine) or at the family or no particular gender (seventeen), with only four examples found of texts aimed explicitly at men. While this project is focused on women of lower and middling status, these texts are generally aimed at people of middling status and above. Indeed, many of those explicitly directed towards women refer to ladies or gentlewomen in their titles, such as *A True Gentlewomans Delight*, *A Delightfull Daily Exercise for Ladies and Gentlewomen*, and *The Ladies Companion*.[130] Many texts are also explicitly directed towards housewives, such as *The Country Housewife's Family Companion* and *The Good Houswife made a Doctor*, suggesting a more middling-

[130] Elizabeth Grey, Countess of Kent, *A True Gentlewomans Delight wherein is Contained all Manner of Cookery: together with [brace] preserving, conserving, drying, and candying, very necessary for all ladies and gentlewomen* (London: Printed by A.M. for Margaret Shears, 1671); John Murrell, *A Delightfull Daily Exercise for Ladies and Gentlewomen Whereby is set foorth the secrete misteries of the purest preseruings in glasses and other confrictionaries, as making of breads, pastes, preserues, suckets, marmalates, tartstuffes, rough candies, with many other things neuer before in print. Whereto is added a booke of cookery. By Iohn Murrell professor thereof* (London: Printed by Augustine Mathewes for Tho. Devve, and are to be sold at his shoppe in St. Dunstons Church-yard in Fleete-street, 1621); *The Ladies companion, or, A table furnished with sundry sorts of pies and tarts, gracefull at a feast, with many excellent receipts for preserving, conserving, and candying of all manner of fruits, with the making of marchpain, marmalet, and quindenis. By persons of quality whose names are mentioned* (London: Printed by W. Bentley, and are to be sold by W. Shears, at the sign of the Bible, in S. Pauls Church yard., 1653).

status intended audience.[131] The poorer women discussed in this project would have been unlikely to have been able to own or read texts as such these, though more middling women were an audience of these recipe books.[132] This does not make these texts obsolete for examining these women's interactions with animals as ingredient, however. While the specific recipes may have been unlikely to be used by women with little wealth in this period, the methods of preparing food (such as cutting meat or boiling milk) are still relevant. This chapter focuses on the representation of the action of preparing food and medicine, rather than consumption and the rituals around this. It is the preparation of animals as an ingredient in food and medicine that is thus significant and, while recipes would have been less extravagant in poorer homes, many of the basics would have been consistent. While what accompanied the meat may be subject to change, the method of carving of a chicken, for example, does not differ based on rank. Indeed, it is significant that the food consumed by lower status people is not represented in these sources. There would likely be no market for a recipe book on this subject, and methods of preparing this food or medicine would have been passed on through experience. This dismissal of lower status people's food is thus reflective far more of cultural attitudes to class than to gender.

This chapter draws on a wide-ranging scholarship, including examinations of food, medicine, and women's work as well as more conceptual studies of relationships between humanity and animals as objects of consumption. Joan Thirsk's work on food is essential in understanding eating habits across the spectrum of English society in this period, encompassing both wealth and regional difference.[133] Thirsk also highlights the limits of

[131] Ellis, *The Country Housewife's Family Companion*; Thomas Tryon, *The Good Houswife made a Doctor, or, Health's choice and sure friend being a plain way of nature's own prescribing to prevent [and] cure most diseases incident to men, women, and children, by diet and kitchin-physick only.* (London: printed and sold by Andrew Sowle, in the Holloway-Lane, near Shoreditch, 1685).
[132] Thirsk, *Food in Early Modern England*, 148.
[133] Thirsk, *Food in Early Modern England*.

recipe books as sources for examining the eating habits of the poorer sections of society, turning to guidebooks and other texts for some insight, though stressing the lack of labouring voices in any of these sources. Regional difference should not be ignored or smoothed out and could be stark even in neighbouring parts of the country, as demonstrated by Mark Dawson in his work on oatcakes.[134] While there is no specific discussion of regional variations in food consumption here, this is an important context, and it must not be assumed that the specific animals and animal products represented in these sources were used consistently across the country or across the period. Karen Raber's work on meat as performance highlights a question which underpins much of the represented interactions between women and animals in this chapter.[135] Raber highlights the "transmutation" of cooking in the early modern period and asks when "does an animal become meat: when slaughtered, when divided by the butcher, when cooked, when eaten?"[136] This divide between an animal's body and meat, between a creature and a meal, is not always harshly drawn in the recipes examined here. The ways that this blurring of living creature and ingredient affect and are affected by gender in these representations thus becomes a core theme of this chapter. Scholarship examining women's production of food and medicine is also vital here and frequently stresses the interconnectedness of the two areas. Stobart discusses how both attend to "bodily needs" and gives the examples of "sugar candy and rose water" as products defined as both a food and a medicine.[137] Stobart highlights the importance of diet and health in this period, discussing the perception of "kitchen physic" and its increasing hold in contemporary thought as the kitchen became more firmly feminine.[138]

[134] Mark Dawson, "Oats and Oatcakes: Farming and Diet in the North Midlands in the Post-Medieval Period" in *Farmers, Consumers, Innovators: The World of Joan Thirsk* ed. Richard Jones & Christopher Dyer, 125-138 (Hatfield: University of Hertfordshire Press, 2016).
[135] Raber, "Animals at the Table".
[136] Ibid, 113; Ibid, 109.
[137] Stobart, *Household Medicine in Seventeenth-Century England*, 87.
[138] Ibid, 104.

There is no distinction made between animals or animal products used in food or medicinal recipes and this overlap of the two areas runs throughout this chapter. There is much historiography focused on elite women's personal and charitable medicine production, such as Jane Whittle and Elizabeth Griffiths' work on Alice Le Strange and Elaine Leong's work on Elizabeth Freke.[139] Anne Stobart's work focuses on wealthier women, discussing in depth the social and economic value of medicinal recipes.[140] Similarly Linda Pollock's work on Lady Grace Mildmay highlights the importance elite women placed on their charitable work in providing medicine for the poor as well as the high level of skill required, particularly drawing attention to Mildmay's rigour and organisation in this work.[141] Pollock also highlights the deep roots of this work and the religious conceptions of charity central to it, with women making medicine for their families and communities long before the period examined in this thesis. This scholarship establishes women's work in medicine production and puts it in a specifically feminine context. While the focus is on elite women, those of lesser status are still acknowledged and their own medicine production or their use of their wealthier neighbours' charity is touched upon.

In addressing the influence of gender on representations of women's interactions with animals as food or medicine, this chapter examines several core areas. First, the impact of status on the work women did in food and medicine production. Status particularly impacted the type and quantity of animals and their products available to women and is a significant element in attempting to access representations of lower and middling status women in recipe books. Secondly, the gendering of the work of food and medicine production, with this work

[139] Whittle and Griffiths, *Consumption and Gender in the Early Seventeenth-Century Household*; Elaine Leong, "'Herbals She Persueth': Reading Medicine in Early Modern England," *Renaissance Studies* 28, no. 4 (September 2014).
[140] Stobart, *Household Medicine in Seventeenth-Century England*, 30.
[141] Linda Pollock, *With Faith and Physic: The Life of a Tudor Gentlewoman* (London: Collins & Brown, 1993), 103.

associated with women (though not exclusively) in this period. Next, the impact of gender on the specific animals with which women could work is addressed, finding that, unlike in work with living animals, women are not represented as limited to working with specific animals as an ingredient in these sources. The chapter will then go on to examine whether the end result of women's work – the food or the medicine – is itself gendered by their involvement, finding that this is not the case, and the results of the recipes are represented gender neutrally in these recipes, despite scholarship on the gendering of certain foods. Next the language in the recipes will be examined, finding animals are firmly objectified and placed beneath humanity, but no suggestion that this presentation is affected by gender. Finally, the representation of the skill of the women making these sources is examined. While recipes do not overtly state the skill of women, in their omission of certain instruction and information they make clear a level of assumed prior knowledge and skill in both food and medicine production, particularly in the handling of animal parts and products. This results in a depiction of women as highly skilled in this area of work, even when learning new recipes. Gender is thus presented as playing an interesting role in women's interactions with animals as an ingredient in food and medicine. While the work of food and medicine production was associated with women, the interaction with the animal itself as depicted in these sources (in terms of which animals were used and how they were presented) was not shown as affected by gender. Even in implicitly acknowledging women's skill in food and medicine production, these sources do not represent the gender of the reader (or actor, if a wealthier reader was assumed to be instructing her servants) as impacting this skill.

While gender is the focus of this project, status had a particularly significant impact on the variation in the availability and complexity of animal parts and products to women in this period. The influence of status on wealth thus must be addressed in approaching

women's interactions with animals as ingredients. The food consumed and prepared in this period saw a considerable variation across status, as highlighted in Ellis' *The Country Housewife's Family Companion*. While Ellis' manual was unlikely to have been read by the very poorest, it did include recipes aimed at them, for example "Savoury Water-gruel made by poor People," suggesting water in place of milk and onions and leeks in place of meat to provide a "wholesome" meal for those who cannot afford the necessary animal products.[142] This recipe, and others like it in Ellis' text, offers an important insight into the dietary habits of the poor in early modern English society. It is particularly pertinent to an examination of women's interactions with animals as food that for many people animals and their products were not a sure component of any given meal. That this meat and milk could be replaced demonstrates that they were not necessities, but Ellis' assigning of this recipe for use only by those who could not afford the meat and milk suggests that this would not be a choice someone would otherwise make. This perceived importance of meat and animal products is significant, suggesting that at least for those who could afford it these were essential parts of a "wholesome" meal. Women with limited access to meat and animal products would likely have perceived it as far more of a luxury than it is often treated in contemporary texts.

Thirsk's work discussing both contemporary and historiographical perception of the amount and types of meat eaten by the poor is essential here.[143] Thirsk first lays out historiographical arguments for a decrease in meat consumption from the sixteenth century, with meat only becoming more readily available from the 1660s. However, she complicates this picture, demonstrating that even contemporaries could not form a consensus on how much meat the poor ate. Thirsk cites Gregory King's (1648-1712) assertion that "half the population never ate meat, those receiving alms ate it not above once a week, while others ate

[142] Ellis, *The Country Housewife's Family Companion*, 210-211.
[143] Thirsk, *Food in Early Modern England*, 248-249.

it not above two days in seven" in contrast with the 1729 argument of Professor Bradley of Cambridge that the poor regularly ate meat.[144] Thirsk further asserts that both "wild meat" and "offcuts" given out of "neighbourliness" were available to the poor, drawing the conclusion that it is likely that even the poorest in towns and villages would have had some access to meat in this period.[145] That meat was offered as part of charity again demonstrates its contemporary significance and the perception of its necessity. Indeed, Thirsk establishes a "varied picture of meat-eating" by labouring people in this period, far more complicated than is suggested by King and the older historiography she refutes.[146]

The reality of the eating habits of the poor is difficult to ascertain, and this is not the purpose of this project. Significantly, the association of particular types of meat and animal products with the poor suggests that these foods were not entirely out of their reach in this period. Thirsk demonstrates the sixteenth-century elite perception of "salted beef, bacon, goose […], swan, saltfish" as well as "hard cheese" and "salt herrings" as food for labouring people, though highlights the shift in perception of goose, noting that by the seventeenth century it was perceived as an elite and "fashionable" meat.[147] Similarly, she discusses the association of pigs with the poor as a later-eighteenth-century development, brought on by the availability of the potato, while dairy products, in contrast, were branded "food of the poor" until the end of the eighteenth century.[148] There were thus clear perceptions of certain animal products as associated with the poor in this period.

The huge variety of animal ingredients described in the recipe books examined here, and particularly some of the more luxurious meals described such as Hannah Woolley's "Umble Pye," requiring "slices of Interlarded Bacon" and covered in "Claret, Butter" once

[144] Ibid, 249.
[145] Ibid, 226.
[146] Ibid, 221.
[147] Ibid, 215.
[148] Ibid, 241; Ibid, 220.

baked, would not have been reflected the typical meals of common people, or even necessarily of the elite.[149] Indeed, Whittle and Griffiths highlight the seasonal nature of food consumption, dependent on both when foods were obtainable and when it was socially and culturally acceptable to eat them.[150] These sources were intended as a year-round guide to a wide variety of meals and occasions, rather than necessarily an everyday reference book. Indeed, manuals such as Woolley's commonly do not offer detailed instruction on tasks deemed quotidian, rather simply stating, for example, "Take the yolks of two dozen of Eggs hard boyl'd" with no description of how eggs are hardboiled, as part of a larger, more complicated recipe (in this case for egg pie).[151]

The more complex and elegant meals described in these texts, such as the "Venison Pasty" described in *The Gentlewoman's Cabinet Unlocked* containing "two pounds of Butter, and as much suet, [and] the yolks of eight or ten Eggs," should not be taken as standard for any status group in English society.[152] Indeed, the very existence of the recipes demonstrates that this was not assumed knowledge for women of the period, just as the lack of explanation for simpler elements demonstrates assumed knowledge. Moreover, it is noteworthy that a similarly broad variety of animal parts and products are used in the recipes provided by Ellis in his manual for ordinary housewives. For example, in his brief description of black pudding alone Ellis suggests using "the Blood of Swine, Sheep, Geese, red or fallow Deer, or the like."[153] Indeed, Thirsk's examination of middling women's own recipes reveals that many

---

[149] Hannah Woolley, *The Compleat Servant-Maid: or, The Young Maidens Tutor Directing them How they may Fit, and Qualifie Themselves for Any of these Employments. Viz. Waiting-Woman, House-Keeper, Chamber-Maid, Cook-Maid, Under-Cook-Maid, Nursery-Maid, Dairy-Maid, Laundry-Maid, House-Maid, Scullery-Maid. Whereunto is Added a Suppliment Containing the Choicest Receipts and Rarest Secrets in Physick and Chyrurgery; Also for Salting and Drying English Ham equal to Westphalia. The Compleat Market-Man and Market-Woman, in Buying Fowl, Fish, Flesh, &c. and to Know their Goodness or Badness in Every Respect, to Prevent being Cheated* (London: Printed for Eben Tracy at the Three Bibles on London Bridge, 1700), 78.
[149] *The Gentlewoman's Cabinet Unlocked*, 79.
[150] Whittle and Griffiths, *Consumption and Gender in the Early Seventeenth-Century Household*, 94.
[151] Woolley, *The Compleat Servant-Maid,* 78.
[152] *The Gentlewoman's Cabinet Unlocked*, 5.
[153] Ellis, *The Country Housewife's Family Companion*, 206.

cooked with a wide variety of meats, selecting whatever was available or fashionable at the time and preparing similar dishes to those eaten by the elite.[154]

Just as the food available to lower and middling status women was affected by their wealth, medicinal ingredients were also affected. Many of the medicinal recipes in the texts examined here contain a long list of often expensive ingredients, such as plants and spices like "Cummen-seed," "Cinamon in powder," and saffron.[155] Even those which do not contain necessarily expensive ingredients often contain huge quantities of ingredients, for example a recipe for a "Water" to wash the face containing "twenty four Eggs," "white-Wine two pints, Goats Milk one pint, Flour of Beans one handful."[156] While perhaps those at the upper end of middling status could have afforded to spend the money or use up ingredients on remedies such as these, certainly those at the poorest ends of society would not have been able to spare twenty-four eggs for a face wash. Indeed, Stobart has found that at least 85% of the medicinal recipes she examined would require purchase of at least one ingredient beyond those which were commonly available in a "substantial" and "self-sufficient" household in this period, let alone poorer households who did not have their own ready supplies of "animal fats and seed oils, bee products, flour and grains, meat and dairy."[157] This does not mean that poorer or lower status women (or even families) did not make their own or have access to medicines, but they are not represented in these sources. Indeed, at least as far back as Alice Clark's work the importance of charitable medicine production by elite women in this period has

[154] Thirsk, *Food in Early Modern England*, 188-189.
[155] Robert Pemell, *Ptōchopharmakon, seu Medicamen Miseris, or Pauperum Pyxidicula salutifera. Help for the Poor collected for the Benefit of Such as are Not Able to Make use of Physitians and Chiurgians, or Live Remote from Them. Also an Appendix concerning Letting Blood in the Smallpox* (London: Printed by J. L. for Philemon Stephens, at the Gilden-Lion, in Pauls Church-yard, 1650), 49; Ibid, 51; Ibid, 53.
[156] T. K., Doctor in Physick, *The Kitchin-Physician, or, A Guide for Good-Housewives in Maintaining their Families in Health wherein are Described the Natures, Causes, and Symptoms of all Diseases, Inward and Outward, Incident to the Bodies of Men, Women, and Children: Prescribing Natural, Useful and Proper Published for the Common Good* (London: Printed for Samuel Lee, 1680), 4.
[157] Woolley, *The Compleat Servant-Maid*, 48.

been acknowledged.[158] Clark highlighted the role of both elite and labouring women in providing medical care for their community, often for free though occasionally for payment.[159] While the poorest women in society may not have had access to many of the ingredients required for more complex remedies or had the animal products to spare for certain recipes, it should not be assumed that they had no relationship with medicines containing animals parts or products, or no part in producing them. However, it is extremely difficult to locate these poorer women in the historical record and to know how commonly they produced their own medicines, let alone medicines containing animal parts or products. While it is unlikely that they would have owned any of the texts examined here or had the means to produce many of the recipes, we should not assume that they never produced any of their own medicines. Other women of lower status, and particularly those with more wealth at middling status, were far more likely to have the means and the time to produce their own medicines, even if not the specific ones detailed in some of the texts examined here.

Women's work with animals as an ingredient in food or medicine was thus affected by their social status and wealth. It is impossible to fully ascertain the availability of animal parts and products to lower and middling women in this period, whether in their own families or as servants in larger households. However, it must not be assumed that these women had no access to these animals, and these sources do not acknowledge any difficulty a reader might face in acquiring animal ingredients. While these sources generally offer recipes for those with some wealth, they relate to a broader spectrum of women, at the very least to those who worked as servants preparing this food. Moreover, Thirsk highlights these authors' aims "not to stand aloof" from lower status people, with some even potentially attempting to depict the meals of the poor.[160] These sources thus are not entirely removed from the lower and

[158] Clark, *Working Life of Women*.
[159] Ibid, 255; Ibid, 257.
[160] Thirsk, *Food in Early Modern England,* 148.

middling status women examined here. The impact of status on which animal parts and products, and in what quantities, women had access to in this period must not be ignored, and gender cannot be considered entirely distinctly from status and wealth. However, it is noteworthy that scholarship has found that even the poorest in society had access to some animal parts and products.

The work of preparing food or medicine was gendered in this period. In most elite households professional cooks were likely to be men, as were learned medical professionals (with the exception of midwives, though men increasingly worked in this field in the eighteenth century). However, in the more ordinary households, and even in many gentry or lesser elite households, it was women who performed the tasks of preparing food and medicines, with this work increasingly perceived as feminine.[161] Even in elite households, medicine production by women, particularly for charitable purposes, was common, as highlighted in Leong's work on Elizabeth Freke, which describes medicine production as a "common pastime" and "duty" for housewives across the early modern social spectrum.[162] Indeed, contemporaries considered medicine production and nursing as central to housewifery and thus womanhood across the social spectrum. This is highlighted, for example, in Gervase Markham's *The English Huswife* (originally published 1615), which notes "her skille in Physicke, [and] Surgerie" first in its list of "inward and outward Vertues which ought to be in a compleate Woman" in the title of the text.[163] Markham's guide,

[161] Stobart, *Household Medicine in Seventeenth-Century England*, p.104.
[162] Elaine Leong, "Making Medicines in the Early Modern Household," *Bulletin of the History of Medicine* 82, no. 1 (2008): 146.
[163] Gervase Markham, *Countrey contentments, or The English husvvife Containing the inward and outward vertues which ought to be in a compleate woman. As her skill in physicke, surgerie, extraction of oyles, banqueting-stuffe, ordering of great feasts, preseruing of all sorts of wines, conceited secrets, distillations, perfumes, ordering of wooll, hempe, flax, making cloth, dying, the knowledge of dayries, office of malting, oats, their excellent vses in a family, brewing, baking, and all other things belonging to an houshold. A worke generally approued, and now much augmented, purged and made most profitable and necessarie for all men,*

though professing to offer instruction for "any compleat Hous-wife," seems directed more towards those with some level of wealth, boasting instructions for "Banqueting-Stuffe, [and] Ordering of great Feasts" on the titlepage.[164] It is thus significant in itself that medicine production is presented as so important to the relatively wealthy audience of this text. However, it is also important to note that the production of medicine was not only valued by those with means. Though Ellis places less emphasis on medicine production, favouring instead to emphasise food preparation on his titlepage, there is a section on "Diseases and Medicines" in his guide aimed at more ordinary housewives containing detailed instructions on producing various remedies for ailments from "a common cough" to "a green Wound."[165]

With the responsibilities of providing both meals and medical care for their families perceived and presented as women's duties in this period, the notion of a caring and nurturing femininity discussed in chapter 1 is once again significant. In this chapter this nurturing femininity is reflected in contemporary expectations of housewives' provisioning for the family. Scholarship has demonstrated the increasing associations with women and thus feminisation (in that it was perceived as women's work) of food and medicine production within the household, including in paid employment, across this period. Sara Pennell notes that even the role of professional cook was increasingly performed by and associated with women across this period, with women teaching cookery in London by the end of the seventeenth century and increasingly employed as cooks by the early eighteenth century.[166] Pennell also highlights the role of "maids-of-all-work" in this period – a single servant employed by middling households to perform a huge variety of tasks, including cooking – and she stresses the continued work of middling women in their own kitchen even when

and dedicated to the honour of the noble house of Exceter, and the generall good of this kingdome. (London: By J.B., for R. Iackson, and are to be sold at his shop neere Fleet-streete Conduit, 1623).
[164] Ibid, 1.
[165] Ellis, *The Country Housewife's Family Companion*, 247; Ibid, 249; Ibid, 266.
[166] Sara Pennell, *The Birth of the English Kitchen 1600-1850* (London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2016), 120.

servants were employed.[167] Whittle and Griffiths describe the tasks of food and medicine production as "elements of housewifery" and thus the responsibility of women within a household, though they note that, as a wealthy household, the Le Stranges' cook and medical practitioners were male.[168] They further describe medical care as "'naturally' falling to women" explicitly because of the "caring role" and link between food and medicinal preparation.[169] Similarly, Leong stresses the importance of medicine production and nursing as essential to contemporary understandings of femininity and housewifery.[170]

This being said, it is important not to dismiss any male involvement or connection with food or medicine production within the home. Harvey highlights the "intimate knowledge" men had of both food and medicine production in this period and stresses that, despite contemporary associations of these tasks with women, such as references to female readers in recipe books or instructional guides, men were not completely divorced from the kitchen or the work taking place in there.[171] Men should not be assumed to have no knowledge about or involvement in the work of cooking and medicine production in lower and middling homes. However, that the overarching assumption in the majority of texts written for either women or households seems to be that women will perform these tasks is significant. It is representations which are the focus here, and in these representations it was women who were associated with this form of work. Indeed, twenty-four of the fifty guide and recipe books examined here refer explicitly to women in their titles, with only three explicitly mentioning men, suggesting that the perceived femininity of the tasks of cooking and medicine production was firmly held. Indeed, Harvey has stressed the strength of this

[167] Ibid, 117; Ibid, 116.
[168] Whittle and Griffiths, *Consumption and Gender in the Early Seventeenth-Century Household*, 87.
[169] Ibid, 109.
[170] Leong, "Making Medicines in the Early Modern Household," 147.
[171] Karen Harvey, *The Little Republic: Masculinity & Domestic Authority in Eighteenth-Century Britain* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 29; Ibid, 26-29.

perceived femininity, highlighting its use as a "marketing strategy," while highlighting the lack of explicit gendering within these texts.[172] The work of food and medicine production performed by those of lower and middling status was thus associated with women in this period in the representations examined here. These feminine associations of this role stem from contemporary perceptions of the caring and compassionate nature of women and the maternal duty to care for the family. While men did perform these roles at more elite and professional levels, within lower and middling households this was commonly the work of women and this is reflected in the sources examined here.

The gendered associations of women with specific animals discussed in chapter 1 are not reflected in representations of women's work preparing animals as ingredients in food or medicine. A wide variety of animals are present in the food recipes examined here. This is particularly centred around their meat, with diverse recipes in any single book, for example black pudding (commonly made with cows or pigs), venison pasty (game animals, typically deer), stewed beef (cows), boiled bacon (pigs), and minced pies made with mutton (sheep).[173] Medicinal recipes, on the other hand, do not tend to focus so heavily on animal parts or products. Indeed, many recipes contain no animal parts or products whatsoever, such as a cure for "The Bloody Flux" comprised of "Hollihock roots" boiled in red wine.[174] Where animals are used in medicinal recipes, the use of their products, particularly eggs, and their fats are most common. Other common animal products used in medicinal recipes are honey,

[172] Ibid, 28.
[173] *The Gentlewomans Cabinet Unlocked Wherein is Contained Many Excellent Receipts for Neat Dressing of Divers sorts of Meats; as Flesh and Fish, with their Proper Sauces· Also Directions for the Best way of making pancakes, fritters, tansies, puddings, custards, cheesecakes. And such like fine knacks. And other delicate dishes, which are most frequently used in gentlemens houses* (London: Printed for W. Thackeray and T. Passenger, 1688), 3-11.
[174] *Every Woman her Own Midwife, or, A Compleat Cabinet opened for Child-Bearing Women furnished with Directions to Prevent Miscarriages during the Time of Breeding, and other Casualties which usually Attend Women in Child-Bed: to which is Annexed Cures for all sorts of Diseases Incident to the Bodies of Men, Women and Children* (London: Printed for Simon Neale, 1675), 46.

milk and butter, all of which are present, for example, in William Ellis' remedy for the "common Cough."[175] In her analysis of medicinal recipes Stobart has found similar results, citing "ingredients included bees (honey and wax), chickens (eggs), cattle (milk, ox gall), deer (antler), pigs (grease), sheep (dung, suet, tallow), snails, swallows, woodlice and worms" as particularly common.[176] While the types of animals used in medicinal recipes are largely the same as those used in food (with the exception of swallows and bugs), the parts of animals used are often different. Stobart's research reflects the findings of the primary sources examined here, with animal products and fat particularly common ingredients in medicine, while food recipes tend to focus on meat. The recipes examined here thus depict a huge range of animals, significantly many of which were not represented as associated with women or women's work in life, as discussed in chapter 1.

Some of this work with living animals inherently overlaps with work in food and medicine production, such as milking cows, making butter and cheese, and collecting eggs. Both beef and chicken are depicted in the recipe books examined here, as well as the milk, butter, cheese and eggs women had produced and collected. Perhaps an even more direct connection between work with living and deceased animals is found in the work of Thirsk. In her examination of the increasing interest in the preservation of meat in the seventeenth century, Thirsk discusses the increasing trend for specific types of food being fed to animals to improve the taste and longevity of the meat.[177] Women's work with living animals was thus closely tied to work with animals as an ingredient.

However, in preparing food and medicine with animal parts and products, women are not represented as being limited by gender to the use of specific animals. As food alone,

[175] Ellis, *The Country Housewife's Family Companion*, 249.
[176] Stobart, *Household Medicine in Seventeenth-Century England*, 79-80.
[177] Thirsk, *Food in Early Modern England*, 137.

Woolley provides recipes for mutton, cows, deer, pigs, rabbits, many types of birds (including geese, chickens, pigeons and swans), and various seafood (from fish to eels to crabs and lobsters).[178] Whether preparing food for themselves or for an employer, women were presented as facing no gendered obstacles in terms of which animals could and could not be prepared by them. For example, lower- and middling-status women are not presented as working with animals such as wild deer while they were alive, but these gendered limitations were no longer an issue once the animal was an ingredient. In life wild deer were associated with masculinity through hunting, as discussed in Catherine Bates' *Masculinity and the Hunt*.[179] Yet in death women could be expected to prepare their bodies for consumption, for example as shown through Woolley's recipe for venison pasty in her book targeted specifically at "Young Maidens."[180] That women are not represented as involved in the butchering process is perhaps significant here. Once the animal is an ingredient, not a corpse, its gendered associations from life are no longer present. The sources do not represent any continuation of the gendered limitations of working with specific animals when alive once those animals become an ingredient in food or medicine. There is nothing to suggest that women were prohibited from any form of work in preparing certain animals as food or medicine, nor do these sources separate the production of food or medicine depending on whether or what animals it contained.

Beyond merely no longer carrying the gendered associations from life, neither the animals as ingredients nor the resulting food or medicine were represented as feminised in these sources. That the animal itself is no longer gendered, nor presented as feminine, is

[178] Woolley, *The Compleat Servant-Maid*, e.g. 35 describes the appropriate terminology for carving various creatures, 77-84 provides recipes for various meat pies.
[179] Catherine Bates, *Masculinity and the Hunt: Wyatt to Spenser* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013).
[180] Woolley, *The Compleat Servant-Maid*¸ 79.

significant in consideration of the association with this work with women. Once again, the death of the animal is significant here in sparking a change in perception. The transformation of the animal from living creature to ingredient enhances the objectification of the animal, with its own sex or reproductive associations no longer relevant to any gendered perceptions of the food or medicine produced from it. Moreover, women's work with the animal's body does not result in the ingredients being perceived as feminine. A simple explanation for this lack of gendering is perhaps that the necessity of both food and medicine diminished the potential for feminisation of the end product. Beyond this, it demonstrates that women simply performing work did not inherently lead contemporaries to represent everything related to this work as feminine. That men also prepared animals for food and medicine at more elite levels was likely significant here.

While scholarship has shown that meat in general was perceived as more masculine in this period, this is not reflected in the recipe books examined here. Carol J. Adams' work on modern perceptions of meat and gender highlights the consistent perception of meat as masculine throughout the early modern period to the present day, locating it as a symbol of masculine power while vegetables are identified as a sign of feminine weakness.[181] Similarly, Bates highlights the inherent masculinity of meat in her work on hunting and masculinity, placing hunting and meat provision as the ultimate display of heroic masculine prowess throughout history.[182] Scholarship on late-seventeenth- and eighteenth-century vegetarianism further stresses the perceived masculinity of meat. The seventeenth and eighteenth centuries saw a rise in debate around vegetarianism, centred around both philosophical and practical health concerns.[183] This increasing discussion of the value and morality of meat specifically

[181] Carol J. Adams, *The Sexual Politics of Meat: A Feminist-Vegetarian Critical Theory* (London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2019), 3-4.
[182] Bates, *Masculinity and the Hunt*, 7-8.
[183] Anita Guerrini, "A Diet for a Sensitive Soul: Vegetarianism in Eighteenth-Century Britain," *Eighteenth-Century Life* 23, no. 2 (1999): 34.

drew attention to the contemporary gendered perception of it. In her work on vegetarian thinkers from this period Anita Guerrini discusses the long-held perception of red meat as "distinctively masculine."[184] Beyond being merely associated with masculinity, Guerrini highlights contemporary vegetarian views of red meat as specifically connected to "passion and violence," reflecting a particularly aggressive form of masculinity, and contrasts this with George Cheyne's (a noted vegetarian) championing of milk, a traditionally feminine drink tied to ideas of motherhood.[185] Vegetarian thinkers' ideals cannot be said to reflect widespread popular thought or culture, indeed Guerrini herself describes the English as "a stubbornly carnivorous people" and stresses the importance of meat to English nationalistic thought by the mid-eighteenth century.[186] However these men deliberately built on popular contemporary opinions in order to make their pro-vegetarian arguments.

More than being merely a symbol of masculinity, by the eighteenth century, beef had come to represent newly emerging British identity. In particular, beef was used by artists to depict British abundance and wealth, with Linda Colley describing roast beef as "the archetypical food of patriots."[187] Even in the sixteenth century, Craig Muldrew highlights a contemporary perception of beef as especially English and is specifically beneficial for their health.[188] Indeed, he notes that beef (as well as meat more generally) was perceived by the English as essential for the health of labouring people in particular, with this attitude maintaining well into the eighteenth century.[189] Meat thus signified more than just sustenance

[184] Ibid, 38.
[185] Ibid.
[186] Anita Guerrini, "Health, national character and the English diet in 1700," *Studies in History and Philosophy of Biological and Biomedical Sciences* 43 (2012): 356; Ibid, 349.
[187] Linda Colley, *Britons: Forging the Nation 1707–1837: with a New Preface by the Author* (London: Pimlico, 2003), 87.
[188] Craig Muldrew, *Food, Energy, and the Creation of Industriousness: Work and Material Culture in Agrarian England, 1550–1780* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 38.
[189] Ibid; Ibid, 41.

in the popular imagination, yet these conceptual attitudes of beef as masculine and English are not depicted in the recipes examined here.

However, this perception of meat as masculine and inherently English is not reflected in the recipes examined here. While gendered language is sometimes present during recipes, there is nothing to suggest a particular food or medicine is intended for men rather than women, or vice versa, nor that there is any strong association of masculinity or femininity. There is reference in *The Kitchin-Physician* to the importance of the beauty "of Men [and] (especially of Women)" as well as explicit mention that the following recipes would be particularly useful for women "as their chiefest virtue is to make the Face fair, to procure and preserve Beauty; of these Imbellishments men have no need."[190] However, this reflects contemporary perception of the gendered importance of appearance rather than any particular masculinisation or feminisation of certain animals or their products. Whoever the specific intended reader, these recipes were meant to be ultimately consumed by anyone, with only occasional reference to a specific intended recipient, as above or, for example, the recipe "To cause a young Child to goe to stoole."[191] The gendered associations of certain foods (particularly relevant here, the perception of meat as masculine) should not be dismissed. However, despite the work being performed by and increasingly associated with women, these sources do not show these associations. This suggests that, though certain foods were perceived as masculine or as having wider conceptional associations when consumed, these perceptions were represented as significant in their production. The production of animals as food or medicine is thus distinct from the resultant product in this way. Animals in food and medicine are here represented in a practical, instructional way and are not gendered by their association with women or any broader cultural gendering of food.

[190] T. K. Doctor in Physick, *The Kitchin-Physician*, 1; Ibid, 3.
[191] *Every Woman her Own Midwife*, 29.

Examining the language used to describe animals in these recipes is further revealing about women's interactions with animals as an ingredient. This language firmly objectifies the animal, now no longer a living being, representing a contemporary perception of animals as beneath humans. This perception is not represented as affected by gender, though Aristotelian ideas of women as closer to the animal than men were still prevalent, particularly earlier in this period.[192] Nor do these authors alter the level of objectification of the animals depending on whether their intended audience was male, female, or a household. Here, once again, gender does not play a significant role in the representation of animals. Any analysis of specific words here is based in contemporary meaning of these words, though for most this meaning remains the same today. If any word's meaning has shifted over time this will be addressed and the early modern definition explained. None of the examples of specific language examined here are unique to any one text unless stated otherwise, with recipes across this period using similar language to describe both the animals and how to prepare them.

While gendered associations of animals shift with the animal's death, the objectification of animals is presented as consistent across life and death in these texts. This is particularly overt where the same text talks about care for living animals and preparation of their flesh as food, as in *The Country Housewife's Family Companion*. In this text Ellis uses a variety of terms to describe various animals, both living and dead. Often there are specific terms used for specific types of meat or pieces of the animal, for example "Bacon," "Pork," "Ox-Cheek," "Beef," "Flank," "Leg," "Mutton," "Buttock."[193] However, significantly, animals as living creatures were not drastically distanced from meat in sources from this

[192] Shoemaker, *Gender in English Society 1650-1850*, 15.
[193] Ellis, *The Country Housewife's Family Companion*, 221-223.

period. In her work on the relationship between meat-eating and conceptions of humanity in this period, Fudge highlights this firm acknowledgement of the "animal origins" of the food on the table, arguing that this served to reinforce human dominion over the animal world.[194] Similarly, Karen Raber discusses the creation of elaborate meat dishes formed into the shape of animals at elite tables which "confuse the distinction between living and dead, between animal and meat" as part of the performance of a meal.[195] While the focus is different, this work demonstrates the early modern comfort with the thought of animals becoming food which can be found in the sources examined here. Specific meat terms are also present in Woolley's guidance for cooks, for example in her description of how "To Boyl a Chine, Rump, Surloyn, Brisket, Rib, Flank, Buttock or Fillet of Beef," which explicitly refers to various types of meat from different parts of the cow.[196] That Woolley refers to this meat as "of Beef" rather than of a cow at first seems significant, perhaps suggesting a desired distance between beef and cow. However she does not shy away from the animality of meat, even specifically of cows, providing recipes for "Calves-foot Pye," "Jelly of Harts-horn," and explicitly describing the difference between "The flesh of a Bull Calf" and "that of a Cow Calf" and between "Cow Beef" and "Ox."[197] Instead, beef is used as specific terminology to demonstrate which type of meat is being discussed, signifying that of an adult cow. Ellis similarly does not use meat terminology to separate the flesh from the living animals, for example using "Pork" and "Hog" in the same sentence of recipe, providing a recipe for a "Hogs Pudding" and for "bak[ing] a Pig," and describing a living pig as a "Porker or Bacon Hog."[198] Living animals and their meat are thus not separated in language in the recipes of this period. Though there were specific terms for meat, these terms were not used to divorce

[194] Fudge, "Saying Nothing Concerning the Same," 76.
[195] Raber, "Animals at the Table", 108.
[196] Woolley, *The Compleat Servant-Maid*, 110.
[197] Ibid, 77; Ibid, 87; Ibid, 195; Ibid, 196.
[198] Ellis, *The Country Housewife's Family Companion*, 82; Ibid, 87; Ibid, 65; Ibid, 80.

the living creature from the flesh, rather to be more specific in the context of a recipe. Significantly, these terms were also used relatively interchangeably, with living pigs referred to as "porkers" to highlight their ultimate intended purpose and say something about the type of meat to be had from them. This blurring of the line between living animal and dead animal as an ingredient is also present in medicinal recipes. For example, *Every Woman her Own Midwife* refers to "a piece of Swines flesh powdered" and "Goose greace" as key ingredients in recipes.[199] Indeed, Michele DiMeo and Rebecca Laroche's work on animal ingredients in medicinal recipes found a consistent "eliding [of] the differences between plant and animal" in the language used, with the same verbs used to describe preparing plant ingredients as animal ones.[200] This is similarly reflected in the recipes examined here, for example with both food and medicinal recipes instructing the reader to "beat" ingredients, whether plant or animal.[201]

The Gentlewomans Cabinet Unlocked offers multiple recipes for preparing various meat dishes and at no point diminishes the animality of the creatures being prepared. The recipe for black pudding is a particularly overt example of this, instructing the reader to "Take your Blood while it is warm" and, once seasoned, "when it is cold put in your Guts."[202] This presents a contemporary acceptance of the more visceral aspects of food preparation, as well as highlighting the practical necessities of much of this work – blood needed to be warm as that meant it was fresh. This is also significant for presenting women at

[199] *Every Woman her Own Midwife*, 13; Ibid, 11.
[200] DiMeo and Laroche, "On Elizabeth Isham's "Oil of Swallows"", 96.
[201] E.g. Mrs A. M., *Cookery refin'd. Or, The lady, gentlewoman and servant-maids useful companion* (London: Printed for G. Conyers at the Ring in Little Britain, and Jo. Sprint at the Blue Bell, 1697), 1.; John Ponteus, *The True Every Man & Woman their own Doctor: or, a Salve for Every Sore Being a Book full of Rare Receipts for the Most Dangerous Distempers incident to the Bodies of Men, Women and Children; and is very Fit to be in All Families Against any Time of Sickness, gathered out of the Library of that Famous Traveller Dr. Ponteus and now Publish'd for the Good and Benefit of the Kingdom; and being Nothing but what is Experienced by many Thousands of People in City and Country, doing Good to Many* (London: Printed by F. L. for Matthias Drew, both living in St. Sepulchres Church yard, and sold by himself, and living in Red-Lyon Court in White-cross-street, 1676), 2.
[202] *The Gentlewomans Cabinet Unlocked*, 3.

the moment of the animal's death and butchering, even if not depicted as actively doing the work of it herself.

Woolley's descriptions of how to carve birds is a notable exception to the consistent presentation of animals as objects across life and death, to which she dedicates five pages of her book.[203] Most notably is her description of carving a swan: "Slit her right down the middle of the Breast, and so clean thorow the Back, from the Neck to the Rump; and so divide her equally in the middle, without taring the Flesh from either part."[204] Woolley does not remotely shy away from the fact that this bird was a living creature, referring to the swan's "Breast," "Back," "Neck," and "Rump." This language is used frequently in various recipe books, for example John Murrell's instructions to "Scald a large Pigge, cut off his head and slit him in the middest, and take out his bones."[205] While these terms blur the line between a living bird and a deceased one, commonly used for both living creatures and meat, Woolley's and Murrell's use of gendered pronouns is noteworthy. Both of these texts are aimed at a female audience, though their use of gendered pronouns slightly differs and is not typical of texts written for women. The use of gendered pronouns is thus not related to the gender of the intended audience of the recipe. Significantly, though rare, gendered pronouns are occasionally used to refer to animals in descriptions of carving. The swan's existence as a once-living creature is highlighted by Woolley's repeated use of "her" and Murrell's use of "his and "him." Woolley repeatedly refers to the swan as female – "Slit her," "divide her" – and she similarly feminises a goose with the instruction "lace her down with your Knife."[206]

---

[203] Woolley, *The Compleat Servant-Maid*, 35-39.
[204] Ibid, 35-36.
[205] John Murrell, *A Nevv Booke of Cookerie VVherein is Set Forth the Newest and Most Commendable Fashion for Dressing or Sowcing, eyther Flesh, Fish, or Fowle. Together with Making of all Sorts of Iellyes, and Other Made-Dishes for Seruice; both to Beautifie and Adorne eyther Nobleman or Gentlemans table. Hereunto also is Added the Most Exquisite London Cookerie. All Set Forth According to the Now, New, English and French Fashion. Set Forth by the Obseruation of a Traueller. I.M.* (London : Printed for Iohn Browne, and are to be solde at his shop in S. Dunstanes Church-yard, 1615), 2.
[206] Woolley, *The Compleat Servant-Maid*, 35.

However, for every other bird, including the explicitly female hen, Woolley uses "it" or avoids pronouns altogether, until she describes carving a pheasant and a crane, for both of which she refers to "his Wings" and "his Legs."[207] While "goose" can be used as a gender-specific feminine term, "swan" does not necessarily denote a female bird, nor do "pheasant" or "crane" necessarily suggest a male one. It is noteworthy that gendering does not occur in descriptions of preparing animals as ingredients that are not specifically related to carving. Once the animal is carved and the transformation to ingredient is complete Woolley no longer uses feminine pronouns, instead saying "Having laid it in the dish."[208] However, these examples of the gendering of the animals being carved are exceptional. This use of gendered pronouns is not common to other recipe books, and the few that do use them do not do so with any consistency. The majority of recipes and recipe books do not use gendered pronouns in this way and maintain the objectification of animals across life and death. Animals are thus not separated from ingredient by recipes in this period. A living pig can be a porker, a pie can be made of calves' foot; there is no new terminology for the back or neck of a dead bird being carved compared to a living one walking around. Animals such as these were already acknowledged to have the dinner plate as their ultimate end. In doing so these recipes firmly present animals as beneath humanity and do not alter this representation depending on the assumed gender of the reader.

Finally, this chapter will address whether and how this work is represented as skilled in these sources. As discussed above, the work itself was associated with women in this period, though far less exclusively than women's work with living animals. The representation of the women who performed this work in terms of the perception or

[207] Ibid, 36-39.
[208] Woolley, 36.

presentation of their skill is thus a significant question in this gendered approach. Far more so than in women's work with living animals, the skill in food and medicine production is acknowledged or at least alluded to in these sources. These sources were intended to be read practically, not merely theoretically. In her work on elite women's relationship with medicinal recipes, Leong highlights the "practical nature" of the reading of these recipes.[209] Women did not just read these texts in a theoretical manner, but used them as practical guides, actually making the recipes described and recording their own notes on them to build on existing medical knowledge. It is in examining these sources as practical guides that their representations of women's skill becomes clear. The chief way that this skill is represented is through assumption of prior knowledge, particularly clear in what is omitted in these recipes. This assumed knowledge of women is particularly significant in the context of their perceived role as provisioners for the household – this skill was thus a woman's duty.

While it is important not to diminish the work of wealthier women, particularly in medicine production, they were far less involved in cooking. Elite women did occasionally work preparing food in their kitchens, as can be seen in Amanda Herbert's work on the relationships between women in early modern Britain. Herbert notes that elite and middling women occasionally participated in work in kitchens while having conversations with their lower status servants.[210] This highlights the practical role of the middling women examined here in occasionally performing this work, as well as their direct overseeing of it. It was thus not just lower-status women who worked with animal ingredients with their hands or used kitchen tools. Indeed, Leong stresses the contemporary importance placed on "hands-on experience" medicinal recipes and guides.[211] She notes that elite authors, both male and

[209] Elaine Leong, "'Herbals She Persueth'," 568.
[210] Herbert, *Female Alliances*, 82.
[211] Elaine Leong, *Recipes and Everyday Knowledge: Medicine, Science and the Household in Early Modern England* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2018), 43.

female, often personally made the recipes in their books to ensure the validity.[212] This practical work producing the recipes in books was thus not limited only to lower status women.

However, generally wealthier women would employ servants to do their cooking (who they may instruct with the help of one of these recipe books or instructional guides) and would thus not have this detailed prior knowledge of food preparation. This is particularly pertinent when considering these recipes in a practical context and their assumed knowledge of the reader around the preparation of animal parts and products. While wealthier women did produce their own medicinal products, these recipes often required only herbal ingredients or perhaps at most the use of eggs. Indeed, herbals, or medicinal texts containing only herbal remedies, such as *Rams Little Dodeon* [sic], were not uncommon in this period.[213] The assumed knowledge in these recipes of how to prepare animals as ingredients, particularly in food, is thus particularly a representation of lower and middling status women's skill.

A common example of this is the descriptions in recipes of when certain foods or medicines are ready, either for consumption or for the next step of the recipe. These descriptions often rely on assumed knowledge of the reader, taking some level of cooking or medicinal experience as a given. Authors often assume the reader will know when things look or feel right, rather than giving a detailed description of what this look or feel, or even taste, should be. This assumed knowledge can be as basic as the instruction "beat them well together" – though an extremely simple instruction, if the reader had never had any

[212] Ibid; Ibid, 79; Ibid, 86.
[213] Henry Lyte and William Ram, *Rams Little Dodeon [sic] A Briefe Epitome of the New Herbal, or Histoy of Plants. Wherein is Contayned the Disposition and True Declaration of the Phisike Helpes of all Sortes of Herbes and Plants, Vnder their Names and Operations, not Onely of Those Which are Here in this our Countrey of England Growing but of All Others Also of Other Realmes, Countreyes and Nations vsed in Phisike* (London: By Simon Stafford, dwelling in the Cloth Fayre, at the signe of the three Crownes, 1606).

experience of preparing food or medicine they would likely not know what beating meant or how the ingredients should look when beaten "well" – to more complex assumed knowledge such as "so do till you think it is reasonable well broiled," an instruction in a recipe for "Hare pye" relying on knowledge of broiling as well as what a cooked hare should look like.[214]

Similarly, Ellis describes making bacon pasties "with Bread-Dough," "in the very same Manner as the boiled Bacon Pasties," and instructs the reader to "set them in with common Oven Cakes."[215] Again, there is assumed knowledge, but also an assumed broader context. This highlights the lived experience of cooking which the reader was expected to have and the practical use of recipes, applying old knowledge to simply new recipes. Ellis is assuming the reader will not only know how to make bread dough but have their own preferred kind to hand, as well as having other "common Oven Cakes" which they regularly bake. This example is particularly useful for highlighting the broader context in which any food or medicine was prepared. If examining recipe books alone it is easy to focus on the theoretical, particularly as many of these texts were written to guide wealthy women on how to instruct servants rather than to be read by those who would actually do the cooking. The intended audience for Ellis' text is perhaps important here with these recipes offering a broader, practical context. However, it is not only Ellis who depicts this assumed experience. *The Kitchin-Physician* similarly provides a recipe for a tooth whitener which is to be "put it into the Oven with several Batches of Bread."[216] This would tell the reader the temperature the oven needed to be to cook this tooth whitener, as well as how long to cook it. This example further highlights the broader context in which these recipes were intended to be

[214] Pemell, *Ptōchopharmakon, seu Medicamen Miseris*, 1; Hannah Woolley, *The Cook's Guide: or, Rare Receipts for Cookery Published and Set Forth Particularly for Ladies and Gentlwomen; Being Very Beneficial for All Those that Desire the True Way of Dressing of All Sorts of Flesh, Fowles, and Fish; the Best Directions for All Manner of Kickshaws, and the Most Ho-good Sawces: Whereby Noble Persons and Others in their Hospitalities May be Gratified in their Gusto's. Never Before Printed*. (London: printed for Peter Dring at the Sun in the Poultry, next door to the Rose-Tavern, 1664), 7.
[215] Ellis, *The Country Housewife's Family Companion*, 221.
[216] T. K., Doctor in Physick, *The Kitchin-Physician*, 51.

prepared and the contemporary blurred line between food and medicine, with bread and a tooth whitener prepared alongside each other. The assumed skill and knowledge of the women making these recipes was thus not limited to either cooking or medicine production specifically in any one text.

The senses are also important in these recipes' representations of women's prowess. Woolley's descriptions of how to tell whether meat is old or young, fresh or stale, rely on the senses, with repeated references to the "smooth Legs" of young chickens and guidance on the "sweet or rank" smell of venison and the "Moorish and ill flavour'd" smell of old ham.[217] Less explicitly referring to the senses are instructions such as "make a powder thereof," as in a recipe for a remedy for cankers in *Every Woman her Own Midwife*.[218] Instructions to grind ingredients into powders are particularly common in medicinal recipes and rely on both the sight and texture of the ingredients as well as experience of what a powder should look and feel like. References to the desired temperature of food or medicines are also common in recipes, such as heating something "blood warm" or instructions to use a medicine only "when it is cold."[219]

It is particularly noteworthy that recipes rarely describe what a finished result should taste like. There are descriptions of how things should look and feel at various stages of the recipe and their effects once consumed, but taste, a presumably important factor in the preparation of anything to be consumed, is rarely mentioned. There is occasional mention of ingredients which can be added to improve taste or specific recipes which taste better than others, but even here the overall taste of the finished food or medicine is rarely described. For

[217] Woolley, *The Compleat Servant-Maid*, 186; Ibid, 198.
[218] *Every Woman Her Own Midwife*, 41.
[219] Thomas Tryon, *A Pocket-Companion, Containing Things Necessary to be Known by All that Values their Health and Happiness Being a Plain Way of Nature's Own Prescribing, to Cure Most Diseases in Men, Women and Children, by Kitchen-Physick Only. To Which is Added, an Account How a Man may Live Well and Plentifully for Two-Pence a Day. Collected from The Good Housewife Made a Doctor* (London: Printed for George Conyers, at the Golden Ring in Little-Britain, 1693), 4; *Every Woman her Own Midwife*, 44.

example, Ellis regularly gives multiple recipes for the same dish, citing different sources and often stating which he believes is best. In one such case, for "Pease-Porridge," he describes adding "Wheat-meal" to the porridge to make it "more hearty" and filling.[220] Despite this description of an improved meal, he offers no description of how the taste is affected one way or another, nor a description of what the taste should be with a basic recipe. This suggests an assumption that the reader will know the taste of this meal, or indeed any meal described as taste descriptions are so lacking in these recipes. It is not uncommon for medicinal recipes to suggest adding sugar or honey "to sweeten it," yet even here there is no description of the original taste of the remedy, nor the now sweetened version.[221] Descriptions of taste are only common when the author feels the reader will not know what something is, for example *The Kitchin-Physician* notes the "harsh and bitter tast" of "fig-bean-meal" and Thomas Tryon describes the "pleasant sowerish Taste" of "Boniclabber."[222] These brief allusions to the taste and texture of completed recipes are the extent of the description of taste in these sources. This general omission of taste or texture description is particularly interesting in the context of Raber's description of meat in this period as "hard to eat" and generally prepared as some sort of "paste".[223] Even in new recipes, food was prepared in similar ways and the women preparing it are represented as skilled enough to already know what this should taste or feel like. There is thus a common assumption that the reader will understand the basic taste of any food including, particularly significantly here, of any meat, described. This omission of taste descriptions from both food and medicinal recipes across the period is thus noteworthy. Rather than diminishing the practical context of recipe use, however, this serves to highlight

[220] Ellis, *The Country Housewife's Family Companion*, 224.
[221] *Every Woman her Own Midwife*, 43.
[222] T. K., Doctor in Physick, *The Kitchin-Physician*, 11; Tryon, *A Pocket-Companion*, 8.
[223] Raber, "Animals at the Table," 114.

the assumed experience-based knowledge of the intended readers of these texts and serves to present women as capable in this field.

The use of hands in these recipes similarly highlights the assumed knowledge and skill of the women making the food or medicine described. Hands are significant in historiography on women's work, particularly in examinations of status. For example, Kate Smith has highlighted the importance of women's hands in Georgian Britain and how physical labour marked the hands of those performing it, offering a clear sign of distinction between those who performed this work and those who didn't.[224] Recipes instruct women to do much work with their hands, though rarely specify that or how the hands will be used. For example, *The Kitchin-Physician* gives detailed instruction for a "Dove or Pigeon-water" for washing the face.[225] The use of the hands is central in this recipe and is presented as a given, rather than something exceptional worth commenting on. The reader is told to "Take two white Pigeons, pluck them, draw out their guts, throw them into a Stilling-glass," all of which would have been performed with the hands, yet there is no specific mention of hands at all. Indeed, the only mention of hands in this recipe is in reference to quantity – "two handfuls of the kernels of Grapes." While this complex recipe for a face wash containing many potentially expensive ingredients was unlikely to have been used by the poorer women examined here, it offers a clear example of the ways in which hands were omitted from recipes, assuming an existing knowledge of how to perform these tasks. This implicit use of the hands is also present in recipes for food, for example the recipe for "Chicken-Pye" in *The Gentlewomans Cabinet Unlocked*.[226] The reader is instructed to "Take your Chickens and season" them, then to "lay them into your Coffin, and lay large Mace upon them." In some instances how the hands should be used is stated, however this is far less common and even

[224] Kate Smith, "In Her Hands", *Cultural and Social History*, 11, no. 4 (2014): 489-506.
[225] T. K., Doctor in Physick, *The Kitchin-Physician*, 5.
[226] *The Gentlewomans Cabinet Unlocked*, 22.

here there is a level of assumed knowledge. For example, in her recipe on how "To Roast a Shoulder of Mutton with Oysters" Woolley instructs her reader to take a variety of ingredients, including parboiled oysters and "the yolks of five or six hard Eggs" as well as, later, "three or four yolks of Eggs" and "mingle all these together with your hands."[227] Hands are also essential in forming animal parts and products into specific dishes, for example the recipe for "balls of veal mutton" which instructs the reader to mix the minced meat with various herbs as well as eggs, then to "make them like tennis balls, and crush them together with your hands."[228] Both of these examples come from recipes for more unusual and extravagant foods and thus there is more instruction required. This does not necessarily undermine the representation of the women preparing this food as skilled, but rather highlights that the purpose of recipes is to practically guide them to produce something new and unknown.

Similarly, recipes depict an assumed knowledge around the tools required to produce the food or medicine, representing women as skilled in and knowledgeable around kitchenware. Pennell's work is particularly significant in highlighting the perceived femininity of kitchenware in this period and the feminine expertise in this area.[229] Though she does not suggest that men were uninvolved or uninformed about kitchen utensils, she firmly establishes this area of material culture as a feminine one. This is significant in examinations of women's relationship with cookery and medicine production, with the tools used to perform these tasks also associated with the feminine. Whittle and Griffiths' work on the kitchenware owned by the Le Stranges is also significant here. While they stress that wealthier households tended to own more kitchenware, they noted that objects such as wooden trenchers and metal cooking pots were common across social status and that, while

[227] Woolley, *The Compleat Servant-Maid*, 111.
[228] Woolley, *The Cook's Guide,* 63.
[229] Pennell, *The Birth of the English Kitchen*, 94.

the wealthiest in society could have afforded silverware, the majority of people used pottery, wooden and metal kitchenware.[230] Thus while the recipes and guides discussed here may not have been intended for or written by women of lower status, many of the tools they discuss were at least similar to those used by the women around whom this project is centred. Indeed, Pennell highlights kitchen equipment as essential for the establishment of a household of any status level and stresses the role of women in the purchasing and trading of kitchenware.[231]

Often recipes do not specifically refer to tools. This is especially true of knives. Recipes for both food and medicine are full of instructions to "cut" or "slit" or "slice" ingredients, often without any reference to a knife (let alone any specific kind of knife) whatsoever. The only consistent mention of knives is in Woolley's writing on how to carve various birds.[232] That Woolley's text is aimed at gentlewomen who will be instructing servants is perhaps significant here. Indeed, to contrast her work once again with Ellis who is far more explicitly drawing on lower status experience, *The Country Housewife's Family Companion* makes no explicit reference to knives in its instructions on cutting or carving meats, suggesting this tool is taken for granted by those who regularly use it.[233] In all texts examined here, there is an assumption that any necessary tools will be on hand and women will already know which tools they need. Woolley refers as a given to the perhaps widest variety of tools, on one page alone referring to several types of dish for preparing and serving food – a "deep dish", a "dripping pan", a serving plate to "dish your mutton."[234] However, given her intended audience of those in elite households, this assumption of a wide variety of tools is not surprising. Both food and medicinal recipes refer to the use of a mortar (or morter) for grinding ingredients (both animal and herbal) and there is no stark difference

[230] Whittle and Griffiths, *Consumption and Gender in the Early Seventeenth-Century Household*, 144-145.
[231] Pennell, *The Birth of the English Kitchen*, 87; Ibid, 94.
[232] Woolley, *The Compleat Servant-Maid*, 35-39.
[233] Ellis, *The Country Housewife's Family Companion.*
[234] Woolley, *The Compleat Servant-Maid*, 111.

presented between the tools needed for cookery and those needed for medicine production. Tools generally are treated almost as flippantly as the hands, with recipes rarely specifying exactly which tools are needed for a particular task. Instead, there is an assumption that the reader will know which tools are required and have them to hand. Even the example of the knife requires existing knowledge, particularly for a servant in an elite household where there would have been more variety, as different knives can be used for different purposes.

It is therefore in what these recipes omit that their representation of women as skilled in the production of food and medicine, notably in working with animal parts and products, can be found. In assuming women have existing knowledge on how to prepare certain foods or medicinal ingredients, on what things should look, smell or taste like, and on how to use their hands or tools in these recipes, there is a clear assumption of their skill. Recipe books do not overtly state that women (or men) are skilled or talented in food or medicine production, nor do they make a point of omitting certain instruction. Yet it is the very mundanity of this assumed skill which is significant. This also highlights the practical context of these recipes and the assumption a reader would prepare the food or medicine described, as well as demonstrating how recipes were used to build on existing (often oral) knowledge, rather than as a basis for all cooking skill. Women are thus represented here as highly capable, not only of producing potentially complex recipes, but of having existing knowledge and skills to be able to do so. This is significant in the context of the association of this work with women, representing contemporary expectations of their prowess in this area, one crucial to their provisioning care for the household. That women's skill in this field is not overly acknowledged in these recipes is thus perhaps a reflection of the mundanity and acceptance of this duty to provision.

In conclusion, women's interactions with animals and their products as an ingredient in food and medicine are not gendered in the same ways as their work with living animals. Status did affect the quantities of animal parts and products available to women, as well as how they interacted with them, with lower status women more likely to be performing the work of cooking than higher-middling status or elite women. While the work of food and medicine production was associated with women, this association was far less strict than the gendering of women's work with living animals. This association with women was rooted in contemporary conceptions of women's duty to provision for the household. The recipes here do not present any limitations on the animals with which women could work as an ingredient based on gender, with recipes describing how to prepare a huge variety of animals as either food or medicine found across the sources examined. Nor do these present the resultant food or medicine as gendered, despite scholarship on the gendering of meat as masculine. There is no suggestion here that any food or medicine is more suited to men or women, other than in instances where a medicine is for a particular issue specifically relevant to gender. Similarly, the language used to describe the animals with which women worked here does not suggest any firm gendered connections between women and animals. In these recipes and instructional guides, animals are objectified in both life and death, with no alteration in the language used to describe living and deceased animals. They are thus placed firmly below humanity, including women, though with no specific representation of any gendered influence here. There are rare exceptions where dead animals are referred to with gendered pronouns, but even within the texts which use these pronouns their usage is inconsistent and does not reflect an anthropomorphising of the animal or a particular gendering of animals. Nor are these exceptions dependent on the intended gender of the reader, with this being atypical across all texts examined here. Finally, these recipes represent the women who work with animals as an ingredient in food or medicine as highly skilled. They do this in their

omission of information and instruction, reflecting an assumption of not only prior knowledge but prior skill and experience, even in recipes which are intended to be new. Women's interactions with animals as an ingredient are thus depicted as an area in which they are assumed to be skilled, though this skill is not overly acknowledged and is rooted in conceptions of women's duty to provision for the household.

Despite the association of women with this work and their assumed skill, the interaction with animals is thus not represented as affected by gender in these sources. In this examination, a more nuanced understanding of the impact of gender on the work women performed in food and medicine preparation is thus reached. While existing scholarship has establishing that this work was associated with women, in investigating women's interactions with animals as ingredient it becomes clear that this association had its limits.

Emotion

This chapter examines lower and middling status English women's emotional responses to animals. The traditional approach to relationships between humans and animals has been through the framework of companion animals. However, this framework is insufficient for examination of lower and middling women's emotional (or, significantly, often unemotional) interactions with animals. This chapter thus examines representations of women's positive emotional responses to animals, their negative emotional responses, and their lack of emotional response in ballads. A positive emotional response is defined here as one in which the woman felt something positive towards the animal. This could include loving or affectionate emotional responses, but more commonly is a perceived companionship on the part of the woman. A negative response is defined here as one in which the woman felt some sort of negative emotion towards the animal. This could be emotions such as fear and anger in modern understandings, but these emotional responses are rarely expressed explicitly as such. Therefore, though engaging with scholarship on companion animals, this chapter moves beyond this, taking a much broader approach to types of both animal and interaction. This chapter does not focus only on those animals termed companion animals or pets (neither term was used in this period, but both have been used in scholarship), such as cats, certain breeds of dog, or birds. Instead, any animal with whom lower and middling women were represented as interacting with is examined in this chapter. In broadening out this framework, a much wider variety of both relationship and animal is examined.

Women's emotional responses to animals, or lack thereof, are represented as varyingly affected by gender. In depictions of women's positive emotional responses to animals, gender is presented as having some impact. This is particularly true in ballads'

representation of stereotypical positive emotional interactions between women and cats. Here, the stereotype revolves specifically around women and the characters in these ballads are necessarily women. In depictions of women's positive emotional responses to animals which go beyond this stereotype gender has a more nuanced impact. The characters are generally necessarily women for some didactic purpose, but their emotional response to an animal is not presented as predicated on their gender. Significantly, the depiction of women's negative emotional responses and their lack of emotional responses is not reliant on their gender. None of these negative emotional or unemotional responses are presented as unique to women or dependent on their womanhood. This suggests that beyond didactic use and stereotype, gender was not perceived as relevant to humans emotional (or lack thereof) responses to animals.

This chapter draws on a wide range of scholarship. Building on historiography on companion animals discussed in the introduction, a much wider framework is established in which allows for examination of women's emotional responses to animals whose purpose (whether literally inside the house, or beyond) was broader than or even totally distinct from companionship. Lower status women in particular were much less likely to have animals with no functional purpose other than companionship and both lower and middling status women would be unlikely to be able to afford the more exotic companion animals (such as parrots) enjoyed by elites in this period. While Tague discusses "unprecedented" levels of "disposable income" and argues that "almost anyone" in eighteenth-century Britain would have been able to afford a songbird, it cannot have been common, nor is it presented as such, for lower status people before this period, nor what was still a significant proportion of the population in the early eighteenth century, to spend what little money they had on birds. Indeed, Carl Griffin states that culturally even in eighteenth-century Britain it was not acceptable for the poor to have such animals, and specifically notes that dogs could leave the poor in a place of

"constant suspicion" of poaching.[235] However, Griffin is also careful to note that the introduction of "game acts" in the eighteenth century demonstrates that the poor did indeed have dogs which needed to be legislated against.[236] Poorer men and women could and did have dogs and cats in this period, but these animals were far less likely to be kept only for companionate purposes. Animals, even if initially acquired freely or cheaply, cost money to maintain, particularly if they were contained in the house as a companion and thus not able to hunt or search for their own food. Indeed, it is far more common to find records of animals which served a purpose performing some sort of work for the household.

Both cats and dogs are principal examples of animals whose role as companions or working animals were constantly blurred for the lower and middling status women examined here. Beyond pure companionship, cats were commonly kept across the social spectrum to help contain mouse and rat populations. Similarly, dogs served a huge variety of roles, with Edward Topsell's 1607 *The Historie of Foure-Footed Beastes* devoting 53 pages to descriptions of different breeds of dogs their purposes, from bloodhounds bred for hunting to "the village dogge or housekeeper" bred to guard villages at night.[237] Hunting dogs are the key example discussed in scholarship on companion animals of dogs which worked for their masters as well as often sharing affectionate relationships. Again, this scholarship rarely addresses any period before the eighteenth century in great depth. These men's connections to their hunting dogs are seen, for example, in the "massive, elaborate dog kennels" of the eighteenth-century elite described by Tague.[238] Indeed, Tague explicitly highlights the relationships developed between men and their hunting dogs and horses before dismissing

[235] Carl Griffin, "Topologies of Tenderness and Violence: Human-Animal Relations in Georgian England," in *The Routledge Companion to Animal-Human History* edited by Hilda Kean and Philip Howell (London: Routledge, 2018), 331.
[236] Ibid.
[237] Edward Topsell, *The Historie of Foure-Footed Beastes* (London: Printed by William Iaggard, 1607), 137-190; Ibid, 150; Ibid, 160.
[238] Tague, *Animal Companions*, 44.

these as belonging to "a separate category," which she does not address or define in depth.[239] While Tague does not state that people in eighteenth-century England referred to animals explicitly as companion animals, she stresses that there was a firm contemporary distinction between working animals and animals owned for companionship.[240] Wealthy men's relationships with their hunting dogs and horses are probably the most discussed human-animal relationship which is not explicitly companionate. In English history alone, work such as Sarah Goldsmith's on dogs and masculinity in the eighteenth century highlights the emotional relationships which could develop between men and their hunting animals, while Catherine Bates' *Masculinity and the Hunt* (2013) demonstrates the importance of both hunting itself and these hunting animals to early modern notions of masculinity.[241] This existing scholarship is likely why Tague addresses these relationships between elite men and their hunting dogs, but this does not address the broader gap in companion animal scholarship. Lower and middling status women's emotional responses to animals which did not neatly fit into the categories of working animal and companion animal have thus not been discussed, nor have those animals to which women cannot be seen to have experienced an emotional response.

As this chapter is thus examining an emotional response (or lack thereof) to animals, scholarship on emotions is also important. First, it is important to define what is meant by emotion here. There is debate within the field over whether emotion should be considered as only those feelings which can be named (distinct from those which are "pre-discursive" and unnamed, referred to as affect), or in the modern usage as a catchall term.[242] In this chapter emotion is used to refer to those feelings which are both named and unnamed. Indeed, many

[239] Ibid, 4.
[240] Ibid.
[241] Sarah Goldsmith, "Dogs, Servants and Masculinities: Writing about Danger on the Grand Tour," *Journal for Eighteenth-Century Studies* 40, no. 1 (2017): 3-21; Catherine Bates, *Masculinity and the Hunt*.
[242] Barclay, *The History of Emotions*, 2-3.

of the emotions discussed here are not explicitly named in the primary sources but are instead only implied. There are various methods to examine the emotions of the past. Many scholars take a linguistic approach, examining what Katie Barclay refers to as "emotion words" (she gives the examples of love, hate and anger) to establish how people in the past understood and felt these specific emotions.[243] However, others use alternative methods to locate emotion. Rob Boddice urges historians of emotion to look "to insights from the neurosciences" to unpick what various emotions meant for people in any given historical period.[244] Others take altogether different approaches, such as Sarah Tarlow's and Alfred Gell's examinations of objects and emotion, or Ben Anderson's concept of an "affective atmosphere" where emotions can be located and spread through space rather than language.[245] Emotions can thus be conceptualised and located in a wider variety of ways, though the consistent warning running through scholarship on the history of emotions is to be cautious of imposing modern conceptions of emotion (whether as a broad concept or in the case of specific emotions) onto the past. In this chapter, no emotion words are used unless the source specifically states them. In general, this is rare and women's emotional responses to animals in ballads are gauged through wider context – their words and actions, the events which take place, and people's reactions to the woman and the animal. This is in part due to shifting understandings and perceptions of these terms, particularly in regard to animals (whereas today most people would have no issue with saying that people can love animals, this was not a given in seventeenth- and early eighteenth-century England). Moreover, it is often difficult to define the way these emotional responses are presented with a single word. For example, violence is often indicative of some sort of negative emotional response, and in modern understandings would probably be seen as indicative of anger. However, early

[243] Ibid, 9.
[244] Boddice, "The History of Emotions", 12.
[245] Sarah Randles, "Materiality," in *Early Modern Emotions: An Introduction*, edited by Susan Broomhall (London: Routledge, 2017), 17; Barclay, *The History of Emotions*, 113.

modern England was much more comfortable with violence than we are today, and it did not necessarily express anger. Husbands commonly beat their wives in this period, but this was not necessarily perceived as aggressive or even a sign of anger.[246] Indeed, this was an effort to correct improper behaviour and could be said to come from a place of care alongside the negative feelings around the behaviour itself. Caution is thus taken when assigning emotion here, and even the broader categories of positive or negative emotional response have been chosen with care.

Engagement with animal studies scholarship is also essential to this chapter, and Erica Fudge's work is a significant influence. Fudge's book *Pets* is particularly relevant to this chapter. In this book, she examines the concept of pet-owning throughout history in what she terms a more "theoretical" way which acknowledges the "affective and the philosophical importance" of these animals.[247] In her work, Fudge attempts to centre the animal experience in human-animal relationships, arguing that the animal perspective is valid in itself beyond offering insight into humanity. She asserts that animals and their experience are worth studying in their own right, not only for what we can gauge about humanity through them. She does this in various ways, though most successfully in her article on milking cows, where she stresses the importance of understanding animals' "sensory engagement with the world" in establishing their perspective.[248] Animals' perspectives are acknowledged in this chapter where possible, but largely only so far as whether they were presented as experiencing an emotional response to humans. Moreover, significantly, the animals discussed here were fictional, often used for literary purposes rather than to demonstrate genuine opinion of animal capabilities or emotions. It is only through expression of the animals' reciprocal

[246] Susan Dwyer Amussen, ""Being Stirred to Much Unquietness": Violence and Domestic Violence in Early Modern England," *Journal of Women's History* 6, no.2 (1994): 1-34.
[247] Erica Fudge, *Pets* (New York: Routledge, 2014), 3; Ibid, 4.
[248] Fudge, "Milking Other Men's Beasts," 27.

emotion that a relationship (an interaction beyond just an emotional response on the part of the human) is possible or visible. Thus, scholarship on early modern perception of animals' ability to feel emotion is also of significance here. Tague's discussion of early modern perception of animals' ability to feel emotion is of particular importance. Tague charts a shift in the understanding of animals across the early modern period, particularly in the later eighteenth century with the development of ideas of sensibility which she argues allowed people to conceive of animals as able to "participate as equals in emotional relationships."[249] Yet she notes an earlier acknowledgement of animal capacity for emotion and relationship, citing the ideas of Michele de Montaigne in the sixteenth century which posited that animals could and did experience emotion and, significantly, emotional relationships with humans.[250] Tague convincingly stresses that Cartesian ideas of animals as machines incapable of emotion or thought were far from universally accepted even in their own time, and states that by the eighteenth century conceptions of animals and their ability to experience emotion were drastically shifting.[251] Conceptions of animals' ability to experience emotion were thus not stable in the period examined in this thesis. While opinions were increasingly allowing for animal emotion, this was still a period when animals were held as inferior and lacking in reason. While in some circumstances animals were held to experience emotions and emotional relationships with people, in others they were presented as virtually inanimate objects, there for human use. These conflicting attitudes are somewhat reflected in the sources examined in this chapter, with no consistent narrative or assumption of animal emotion presented across this period. Indeed, change towards conceptions of a more emotional animal cannot even be tracked consistently, with some earlier sources suggesting animal emotion (though often for use as literary tool) and some later ones suggesting a

[249] Tague, *Animal Companions*, 348.
[250] Ibid, 350-2.
[251] Ibid, 351; Ibid, 352.

complete lack of animal emotion. However, in general, the sources examined here do not represent a widespread belief between 1600 and 1750 that animals genuinely felt emotions. This is why this chapter focuses on women's emotional responses (or lack thereof) to animals, rather than their relationships with them.

This chapter is based in an examination of ballads. The ballads discussed here have been located using the online databases Early English Books Online, Eighteenth Century Centre Online, and the English Broadside Ballad Archive. Search terms such as specific animal names ("dog", "lapdog", "cat", "cow", "songbird" etc.) as well as more general searches such as "pets", "companion animals", "women and animals" have been used to locate relevant sources. For each search term at least fifty sources have been examined (less only if fewer than fifty results were returned), with any irrelevant ones dismissed. The examples chosen for discussion here were selected to reflect common representations, and almost all of these examples survive with multiple copies and often reprints, suggesting their contemporary popularity. The searches were not tailored to only locate women's responses to animals. While women are the focus of this thesis, their interactions with animals cannot be fully understood if examined only in isolation. Therefore, several of the sources discussed here are explicitly about men, while others are not explicitly gendered at all.

For example, searching the term "cat " (with a space added in this instance to limit unrelated words which contain "cat" such as "delicate") yields fifty-two results on EBBA. Thirty-nine of these results actually mention cats in some way. Discounting duplicate sources, eleven ballads mention cats in relation to women, ten in relation to men, and five not in relation to people. A significant proportion of the ballads which mention any animal do so in a proverbial sense, most commonly through gender-neutral expressions such as "cat will after kind," suggestions of impossibility such as "When Cats do bark, and Dogs do mew," or

reference to alcohol that will "make a cat speak."[252] Almost all references to cats in relation to men are through such proverbs, while ballads which refer to cats in relation to women include proverbial references, metaphorical comparisons of women and cats, and examples of women actually having a cat. Women's associations with cats in these fifty-two ballads thus reveal a much closer connection in these representations between women and cats than between men and cats. This chapter goes beyond this, however, and examines women's emotional responses to animals, or their lack of emotional response, as depicted in ballads. Using ballads to assess women's emotional responses to animals raises its own challenges, particularly as both the women and the emotions depicted in ballads are fictional. Ballads offer a contemporary representation and perception of women and their emotional responses, not a reflection of these women's own thoughts and feelings. However, ballads' value, recognised even by contemporaries, as a "cultural barometer" allows for a careful assessment of contemporary popular thought about women and their interactions with animals.[253]

The ballads examined here date from across the period, though can largely be placed into three clusters. Several ballads date to the 1630s, a cluster date to roughly 1675-96, and several ballads date to the early-eighteenth century. Although these ballads thus date from over a 100-year period and were each written and published in very different contexts, their representation of women's emotional responses, or their lack, to animals does not drastically differ. In ballads from both the beginning and the end of the period women are depicted as exhibiting varied emotional responses. However, significantly, both ballads discussed here which depict a close relationship between a person and an animal date from the period 1675-96. This could signify a greater market for this type of story, or that these close relationships

[252] *The Mother and Daughter* (London: Printed for P. Brooksby, at the Golden-Ball, near the Hospital-gate, West-smithfield, 1672-96); *The Jolly Welsh Woman* (London: Printed for P. Brooksby, J. Deacon, J. Blare, and J. Back, 1675-96); J. S. fl., *The Young Mans Resolution to the Maidens Request. A Witty Dialogue Between a Young Man and a Maid* (London: Printed for Eliz. Andrews, 1663-1664).
[253] Marsh, *Music and Society,* 225.

were more conceivable later in the period, though these stories do not continue into the eighteenth century. It is not possible within the scope of this piece to fully assess the variations in ballads across this 150-year period, but that ballads which depict more typical interactions between women and animals, consisting of positive, negative and no emotional response, were published across the period suggests a consistency in representations.

In building on existing scholarship, this chapter will address the depiction of women's emotional responses to animals or lack thereof in ballads and whether and how these depictions were gendered. First, the stereotypes built on women's positive emotional interactions with cats are analysed, demonstrating an inherent reliance on gender in these depictions to make didactic comments on both women and the poor more generally. These stereotypes are reflected in representations of men's positive emotional interactions with dogs. Depictions of men's interactions are similarly reliant on gender, but do not carry the same didactic criticism as women's. Representations of women's positive emotional responses to animals beyond these stereotypes are then examined, finding a more nuanced depiction of the influence of gender here. The gender of the women presented in these ballads is relevant to the didactic message of the ballad, but generally less so to their emotional response to the animal. It is also in these ballads that animals are occasionally depicted as experiencing an emotional response to a person. The far less common case of women's negative emotional responses to animals is then examined, finding that these depictions are not reliant on gender. Finally, the most common representation of women's emotional interactions with animals is discussed – their lack of an emotional response. Once more, this lack of emotional response is not depicted as influenced by gender. These unemotional interactions with animals are presented as a typical human-animal interaction, unaffected by the characters being men or women. Gender thus has a complex and varying influence on depictions of women's emotional responses or lack thereof to animals in ballads.

Ballads from across the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries present a core common stereotype of lower and middling status women's emotional interactions with animals. These women, particularly poorer and older women, are represented as having close relationships and connections with cats. While the women themselves are depicted as experiencing positive feelings towards these cats, this was not presented as a good or normal thing. Indeed, women's positive emotional responses to animals were often represented to the detriment of the women described.

Cats offer a unique example of an animal which was considered both firmly a working animal and also a companion animal, serving to clearly demonstrate the limitations of the companion animal model. While dogs could be both working animals and companions, they were generally divided along breed lines into specific roles. Working dogs could incite emotions in their masters or mistresses, but they were not considered to be companions by contemporaries.[254] Cats, in contrast, were both working animals – given the task of catching rats and mice – and companions. They had a defined job and thus were not exclusively companion animals (in the historiographical definition). However, they lived within the house, partially for the purpose of carrying out this job. They were not commonly eaten – as can be seen in the pamphlet *Human Monsters!!* (1750) which describes the "depraved appetites" and "most brutal and beastly practices" of a man who ate live cats rather than "the ordinary food of mankind."[255] They were also often named, for example eighteenth-century poet Christopher Smart's cat Jeoffrey.[256] Yet cats' working role was often referred to, for example in the ballad *London's Glory, and Whittingtons Renown* where Sir Richard

[254] Tague, *Animal Companions*, 4.
[255] *Human Monsters!!* (1750).
[256] Christopher Smart, *Rejoice in the Lamb: A Song from Bedlam*, edited by William Force Stead (London: Jonathan Cape, 1939).

Whittington's cat's prowess at rat and mice catching is stressed.[257] Indeed, in this classic folktale, this prowess is what earns Whittington his fortune and place in elite society. Cats are represented as inherently linked with their working role in this source, with the cat's success in performing this work as the reason both cat and master were noteworthy. The cat is not presented as being uniquely talented – the cat's worth is due to a lack of cats and an overabundance of mice and rats. In this case, Whittington is not presented as having any sort of close relationship with this cat, nor an emotional response to the cat. Indeed, it is selling the cat which gains him his wealth. This source thus highlights that cats' working role was by no means forgotten or diminished in contemporary representations. However, while this role was never presented as something which prevented a positive emotional response, it did not inherently incite one either.

The representation of lower status women and cats in the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries can be seen to mirror that of elite women and their lapdogs from the later seventeenth century. These women were culturally tied to these animals, with the animals used to represent and criticise them, and these ties were rooted in perceptions of these women's positive emotional responses to the animals. Before examining this in depth for lower and middling status women, the stereotypes for wealthier women must be briefly addressed. Popular perception of wealthier women's (and men's) relationships with companion animals is well established in scholarship. Wealthy women's pets in this period were the object of much scorn and satire, with contemporaries commonly alluding to inappropriate (often sexual) relationships between women and their lapdogs and the lapdog itself regularly used as a tool to reflect broader issues. Jodi L. Wyett's work on lapdogs summarises this popular perception succinctly, describing these animals as "exotic luxury

[257] *Londons Glory, and Whittingtons Renown, Or, A Looking-Glass for Citizens of London* (London: Printed for R. Burton at the Horse-shoe in West Smithfield, 1640-74).

products, [and] objects of excessive and amoral consumerism," and lauding their presentation as a key insight into "social anxieties surrounding class, gender, sexuality, trade, nation, and empire."[258] Indeed, Tague argues that in figuring contemporary concerns in the image of pets, especially women's pets, satirists could minimise the anxiety these concerns caused.[259] Much of the scholarship on elite women and their lapdogs is focused on the eighteenth century, but the perceptions they discuss were already beginning to be established in the seventeenth century. This can be seen, for example, in the pamphlet *A Pleasant Battle Between Two Lap Dogs of the Utopian Court* (1681), in which two lapdogs representing Britain and France are used to display the worst of each nation.[260] In these satires, women and their pets become a shorthand for vice, seen as inherently negative and often inappropriate. Wealthy men too were the object of satires and mockery for their relationships with companion animals, but this tended to attack their masculinity rather than their morality.[261] Rather than necessarily suggesting these relationships made them immoral or bad people, it was generally suggested that they were effeminate and weak. This could be linked to their morality but was not necessarily targeting it. Wealthy women were thus explicitly tied to their companion animals in a distinctly feminine way.

Where elite women were culturally associated with their lapdogs, poorer women were culturally tied to cats. Cats could be used satirically to mock poorer women in the late seventeenth century, just as lapdogs were used to mock the elite, with these women's positive emotional responses to cats at the centre of these satirical criticisms. The 1695 ballad *Great News from Southwark* is a particularly clear example of the ways lower and middling status

[258] Wyett, "The Lap of Luxury", 277.
[259] Tague, *Animal Companions*, 97.
[260] *A Pleasant Battle Between Two Lap Dogs of the Utopian Court, or, A Dialogue between Asleep and Awake, Jest and Earnest, Reality and Fancy being Fought Upon the New Erected Dog-Put Lately Contrived Purposely Upon this Occasion as Aforesaid in the Anti-Chamber of the Said Court* (London: Printed for R. B., 1681).
[261] Tague, *Animal Companions*, 120.

women's positive emotions towards cats were used to express contemporary concerns about both femininity and the poor.[262] This ballad depicts a seemingly poor woman who starved herself and took charity to allow her cat to live off meat and upon her death left £1800 to the cat. While this story is sensational and the woman's relationship with her cat is presented as extreme, it highlights effectively the extremes of the satirical stereotype of old women's loving relationships with their cats and draws on wider social concerns. While the ballad never explicitly states any emotion from the woman herself (who is dead by the time her story is being told), the actions of this woman – prioritising her cat above herself and other humans and leaving the cat a large sum of money – suggest a positive emotional response towards the cat.

Through the lines "Her Family was very small; / A cat she kept, and that was all" this ballad highlights the strength of the connection between the woman and her cat. This connection is presented as going beyond norms, with the cat figured as not only "family," but as this woman's only family. This use of the word family is significant and must be considered in light of early modern conceptions of family. Naomi Tadmor's concept of household-family highlights the strength of the relationships formed between those living within a household together and the contemporary perception of these relationships as family.[263] Tadmor argues that the types of relationships which existed within this family varied, with some based in blood relation, others in marriage, and others in contracts between servant and master. Despite the unequal nature of many of these relationships, particularly between servant and master, these individuals combined to form the household family. Tadmor does not suggest that these bonds are inherently affective, however, and thus the use

[262] *Great News from Southwark; or, The Old Womans Legacy to her Cat* (London: Printed for James Read, 1695).
[263] Naomi Tadmor, *Family and Friends in Eighteenth-Century England: Household, Kinship, and Patronage* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004).

of "family" alone cannot be taken to necessarily signify a positive emotional response. That this woman has chosen her cat as family over other humans could suggest a representation of positive emotional response, but it is important to note that constructions of family in this period were not necessarily rooted in such emotions.

In this ballad, this early modern conception of family as including all those who lived in a household is explicitly extended to include non-human beings. However, this is presented as an unnatural extension. The magnitude of animals' inferiority to humans in contemporary thought prevents animals from being considered a true part of this household family. This cat cannot and does not contribute to the family in the way human family could but can only take resources from this woman. The way this woman treats her cat goes beyond accepted norms and calling this cat "family" only serves to further mock this woman, emphasising the extreme and unnatural nature of this emotional relationship. The positive emotions this woman feels towards her cat are presented as subverting the natural order, with the cat positioned as not only equal to humans, but superior to its owner. This is not only presented as unacceptable and wrong in this ballad, but repeatedly mocked. Indeed, the last line of the ballad highlights the ridiculousness of the relationship, stating that while she has promised all her money to her cat, "Puss must shew the Will for that." This joke plays on both the absurdity of the idea of a cat understanding a will and claiming its inheritance, but also the word "Will" itself is a pun. In order to obtain an inheritance, the cat would have to show the physical will, but would also have to have the will (as in awareness and autonomy) to understand these concepts of money, inheritance and law. With animals believed to lack reason in this period, this final joke highlights that the cat is nothing more than an animal and repositions the cat as firmly beneath humans once more.

Furthermore, this ballad thus also represents a key contemporary attitude to poor people owning animals for companionship. This woman's neighbours judge her for her

treatment of her cat, understandably questioning why she would allow herself to starve yet let her cat live in luxury. But this judgement goes deeper than mere disapproval of this treatment. It is her neighbours who have sustained this woman's life through charity and the shocking revelation that she had had money all along incites much anger in the community. When contemporaries perceived the poor as owning companion animals, they were criticised for wasting food and money, allowing their children to go hungry to feed an animal who brought nothing to the income of the family.[264] This ballad offers a clear example of the contemporary derision for the poor who kept pets at the expense of their own suffering as part of a wider contemporary debate around the poor and necessities. It was a common perception that those who could afford to keep a companion animal should therefore be able to afford to feed themselves, and Griffin notes that ownership of dogs was used to deny poor relief on these grounds.[265] The old woman in the ballad is described as "Miserable" and "wretchedly Covetous," and is presented as not only foolish but selfish. She deceives her neighbours and is an extreme example of contemporary fears and stereotypes around the poor. She is said to have "cheat[ed] and baffle[d]" her community and in doing so is presented as inverting the natural order, with animals being perceived to be prioritised over humans. Indeed, in taking her neighbours' money and denying them any inheritance, she positions her cat as superior to her neighbours as well as herself, further subverting the natural order. Furthermore, this could incite an emotional response (in this case negative) in the audience of the ballad, who are being encouraged to feel outrage over this woman's privileging of her cat over humans. The emotions incited by animals in ballads were thus not limited to the other characters within the ballad. In a time of economic hardship, women's positive emotional responses to their cats were thus used to discuss contemporary lack of resources and express concerns around the

[264] Tague, *Animal Companions*, 37.
[265] Griffin, "Topologies of Tenderness and Violence," 331-2.

poor. The woman in this ballad is at no point represented as typical, nor is there any suggestion that contemporaries genuinely believed a woman would do these things. This woman and her cat are used to demonstrate and discuss genuine contemporary concerns and highlight inappropriate behaviour.

In ballads throughout the seventeenth century, cats were firmly associated with women and femininity. Even in ballads not specifically about animals, old women and cats were paired together as a norm. For example, *A New Made Medly Compos'd out of Sundry Songs* (1675-96) includes the line "The Old Woman and her Cat sate by the Fire."[266] The ballad is intended to be humorous and depicts multiple situations which subvert expectations. This old woman is thus jokingly described as the "Love" of the narrator. The two lines establishing the old woman's presence and her position as the "Love" are her only mention in the entire ballad. That the woman is paired with a cat (significantly *her* cat) establishes a clear image in the audience's mind of the type of woman she is. This suggests that this stereotype of old women's positive emotional responses to cats and their pairing was firmly established in ballads by the late seventeenth century.

Indeed, in early modern representation, cats were consistently associated with lower and middling status women, while dogs (other than lapdogs) were associated with men. For example, in the ballad *John and Joan* (1634), the couple are described as equals (which is presented in a negative light) and repeatedly mirror each other's actions. While both are described as mistreating their animals, it is significant that John has a dog, while Joan has a cat.[267] More than merely presenting cats as a woman's companion, however, cats themselves are consistently feminised in seventeenth-century sources, while dogs are commonly

[266] *A New made Medly Compos'd out of Sundry Songs, For Sport and Pastime for the Most Ingenious Lovers of Wit and Mirth* (London: Printed for P. Brooksby, J. Deacon, J. Blare, and J. Back, 1675-96).
[267] *John and Joan: or, a Mad Couple Well Met* (London: For Tho: Lambert., 1634).

masculinised. Cats are almost always referred to as female; for example, the cat in the ballad *The Poplar Feast* (1685-88) is female: "Although she was dead she did force them to mew"; and the ballad *The Sorrowful Wife* includes a female cat: "I ran and thought for to make her afraid."[268] In addition to being literally feminised themselves, cats were also consistently used metaphorically in relation to women, particularly as an insult in relation to inappropriate behaviour such as violence. The ballad *Have Among You Good Women* (1634) offers a particularly clear example of this representation, with an immoral and violent woman described as a cat in the line "His face She will scratch like a Cat."[269] Similarly, the two women who fight in *A Pleasant New Song Called The Cony Barber* (1680-85) are described as "Like Cats" for the way that "they scratch and they claw" at each other.[270] That cats were linked not only to women and femininity, but specifically violent femininity in these representations is noteworthy. Cats were thus consistently feminised, both as beings themselves but also gendered feminine by their association with women. Representations of women and cats as connected and close highlight a contemporary stereotype of women's positive emotional response to cats and these representations mutually reinforced one another in ballads.

The association of cats with women was mirrored in these sources by a stereotypical association of dogs with men. Indeed, dogs were depicted as the male companion animal

[268] Samuel Rowlands, *A Crevv of Kind Gossips, All Met to be Merrie Complayning of their Husbands, with their Husbands Ansvveres in their Owne Defence* (London: Printed by W. W[hite] for Iohn Deane, and are to be sold at his shoppe at Temple-barre, 1613), 33; *The Poplar Feast: Or, A Cat-Pasty* (London: Printed for C. Dennison, at the Stationers-arms within Aldgate, 1685-88); *The Sorrowful Wife: Or, Love in a Tub* (London: Printed for J. Blare at the Looking-glass on London Bridge, 1685-88).
[269] *Have Among You Good Women or, a High-Way Discourse between Old William Starket, and Robin Hobs, going to Maydstone Market: Good Women before hand Let Me You Advise, to Keepe your Owne Counsell, and so be Held Wise. If Any One Taken in Ill Part What's Here said, Sheel Shew by her Kicking that shee's a Gauld Jade* (London: Printed at London: for Thomas Lambert, 1634).
[270] *A Pleasant New Song Called The Cony Barber, or, A young ladies delight, how she trim'd her maid, when she was on the straw asleep* (London: Printed for P. Brooksby, 1680-1685).

equivalent to cats, as can be seen in *John and Joan* with John's dog ownership presented as the masculine parallel to Joan's cat.[271] Representation of men as being especially close to their dogs was not uncommon in ballads. Indeed, men were presented as so connected to their dogs that they become one unit. For example, the 1675 ballad *My Dog and I*, tells the story of a man and his dog who do everything together – from "cur[ing]" women of their "Green-sickness" to going to war.[272] These actions also highlight the masculinity of dogs, with the activities carried out by this man and his dog specifically being the perceived hyper-masculine acts of having sex with women and fighting in a war. Indeed, this ballad compares this man and his dog to Prince Rupert and his dog, a common seventeenth-century example of a real man and his dog frequently depicted as one. The man in this ballad and his dog are depicted as so close that the dog comprises his entire family – "And have no bigger Family, / But only two, my and I." Here, there are no negative connotations as with the woman and her cat in *Great News from Southwark*, rather these lines in the ballad serve to demonstrate the unity of the man and his dog. The relationship between the man and his dog in this ballad is presented triumphant and masculine, rather than as unnatural and disturbing. The dog is simultaneously the man's inferior as his animal companion and an extension of his very self, acting as both a mirror for and a symbol of his masculinity.

This unity between a man and his dog continued into the eighteenth century, for example in the 1725 ballad *The Butcher's Kindness to the Taylor's Wife*.[273] In this ballad the butcher and the tailor's wife are having an affair. After complaining about a nasty smell, the wife reports that the smell is "my Husband's Dog, / which under the Bed does lye." Once the

[271] *John and Joan*.
[272] *My Dog and I. We Write no Flights of Dutch or French, no Courting of a Handsome Wench, no Monsters, Wonders in the Air, no Persons Dying in Despair; nor Any Thing Under the Sky, but Onely of my Dog and I* (London: Printed for F. Coles, T. Vere, J. Wright, and J. Clarke, 1675).
[273] "The Butcher's Kindness to the Taylor's Wife" in *The Cheating traders garland, containing two excellent new songs*, 5-8 (York: Printed by John White, 1725).

butcher looks under the bed, he sees the tailor's legs, then asks "Is this your Dog the Butcher said, / I'll kill you now outright." It is unclear whether the butcher is identifying the tailor by his dog, or whether (as seems more likely) he is referring to the tailor as the wife's dog. This is a deliberate play on words which blurs the boundary between the man and his dog and uses "dog" to insult a man. Indeed, whichever meaning is intended the tailor is aligned with his dog and they are identified as one unit, and in doing so the tailor is insulted. Here, the tailor's masculinity is not reinforced, however. Rather this conjunction of man and dog serves to position the tailor as inferior, aligned with the animal. It is thus noteworthy that this pairing of man and dog could be used to both reinforce masculinity as well as undermine it, depending on the intention of the author. These ballads use no specific emotional language around the relationship or interactions between these men and their dogs, but establish an inherent connection between them mirroring that of women and cats and similarly reliant on gender. This stereotype of a positive and inherent connection between men and dogs significantly is not used in an exclusively negative way, as the stereotype of women's perceived overly emotional and overly attached relationships with their cats is. While these stereotypes are thus in many ways similar, it is significant that women's relationships with their cats are stereotyped specifically as emotional and represented as negative because of this.

Women were depicted having positive emotional responses to animals beyond this stereotype and in these instances the influence of gender is far more nuanced. Women's positive emotional responses to cats are also represented in the ballad *Come Buy a Mouse-*

Trap (1647), where cats are figured as women's saviours.[274] In this ballad, a lecherous man is referred to as a "Rat" and the woman he attempts to seduce is told she does not need a cat but should instead "Come buy a new Mouse-Trap to catch an old Rat." The assumed connection here between women and cats is noteworthy, with a lack of "good Cats" to protect women lamented at the start of the ballad. Here cats could be seen to refer to good men (as opposed to the bad ones who are described as rats), but the ballad does not explicitly give any gender to the cats it references. Indeed, the woman's husband is also a central character of this ballad and presented as good man who helps her to deal with the "rat," but he is not described as a cat. This ballad positions cats as women's protectors and in doing so suggests dependency on them. But in informing women of an alternative method to combat such "rats" rather than needing to rely on cats, the ballad nullifies this existing relationship. Women "have no need of a Cat" anymore as the rats are no longer real rats, but metaphors for dangerous men. Cats are now replaced by their husbands, with whom they were expected to have a far greater emotional tie than to a cat. While this ballad is intended to be humorous, it also re-establishes the husband as the figure on whom women should be dependent and undermines their positive emotional response to cats by eliminating their purpose. This representation thus inherently ties any emotional response women could have to cats in this period to the cat's working role. Here gender is significant, with this this representation building on the stereotype women's of inappropriately close relationships with cats but moving beyond this to make a wider didactic point about marriage. Cats are figured as useful for women's companionship and protection only when they do not have husbands.

While women had a particularly strong association with cats in this period, there were other animals to which they had emotional responses in ballads and, significantly, where

[274] *Come Buy a Mouse-Trap, or, A new way to catch an old rat: being a true relation of one Peters a Post of Roterdam, who temping [sic] an honest woman to leudnesse, was by her and her husband catch in a mouse trap, by what meanes the following story shall relate* (London: Printed by John Hammond, 1647).

animals were depicted having an emotional response themselves. For example, in *A Worthy Example of a Vertuous Wife* (1658-64) a starving woman expresses a bittersweet envy and hope towards a chick and a mouse, who can sustain themselves on "those most precious crumbs, / which they away do throw." The lines "O that some pretty little mouse, / so much my friend would be, / To bring some old forsaken crust, / into this place to mee" highlight her desperation – she is literally begging for scraps of food from a mouse and would even consider the mouse her friend if one would help her. This woman is thus positioned as inferior to the mouse, lowlier and more starving than scavengers and pests. Moreover, friendship suggests a supportive and mutual relationship, implying she believes the mouse could reciprocate these positive emotions. This further highlights the woman's desperation. The ballad does not suggest that a mouse would or could return her positive emotions, indeed all of this woman's wishes are presented as futile and unlikely to the extent of impossibility. Yet she still begs for a mouse to bring her scraps and be her friend. Indeed, more than this implied reciprocal emotion, the woman even describes a chick as "happie" when it finds food to eat. Here the woman projects her own emotions onto the chick, further highlighting her own desperation for food. This woman earnestly hopes animals to be capable of emotional responses in return to her own in order that she might survive. This exaggerates the tragedy of her situation, particularly as the audience already knows this woman will starve to death. This woman is, of course, fictional and not necessarily reflective of real lower status women's thoughts or desires. However, as a representation of the poorest women in society this is revealing. In aligning this woman with these animals and presenting them as her only solution, she is figured as pathetic and the audience is encouraged to feel sympathy for her. That the woman is depicted not only as feeling such positive emotions towards these animals, but as believing they could feel them in return serves to highlight the extent of her desperation. Here, gender is relevant in the presentation of this woman a virtuous wife who

has sacrificed herself for her husband in the ultimate fulfilment of her provisioning duties. However, in her interactions with animals gender is not depicted as having an impact. That this character is not presented as affecting the way she envies these animals or the friendship (and food) she desires from them.

Ballads presenting women's positive emotional responses to animals often depicted the animal as capable of experiencing emotion for literary purposes. Notably, the 1684-86 ballad *The Woody Queristers* is written from the perspective of several different kinds of birds, each of which has loved a woman and lost that love in some way, whether unrequited, through death or simply her loss of interest.[275] The birds lament their lost loves – the blackbird now "mourn[s] in Black," the lapwing "[flies] in deadly pain." That this ballad uses birds to express heartbreak does not necessarily suggest that contemporaries believed birds to be capable of such emotion, but it is significant that they were perceived to be a genuine poetic choice to tell these tales. While ballads were intended to entertain, the tone of this ballad does not suggest that the listener is supposed to laugh at the birds for experiencing emotional pain, rather that they should pity them. The didactic message of this ballad is "Let this to all a pattern be, For to Delight in Constancy." It is through the birds' emotion that the listener is reminded of the importance of faithfulness. Whether audiences felt sympathy or laughed at the birds in this ballad, it is also significant that animals are used here explicitly to incite an emotional response. The audience of this ballad was expected to have some emotional response to the (albeit fictional) animals they heard about here. If the birds in this ballad are taken as literal (rather than metaphorical) birds, it seems likely that they were kept as companion animals (perhaps by the more middling women examined here, rather than those from the poorer end of society) and are lamenting their lost mistresses. While the ballad does not offer the voices or perspectives of the women who have left these birds, the birds

[275] *The Woody Queristers* (London: Printed for I. Clarke, W. Thackeray, and T. Passinger, 1684-1686).

here clearly believe that at one point the women loved them, before turning their affections elsewhere. This ballad does not necessarily suggest that contemporaries believed that birds were genuinely capable of experiencing emotions. Here, birds are figured as creatures which are quickly loved and quickly forgotten when their mistresses move on to newer things. They thus are used to represent men who are quickly abandoned by inconstant women. In using birds to metaphorically represent women's fickleness, this ballad suggests that contemporaries did believe positive emotional responses to animals were at the very least a viable literary technique.

Indeed, the use of birds, particularly birdsong, as a literary device was well-established by this period. Birdsong was particularly commonly used in literature to represent giving a voice to the voiceless. This can be seen in the story of Philomela in Ovid's *Metamorphoses* where Philomela is raped and has her tongue cut out, taking away her ability to speak. Upon achieving revenge for what was done to her, Philomela is transformed into a nightingale who can once again communicate through her song.[276] In giving voice to the voiceless, birdsong is also depicted as saving lives, as in Aesop's fable *The Swan and the Goose* where the swan's song saves it from the cook.[277] These classical tales would have been known to early modern audiences and their use of birdsong as a literary trope is reflected in early modern sources. A particularly relevant example of this is birdsong giving voice to the voiceless in an expression of emotion in Orlando Gibbon's 1612 *The Silver Swan* where the swan sings out for death at the end of her life.[278] Birdsong as a way to express that which could not be otherwise expressed was thus a well-established literary trope in the early modern period. The use of birds singing this ballad similarly gives a voice to those otherwise

[276] Ovid, *Metamorphoses*, trans. Charles Martin (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 2004), 206-218.
[277] Aesop, "The Swan and the Goose", *Fables of Aesop*, Nov 26, 2013, accessed June 29, 2022, https://fablesofaesop.com/the-swan-and-the-goose.html.
[278] Orlando Gibbons, "The Silver Swan", *Poetry Foundation*, accessed June 29, 2022, https://www.poetryfoundation.org/poems/50405/the-silver-swan.

unable to express their emotion – whether literal birds or jilted lovers. Gender is significant in this literary emotional interaction between women and birds. The birds are used to represent male suitors and the women in this ballad are used as didactic warnings about the pain caused by such fickle women. This representation of an emotional interaction is thus entirely dependent on the genders of the birds and women in depicts.

Similarly, the 1685 ballad *The Sorrowful Lamentation of the Pedlars, and Petty Chapmen, for the Hardness of the Times, and the Decay of Trade* presents an assumption that cows experienced emotion.[279] This ballad describes the difficult lives and work of pedlars in this period and highlights the value of their wares, including "choice of Songs and merry books too." It is suggested that these songs may be whistled by a "young swain […] at Plough" and, significantly, that "Every fair Milk-Maid may sing to her Cow." It is noteworthy that men ploughing are not described as whistling *to* anyone, indeed no reference to any ploughing animals is made at all. In contrast, milkmaids' work is inseparable from the cow. Yet the milkmaid is not described as singing *near* her cow or even merely singing while milking her cow, as the "swain" whistles while doing his work. Instead, it is suggested the milkmaid could sing these songs *to* her cow. This presents milkmaids singing to cows as normal and acceptable, but also the notion that there was some worth in this. There is no suggestion here that the milkmaid would necessarily feel anything towards the cow while singing this song; indeed, the relationship may well have been entirely functional. However, the use of "to" suggests a deliberate inclusion of the cow in this and a relationship of some form with another living being. Even if this relationship was entirely functional, and the calming emotions expressed intended as a practical way to soothe the cow rather than an

[279] *The Sorrowful Lamentation of the Pedlars, and Petty Chapmen, for the Hardness of the Times, and the Decay of Trade* (London: Printed for I. Back, at the Black-boy on London-bridge, 1685).

expression of love, the milkmaid could not sing to her pail or churn, but she could (and did in this ballad) sing to her cow.

This could reflect only a literary motif of cows' ability to feel emotions. However, considered in light of Fudge's work on contemporary perception of cows and emotion singing *to* a cow takes on deeper dimensions. In her article on the crime of milking others' cows, Fudge highlights the importance of a potential milker developing close relationships with the cows they intend to milk.[280] She states that in both modern and contemporary understanding, cows are prey animals and prone to nervousness and potential violence if scared.[281] Fudge centres the cow as a victim in this crime and discusses how the cow would be affected by this crime, noting that an unfamiliar milker could cause a cow enough stress that she stops producing milk.[282] Fudge's work demonstrates that contemporaries believed cows were able to experience emotions, and specifically in response to people. Similarly, Herbert notes the contemporary conception that women working with cows should be "gentle, soft-spoken, and kind."[283] She finds that throughout the period examined here, guidebooks and imagery of dairymaids depicted them as "happy" to be doing their work and stressed the importance of maintaining a good relationship with the cow to avoid scaring it.[284] Indeed, Herbert similarly highlights a contemporary anthropomorphising of cows, which are presented as similarly happy and explicitly feminised in early modern text.[285] The assumption that the milkmaid would sing a new song *to* her cow reflects this perception that cows could feel fear and be soothed. In this case, the gender of the milkmaid is significant so far as it was

[280] Fudge, "Milking Other Men's Beasts."
[281] Ibid, 27.
[282] Ibid.
[283] Herbert, *Female Alliances*, 99.
[284] Ibid, 100.
[285] Ibid, 99.

a woman depicted as doing this work. However, there is no suggestion in this ballad that the emotion in the interaction is dependent on the fact that it is a woman singing to this cow.

Representations of women's positive emotional responses to animals thus varied in this period and are often difficult to pin down to specific emotion words. These sources present a conception in popular culture that women could experience positive emotions towards animals. Outside of the stereotype of women and cats, these emotional responses were rarely the central theme of the ballad. They were often used so support a wider didactic message, such as sympathy for the poor or the benefits of song. However, that these positive emotional responses were depicted at all is significant. These positive emotional responses depict a far more nuanced effect of gender on the presentation of women's emotional interactions with animals. While the fact that the characters in these ballads are women is often relevant to the didactic message of the ballad, in most cases their womanhood is not central to the emotional response or interaction with the animal.

Lower and middling status women were also represented as experiencing negative emotional responses to animals in ballads in this period, though this is the least common representation with only one clear example. This is significant and suggests that this type of emotional response to animals was not perceived as typical or a useful literary device by ballad authors. The ballad *The Poets Dream: or, The Great Out-Cry and Lamentable Complaint of the Land Against Bayliffs and their Dogs* (1683) depicts an explicitly negative emotional response to a bailiff's dog.[286] This ballad does not specifically refer to women's relationships with animals, rather depicts the poor's opinions on bailiffs' dogs. In this ballad,

[286] *The Poets Dream: or, The Great Out-Cry and Lamentable Complaint of the Land Against Bayliffs and their Dogs* (London: Printed for P. Brooksby at the Golden Ball near the Bear Tavern in Pye Corner, 1683).

the bailiff and his dog are presented as a unit (reflecting the stereotype of men and dogs discussed above), and both are the target of the poor's negative emotions.

Carl Griffin's work on human-animal violence is pertinent in examination of the negative emotional responses to animals this ballad depicts.[287] Griffin discusses dogs in particular as "symbols of class oppression" and argues that dogs were figured as extensions of their elite owners by the poor, who then enacted violence against these animals from both fear of the creature itself and in angry an attempt to harm their owner.[288] Significantly, Griffin states that both working guard dogs and dogs kept for companionship and as symbols of status were perceived in the same way by the poor, suggesting that Tague's firm line between working and companionate animals was not necessarily always perceived to be so firm by contemporaries.[289]

The negative emotional responses to the dog in this ballad are inherently tied to the negative emotional responses to the bailiff, with the dog presented as an extension of its master. Just as the man in *My Dog and I* does everything with his dog, the bailiff in this ballad is consistently followed around by his dog, with the two almost always cited as a pair – for example "Toby and Dog's Employ'd," "has Bayliffs and their Dogs for Friends," "'Tis seldom a Bayliff or his Dog, / is ever known for to go to Church." The bailiff in *The Poets Dream* is not presented as a triumphantly masculine figure. Aligning him with his dog does not elevate him or the dog to higher status. Rather the man is lowered to the status of an animal, with both maligned by the poor community and the bailiff's higher social position reduced to that of his dog. Dogs, depending on their breed, could signify much about their master's social position and were thus powerful literary allegories, particularly in ballads.

[287] Griffin, "Topologies of Tenderness and Violence".
[288] Ibid, 331.
[289] Ibid.

This ballad demonstrates a contemporary perception of the connection between dogs and thieves – "From Thieves to Bayliffs-Dogs have turn'd" – and in doing so positions the bailiff as a figure akin to the thief. Similarly, the bailiff and his dog are said to associate with "Moore-field Mobbs, and Whetstone-W[hores]." Bailiffs are thus positioned amongst the lowest in society, both at a human level and, significantly, in unifying them with their dogs at an animal level.

Beyond being merely a working relationship where the two perform their jobs side by side, the bailiff and his dog are presented as interchangeable. The dog comes to represent the bailiff in this ballad and thus receives just as much negative emotional response as the bailiff himself. Indeed, the dog is even said to report on people's misbehaviour – "If Cullies fight in a Drunken fit, / Away goes Toby's Dog for a Writ." It is most notably in their aggressive and (significantly) frightening behaviour that the bailiff and his dog are presented as not only performing equivalent tasks in their roles – "The Bayliffs Yell, the Dogs did Bark" – but in being one and the same – "a Baylif and his Dog to Bite." This representation of the dog as sneaky and violent and in this way inciting fear is significant. Violence was a common method of maintaining social hierarchy in this period, even within loving relationships, with spousal violence perceived as appropriate provided it was not too extreme.[290] The violence of the bailiff and his dog is thus not unusual in this context; however, the ballad presents this violence as beyond acceptable limits. This is the cause of the poor's anger and fear in this ballad.

This ballad does not depict a gendered expression of emotion specific to either men or women; rather, it is intended to represent the poor as a whole. That this negative emotional response is not gendered is significant, particularly given the association of dogs with men.

[290] Susan Dwyer Amussen, ""Being Stirred to Much Unquietness"".

While positive emotional interactions with animals were the subject of gendered stereotypes in ballads, these negative emotional response are centred around status-specific concerns rather than related to gender or gendered expression of emotion.

Finally, just as ballads depict positive and negative emotional responses to animals, there are many cases where animals are mentioned in relation to people but seemingly no emotional response is incited. Indeed, animals are most often alluded to as background figures rather than the central characters in ballads. A lack of emotional response is the most common representation of women's response to animals in ballads and in all of these cases the animal is objectified, and often presented as a commodity. This objectification of the animals was in line with contemporary perceptions of animals more broadly. It is hardly surprising that this perception of animals as objects is particularly strongly represented where the humans in the ballads are depicted as feeling no emotional response to animals.

Even in cases of violence towards animals, ballads present a lack of emotional response. For example, in *John and Joan*, where John's beating of his dog and Joan's beating of her cat are presented as a common occurrence.[291] These animals are only referred to once in the entire ballad, indeed these two lines of the ballad have been discussed already above in relation the gendering of cats and dogs. Here, it is the actions towards these animals which is significant. That Joan beats a cat is noteworthy, demonstrating that women's emotional responses to cats were not always represented as positive. Both John and Joan are depicted beating their pets, suggesting this is not a uniquely masculine or feminine interaction with an animal. No reason or explanation is given for this violence. The entire description of the event is twelve words long – "If Iohn his dog had beaten, / then Ioan would beat her cat."

[291] *John and Joan*.

This statement is part of a list of foolish and damaging actions, including burning and breaking their clothes and kitchenware. It is significant that the animals' abuse is listed in conjunction with the breaking of objects. Further, unlike in literary depictions of positive emotional responses, neither the cat nor the dog are depicted as experiencing any emotional response towards John or Joan. This reflects early modern conceptions of animals as objects and is common in representations of animals in ballads across the period. However, while the burning and breaking of hats and pots is presented as foolish accidents, the beating of the cat and dog is a deliberate and conscious choice, much like many of the other actions of the pair in this ballad, such as drinking in alehouses. The couple in this ballad are presented as violent people. That no specific reason is given for the beating of their pets suggests that this violence was frequent and normal enough (whether specifically for John and Joan, or for any individual) not to warrant providing one. While both John and Joan are presented as exhibiting inappropriate and exceptional behaviour, the criticism of their actions of beating their pets is based in the illogical nature of these beatings. Violence against animals was normalised in this period, particularly to correct bad behaviour. For example, scholarship often cites the poorly treated turnspit dog (tasked with running in a wheel above the fire in large kitchens to turn the spit on which meat cooked) as an example of an animal whose life was "not pleasant," with cooks commonly throwing hot coals into the wheels to encourage them to run faster.[292] John and Joan are thus not criticised for their violence towards their pets, nor is this presented as an expression of any emotion. Indeed, these actions are the subject of criticism in this ballad precisely because of their nonsensical origins. That this behaviour is not gendered in this ballad is also significant. While both John and Joan are criticised for inappropriate behaviour, there is no suggestion that Joan's beating of her cat is morally worse than John's beating of his dog.

[292] Coren, *Pawprints of History*, 171.

Objectification of animals is at the core of representations of women and animals where no emotional response was depicted. In such representations in particular animals are presented as a commodity. For example, the 1680 ballad *The Young-man & Maidens Fore-cast; Shewing how they Reckon'd their Chickens Before they were Hatcht* depicts a young woman who buys "Thirteen to the Dozen of Eggs" and begins making plans immediately for how she will spend the money she expects to receive from the "five Capons" she predicts will hatch.[293] All of her plans involve buying more animals – first a pig, which she will breed to buy a ewe, which she planned to breed to buy a calf. Unfortunately for this young woman, she slips and breaks all of her eggs before they can hatch. A young man also buys eggs and similarly makes plans to make money by creating a cockfighting ring once they hatch, but this man also breaks all of his eggs before they can hatch. The moral of this ballad is clear and is still a common expression today – do not count your chickens before they hatch, do not make assumptions about the future based on speculation rather than fact. But it is the actual events which take place in the ballad which are of interest here, particularly with regards to the woman. Each animal here is viewed as a commodity by this woman. The only purpose for these animals that the ballad presents is financial gain. The smashed eggs themselves are not described, instead the ballad states "There lay her Pigs, her Chickens, her Lambs." The loss is not the eggs themselves but their potential, and this potential, figured through animals, is a financial potential. There is no suggestion that the woman felt any emotional attachment to the future chickens, pigs, sheep or calf, let alone to the eggs. Indeed, the ballad immediately moves on to the man's parallel tale without addressing the woman's feelings at all. The loss represented in this ballad for both the woman and the man is a financial one; there is no suggestion that losing the animals themselves would incite emotion out of care for the

[293] *The Young-man & Maidens Fore-cast; Shewing how they Reckon'd their Chickens Before they were Hatcht* (London: Printed for P. Brooksby, 1680).

creature. The only implied emotion for either woman or man is disappointment at the crumbling of their plans and the financial loss this entails. In this way, these animals are figured as a commodity and a tool for this woman, not as creatures in their own right, nor as something which could incite an emotional response. That both a man and a woman are presented as exhibiting the same lack of emotional response to animals is significant. This highlights a representation of a lack of emotion towards animals as the norm across genders.

The Farmers Wifes Complaint Against the Ladys Comodes and Top-Knots (1687-91) presents a particularly interesting case of a woman's lack of emotional attachment to animals.[294] The purpose of this ballad is to satirise and criticise elite women and their fashion, but it also offers valuable insight into contemporary perceptions of emotional responses and animals. This ballad is a relatively typical example of a monstrous birth tale. As such, the animals in it are not presented as inciting emotion. In this ballad, a farmer's wife criticises a wealthy woman for her elaborate hairstyle of "Top Knots of Ribbonds full six stories high." She complains that this woman walked by the farm "Whilst Colly took Bull" and frightened both animals, disrupting the mating process. Not only this, but the resultant calf was "ruin[ed]" and born with "A Top Knot like Ribbonds full half a yard high." This reflects contemporary perceptions of the impact of shock on pregnancy and is a typical example of a monstrous birth story. Significantly for this chapter, the woman *does* have an emotional response, though not primarily to her animals. She is "griev'd" to see the calf born with a topknot, demonstrating an emotional response to the appearance of her animal, but not to the animal as a creature. Indeed, there is no implication that she is "griev'd" because she is concerned for the calf. Moreover, her primary emotion is anger, and this anger is directed at the wealthy woman who disturbed her cow and bull. The farmer's wife threatens to "tear all

[294] *The Farmers Wifes Complaint Against the Ladys Comodes and Top-Knots. For hindring their Cows going a Bulling* (London: Printed and Sold by T. Moore, 1687-91).

their Riggin" if any such women come near her cow whilst mating again, and the entire ballad is an expression of her anger at this woman for affecting her cow and the resultant calf. The farmer's wife expresses no concern for the cow, bull or calf themselves, viewing them only as commodities which have been harmed. Yet the animals in this ballad are presented as experiencing emotions and having emotional reactions to people, with both the cow and the bull being frightened by the wealthy woman's elaborate hair, while neither this woman nor the farmer's wife express any emotion towards the animals themselves. The more common depiction of a human emotional response and an animal's lack of emotion is here reversed. This reversal further highlights the absurdity of the wealthy woman's fashion (so ridiculous that it incites emotion in animals), the real butt of this ballad, and reflects the subversion of norms inherent in a monstrous birth. While women's associations with cats fed into representations of positive emotional responses to cats, their associations with cows do not thus lead to representations or perceptions of any kind of emotional response to the animal itself.

Animals in this period were commodities, both in real terms and in popular thought, and the lack of emotional response to them presented in most ballads is thus unsurprising. That this lack of emotional response is not gender-specific in these representations is thus also unsurprising in this light. The perception of animals as commodities remained steadfastly true regardless of gender where no emotional response to an animal is depicted. That women are not presented as necessarily developing an emotional response to or relationship with the animals with which they interacted is significant. Yet that this is not presented as a uniquely female response (or lack thereof) results in a representation of a common human experience of lack of emotion to animals.

In conclusion, lower and middling status women in ballads are presented as experiencing both positive and negative emotional responses to animals, as well as (most commonly) no emotional response at all. Stereotypes of specifically female or male relationships to animals were common in ballads, with lower status women tied to cats and men tied to dogs. These stereotypes depict positive emotional responses to animals, but this emotion is mocked in women and the stereotype of poor old women and cats presented negatively. The poor woman's cat in particular is a core example of an animal which flouts the historiographical construction of companion animals. The stereotypes presented in these ballads serve to further undermine this distinction between working and companionate animals. It is also these stereotypes which offer the most explicitly gendered emotional response to an animal. Animals and emotion were tied together in these stereotypes to comment on contemporary concerns about women and society more generally. In this way ballads reflected the stereotypes of wealthy women and lapdogs depicted in satires. Gender was thus at the core of these representations of women and cats.

It is in representations of positive emotional responses to animals beyond these stereotypes that there is any suggestion that animals could feel an emotion back. This was most commonly depicted in metaphors and used for literary purposes. However, in certain circumstances, such as representations of cows, these emotional responses of animals can be seen to line up with the popular conceptions discussed by Fudge. These positive emotional responses to animals are presented with the most nuanced impact of gender discussed in this chapter. The characters in these ballads are necessarily women for the didactic message of the ballad, but the interaction with the animal and the emotional response therein is presented as varyingly affected by gender. In some cases, the fact that the character is a woman is significant in the emotions depicted, but in most there is no suggestion that gender would have altered the emotional interaction at all.

Far more common was the conception that animals could not experience emotion. Indeed, the overall perception from the beginning to the end of the period examined here is that animals did not experience emotion. Even in the depiction of a human negative emotional response, where the bailiff's dog incites fear and anger, the animal itself is not depicted as experiencing an emotion. That there is only one such depiction in the ballads examined here is noteworthy, suggesting these negative emotions towards animals were not perceived as common by these sources. These negative emotional responses to animals which do not rely on stereotypes of overly-emotional relationships are not presented as gendered. The women experiencing these emotions are not depicted as uniquely feminine in feeling negative emotions towards an animal, nor are the emotions depicted presented as specifically feminine emotions.

Most commonly women (and men) are presented as experiencing no emotional response to or relationship with an animal. Animals are largely presented as creatures (indeed, often objects) which elicited no emotion. In such depictions, animals are presented as objects and commodities rather than living beings. If emotions related to these commodity-animals were depicted, they were emotions over damaged property, rather than any sort of sympathy or emotional response to the animal itself. These depictions, too, are not gendered but presented as a norm for all humans. That these depictions are the most common and not influenced by gender suggests these ballads were presenting a more unified human response to animals.

This chapter goes beyond current scholarship in re-examining and redefining how women's interactions with animals are examined. The framework of companion animals is built upon, using approaches from the history of emotions, to establish what kind of emotional responses and interactions lower and middling status women are represented as having in this period. In examining these emotional responses through a gendered lens,

whether and how gender had an impact on these representations can be ascertained. It is significant that neither negative emotional responses or a lack of emotional response to animals are depicted as influenced by gender. Only in making didactic points specifically about women and in representations of positive emotional responses, particularly through the use of stereotypes, are women's emotional responses to animals depicted as affected by gender. In presentations of women's emotional responses to animals, the use of women's positive emotions towards animals was thus an accepted and useful method for ballads to moralise.

Conclusion

In conclusion, in ballads, instructional guides and recipe books from England in the period 1600-1750 the influence of gender on representations of lower and middling status women's interactions with animals is complex. In depictions of women's work with animals, gender is presented as having a strict influence. The influence of gender on representations of women's work with animals as ingredients and on portrayals of women's emotional responses or lack thereof to animals is far more nuanced.

Scholarship has not yet examined lower and middling status women's interactions with animals in any significant depth. Examination of their work with animals is primarily focused on dairy as an industry, while analyses of food and cooking in this period focus more on consumption and ritual than the individuals preparing the food. Work on women's emotional responses to animals is focused on the elite and their companion animals, with little to no discussion of those lower down the social scale. This thesis builds on this existing scholarship to examine representations of these interactions in greater depth and through a gendered lens. In combining varied fields of scholarship and taking this gendered approach, new insight is gained into how women were represented in this period. Gender is found to be central to certain depictions of lower and middling women's interactions with animals. Where gender is represented as significant, it often affects the specific types of animals with which women are presented as interacting – the animals they work with in life, as well as those to which they are stereotyped as having a positive emotional response. However, there are also many areas where gender does not influence representations of women's interactions with animals. That women are performing the work of food and medicine production does

not affect the interaction with the animal ingredients or the food or medicine produced in these depictions. Similarly, a negative emotional response to a dog figured as representative of class injustice and the lack of emotional response to animals as a whole presented as common in ballads from this period are not influenced by gender. All areas of women's interaction with animals which are not depicted as influenced by gender are areas which were far less strictly gendered in this period. They are also areas which reflect a commonality between humans – all humans have to eat, just as all the poor are collectively enraged at injustice, and all humanity is distinct from the animal, viewing animals as commodities.

Representations of women's work with living animals in ballads and instructional guides show gender as heavily influencing these interactions with animals. Lower and middling status women's work with animals is depicted as firmly gendered, with these women depicted as working only with certain animals and in certain roles, performing the practical caring work and nursing for cows, pigs, and poultry as well as collecting their products. Though the level of physical involvement alters, as does whether or not they were paid, women remain tied to the same animals and work across social and marital status in these representations. Indeed, these animals and this work are presented as so strongly associated with women that men could not be conceived of as performing this work. This work with animals is rooted in conceptions of women as carers, here in a practical (not emotional) sense. This care is centred around daily feeding and nursing, as well as the collecting of resources, feeding into women's role as household provisioners. Women's work with animals is depicted as necessary, but it is not awarded high cultural value, explicitly because it is associated with women. This is particularly clear in these sources' lack of acknowledgement of the skill or knowledge of the women who they depict doing this work, with only one exception. Finally, the women who perform this work with animals are most

overtly represented through the stereotype of the dairymaid in ballads. The dairymaid is figured as the ideal of feminine virtue and chastity, yet simultaneously as highly vulnerable to corruption or 'falling' from this pedestal, explicitly in parallel with Eve. Dairymaids' work with cows is significant in their use as a didactic stereotype in this way. Cows as an animal are intrinsically linked with reproduction and maternity and their inherent association with dairymaids, tying these women to reproduction. Women's work with animals is represented as inherently gendered in these sources. Rooted in notions of the female duties of practical care, this work is inextricably associated with women in these depictions. Existing scholarship is thus built upon in examining not only specifically work with animals but also in analysis of how early modern conceptions of femininity influenced these representations.

Representations of women's work with animals and their products as an ingredient in food and medicine has a more nuanced relationship to gender. This work is once again linked to conceptions of care and femininity, but here the care is directed towards those eating the food rather than the animal and is centred around conceptions of the housewifely duty of provisioning for the family. While this work was not exclusively performed by women in this period, nor do these sources suggest *only* women could perform this work, it is firmly associated with women in these texts, with the majority of these recipe books and instructional guides written for women, either as individuals or as part of the family. These sources contain no representations of women performing the work of slaughtering or butchering animals. The gendering of the work of food and medicine production itself, however, is presented as far less strict than that of women's work with living animals. Women are not represented as limited to the use of specific animals nor is the food or medicine they are instructed to produce presented as either masculine or feminine. The language used in recipes books and instruction manuals does not depict any gendering of the

animal's body, parts or products in relation to the women working with them. These sources also, significantly, represent the women producing food and medicine as skilled. This representation is largely through omitted instruction, demonstrating the author's perception of the reader's assumed knowledge around cooking and medicine production. This representation of skill is significant in the context of the lack of acknowledgement of skill in women's work with living animals. The less strict gendering of the work of food and medicine production as well as the lack of gendering of the interactions with animals here likely allow for a greater acknowledgement of the skill and prior knowledge required to perform this work. Gender thus has a more subtle and varied influence on women's interactions with animals as an ingredient in food and medicine. In building on existing scholarship on the gendering of this work to examine depictions of women's interactions with animals in performing this work, the limitations of the impact of gender are thus highlighted.

Representations of women's emotional responses or lack thereof to animals are similarly affected by gender in varying ways. Gender is relevant only in depictions of positive emotional responses to animals, almost always for the ballad's didactic purposes. This is particularly prominent in representations of the stereotype of women's (especially poor, old women's) close relationships with cats. This stereotype is used explicitly to mock and criticise women, as well as to make wider points about the poor, mirroring the stereotype of wealthy women and lapdogs depicted in satires. That the characters depicted as having a positive emotional response to an animal are women is thus central to these ballads. Gender is also relevant in depictions of men's positive emotional responses to their dogs, with ballads often depicting them as unified. These depictions, however, are far less critical than the depictions of women and cats. Women's positive emotional responses to animals beyond this stereotype are also influenced by gender, but here in a far more nuanced way. In these

depictions, the character is generally necessarily a woman for some didactic purpose, but her womanhood is not relevant to the interaction with the animal. Here the didactic importance of gender can once more be seen clearly, but so too are the limits of its influence on representations of women's interactions with animals. In the depiction of women's negative response to animals and of their lack of emotional response, there is significantly no particularly strong gendered association. Women and men are presented as similarly aloof or angry towards animals in ballads from this period, with no apparent connection to their gender. In the case of the negative emotional response, these depictions are not common in the ballads examined here and the women represented are part of a collective whole – the poor – whose frustration and fear are expressed. That these depictions are not common is significant, suggesting that negative emotional responses to animals are at the very least not a common trope in ballads. The lack of emotional response to animals is the most common type of response represented in these sources. This could be due to the nature of the sources examined – ballads were written to entertain and most references to women and animals are more incidental than pivotal, so their emotional responses are not discussed. This could also be due to the rank of women examined – while elite women are depicted as being expected to have a close and positive emotional response to their lapdogs, and poor old women to their cats, other lower and middling status women are not represented through such stereotypes, so more varied kinds of emotional response could be omitted from these sources. However, this also highlights a presentation of women as part of a collective once more, here figured as human versus animal. Animals are objectified and perceived as commodities in almost all the sources examined here, but this is particularly true when no emotional response is depicted. Animals are thus positioned as distinct from humanity and as not warranting an emotional response from either men or women. The influence of gender on representations of women's emotional responses to animals is thus not straightforward. Gender here is sometimes

essential to depictions, but far more commonly not relevant to the ways women's interactions with animals are depicted. In building on scholarship on companion animals and emotion, a far broader examination of women's emotional (or lack thereof) responses to animals is thus possible, resulting in a far more nuanced understanding of the impact of gender on these interactions.

The influence of gender on depictions of lower- and middling-status women's interactions with animals in ballads, instructional guides and recipe books thus varies greatly. This study combines a broad range of scholarship, applying approaches from animal studies, work history, and the history of emotion to examine the influence of gender on women's interactions with animals in early modern England. Women's interactions with animals are sorely understudied in scholarship and this examination of the influence of gender on their representation aims to begin to address this gap in understanding. While gender is central to these sources' depiction of certain interactions, that it is not always depicted as significant highlights the limits of its influence on representations of women's daily experience. The influence of gender on representations of women's interactions with animals is thus nuanced in this period. That interactions with animals elicited such nuance in the impact of gender is significant and opens the door for further work in the study of women and animals in early modern England.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Aesop. “The Swan and the Goose”. *Fables of Aesop*. Nov 26, 2013. Accessed June 29, 2022. https://fablesofaesop.com/the-swan-and-the-goose.html.

Allestree, Richard. *The Ladies Calling in Two Parts.* Oxford: At the theatre in Oxford, 1673.

Best, Henry. *Rural Economy in Yorkshire in 1641, Being the Farming and Account Books of Henry Best of Elmswell, in the East Riding of the County of York.* Durham: Published for The Society by George Andrews, 1857.

Come Buy a Mouse-Trap, or, A new way to catch an old rat: being a true relation of one Peters a Post of Roterdam, who temping [sic] an honest woman to leudnesse, was by her and her husband catch in a mouse trap, by what meanes the following story shall relate. London: Printed by John Hammond, 1647.

Ellis, William. *The Country Housewife’s Family Companion: or Profitable Directions for Whatever Relates to the Management and Good Oconomy of the Domestick Concerns of a Country Life.* London: Printed for James Hodges, at the Looking-Glass, facing St. Magnus Church, London-Bridge; and B. Collins, bookseller, at Salisbury, 1750.

Every Woman her Own Midwife, or, A Compleat Cabinet opened for Child-Bearing Women furnished with Directions to Prevent Miscarriages during the Time of Breeding, and other Casualties which usually Attend Women in Child-Bed : to which is Annexed Cures for all sorts of Diseases Incident to the Bodies of Men, Women and Children. London: Printed for Simon Neale, 1675.

An Excellent New Medly. London: Printed by the assignes of Thomas Symcocke, 1628.

Fitzherbert, John. *The Boke of Husbandry*. 2nd edition. London: In fletestrete in the house of Thomas Berthelet, nere to the condite at the sygne of Lucrece, 1540.

Gibbons, Orlando. "The Silver Swan". *Poetry Foundation*. Accessed June 29, 2022. https://www.poetryfoundation.org/poems/50405/the-silver-swan.

Great News from Southwark; or, The Old Womans Legacy to her Cat. London: Printed for James Read, 1695.

Grey, Elizabeth, Countess of Kent. *A True Gentlewomans Delight wherein is Contained all Manner of Cookery: together with [brace] preserving, conserving, drying, and candying, very necessary for all ladies and gentlewomen.* London: Printed by A.M. for Margaret Shears, 1671.

Have Among You Good Women or, a High-Way Discourse between Old William Starket, and Robin Hobs, going to Maydstone Market: Good Women before hand Let Me You Advise, to Keepe your Owne Counsell, and so be Held Wise. If Any One Taken in Ill Part What's Here said, Sheel Shew by her Kicking that shee's a Gauld Jade. London: Printed at London: for Thomas Lambert, 1634

John and Joan: or, a Mad Couple Well Met. London: For Tho: Lambert., 1634.

K., T., Doctor in Physick. *The Kitchin-Physician, or, A Guide for Good-Housewives in Maintaining their Families in Health wherein are Described the Natures, Causes, and Symptoms of all Diseases, Inward and Outward, Incident to the Bodies of Men, Women, and Children: Prescribing Natural, Useful and Proper Published for the Common Good.* London: Printed for Samuel Lee, 1680.

Londons Glory, and Whittingtons Renown, Or, A Looking-Glass for Citizens of London. London: Printed for R. Burton at the Horse-shoe in West Smithfield, 1640-74.

Lyte, Henry and William Ram. *Rams Little Dodeon [sic] A Briefe Epitome of the New Herbal, or Histoy of Plants. Wherein is Contayned the Disposition and True Declaration of the Phisike Helpes of all Sortes of Herbes and Plants, Vnder their Names and Operations, not Onely of Those Which are Here in this our Countrey of England Growing but of All Others Also of Other Realmes, Countreyes and Nations vsed in Phisike.* London: By Simon Stafford, dwelling in the Cloth Fayre, at the signe of the three Crownes, 1606.

M., A. *Cookery refin'd. Or, The lady, gentlewoman and servant-maids useful companion.* London: Printed for G. Conyers at the Ring in Little Britain, and Jo. Sprint at the Blue Bell, 1697

Markham, Gervase. *Countrey contentments, or The English husvvife Containing the inward and outward vertues which ought to be in a compleate woman. As her skill in physicke, surgerie, extraction of oyles, banqueting-stuffe, ordering of great feasts, preseruing of all sorts of wines, conceited secrets, distillations, perfumes, ordering of wooll, hempe, flax, making cloth, dying, the knowledge of dayries, office of malting, oats, their excellent vses in a family, brewing, baking, and all other things belonging to an houshold. A worke generally approued, and now much augmented, purged and made most profitable and necessarie for all men, and dedicated to the honour of the noble house of Exceter, and the generall good of this kingdome.* London: By J.B., for R. Iackson, and are to be sold at his shop neere Fleet-streete Conduit, 1623.

Meager, Leonard. *The Mystery of Husbandry: Or, Arable, Pasture, and Wood-land Improved.* London: Printed by W. Onley, and are to be sold by Will. Majore, Bookseller, in Newport, Cornwall, 1697.

Murrell, John. *A Nevv Booke of Cookerie VVherein is Set Forth the Newest and Most Commendable Fashion for Dressing or Sowcing, eyther Flesh, Fish, or Fowle. Together with Making of all Sorts of Iellyes, and Other Made-Dishes for Seruice; both to Beautifie and Adorne eyther Nobleman or Gentlemans table. Hereunto also is Added the Most Exquisite London Cookerie. All Set Forth According to the Now, New, English and French Fashion. Set Forth by the Obseruation of a Traueller. I.M.* London: Printed for Iohn Browne, and are to be solde at his shop in S. Dunstanes Church-yard, 1615.

Murrell, Jonh. *A Delightfull Daily Exercise for Ladies and Gentlewomen Whereby is set foorth the secrete misteries of the purest preseruings in glasses and other confrictionaries, as making of breads, pastes, preserues, suckets, marmalates, tartstuffes, rough candies, with many other things neuer before in print. Whereto is added a booke of cookery. By Iohn Murrell professor thereof.* London: Printed by Augustine Mathewes for Tho. Devve, and are to be sold at his shoppe in St. Dunstons Church-yard in Fleete-street, 1621.

My Dog and I. We Write no Flights of Dutch or French, no Courting of a Handsome Wench, no Monsters, Wonders in the Air, no Persons Dying in Despair; nor Any Thing Under the Sky, but Onely of my Dog and I. London: Printed for F. Coles, T. Vere, J. Wright, and J. Clarke, 1675.

A New Made Medly Compos'd out of Sundry Songs, For Sport and Pastime for the Most Ingenious Lovers of Wit and Mirth. London: Printed for P. Brooksby, J. Deacon, J. Blare, and J. Back, 1675-96.

Ovid. *Metamorphoses*. Translated by Charles Martin. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 2004.

Pemell, Robert. *Ptōchopharmakon, seu Medicamen Miseris, or Pauperum Pyxidicula salutifera. Help for the Poor collected for the Benefit of Such as are Not Able to Make use of Physitians and Chiurgians, or Live Remote from Them. Also an Appendix concerning Letting Blood in the Smallpox*. London: Printed by J. L. for Philemon Stephens, at the Gilden-Lion, in Pauls Church-yard, 1650.

A Pleasant Battle Between Two Lap Dogs of the Utopian Court, or, A Dialogue between Asleep and Awake, Jest and Earnest, Reality and Fancy being Fought Upon the New Erected Dog-Put Lately Contrived Purposely Upon this Occasion as Aforesaid in the Anti-Chamber of the Said Court. London: Printed for R. B., 1681.

A Pleasant New Song Called The Cony Barber, or, A young ladies delight, how she trim'd her maid, when she was on the straw asleep. London: Printed for P. Brooksby, 1680-1685.

Ponteus, John. *The True Every Man & Woman their own Doctor: or, a Salve for Every Sore Being a Book full of Rare Receipts for the Most Dangerous Distempers incident to the Bodies of Men, Women and Children; and is very Fit to be in All Families Against any Time of Sickness, gathered out of the Library of that Famous Traveller Dr. Ponteus and now Publish'd for the Good and Benefit of the Kingdom; and being Nothing but what is Experienced by many Thousands of People in City and Country, doing Good to Many.* London: Printed by F. L. for Matthias Drew, both living in St. Sepulchres Church yard, and sold by himself, and living in Red-Lyon Court in White-cross-street, 1676.

Praise of the Dairy-Maid, with a Lick at the Cream-Pot, or Fading Rose. London: Printed for the use of the Milk-Maids on May-day for ever, 1683.

Rowlands, Samuel. *A Crevv of Kind Gossips, All Met to be Merrie Complayning of their Husbands, with their Husbands Ansvveres in their Owne Defence.* London: Printed by W. W[hite] for Iohn Deane, and are to be sold at his shoppe at Temple-barre, 1613.

S., J., fl., *The Young Mans Resolution to the Maidens Request. A Witty Dialogue between a Young Man and a Maid*. London: Printed for Eliz. Andrews, 1663-1664.

Smart, Christopher. *Rejoice in the Lamb: A Song from Bedlam*, edited by William Force Stead. London: Jonathan Cape, 1939.

"The Butcher's Kindness to the Taylor's Wife". In *The Cheating traders garland, containing two excellent new songs*, 5-8. York: Printed by John White, 1725.

The Country-Man's Delight: or, The Happy Wooing. Being the Successful Love of John the Serving-Man, in his Courting of Joan the Dary-Maid. London: Printed for P. Brooksby at the Golden-Ball, near the Hospital-Gate, in West-Smithfield, 1670-1696.

The Country-Mans Lamentation for the Death of his Cow. London: Printed for C. Passinger, at the seven stars in the new buildings on London-bridge, 1674-1683.

The Down-Right Country-Man; or, The Faithful Dairy-Maid. London: Printed for Philip Brooksby, at the Golden-Ball, near the Hospital-gate, in West-Smithfield, 1670-1696.

The Farmers Wifes Complaint Against the Ladys Comodes and Top-Knots. For hindring their Cows going a Bulling. London: Printed and Sold by T. Moore, 1687-91.

The Gentlewomans Cabinet Unlocked Wherein is contained many excellent receipts for neat dressing of divers sorts of meats; as flesh and fish, with their proper sauces· Also directions for the best way of making pancakes, fritters, tansies, puddings, custards, cheesecakes. And such like fine knacks. And other delicate dishes, which are most

frequently used in gentlemens houses. London: Printed for W. Thackeray and T. Passenger, 1688.

The Jolly Welsh Woman. London: Printed for P. Brooksby, J. Deacon, J. Blare, and J. Back, 1675-96.

The Ladies companion, or, A table furnished with sundry sorts of pies and tarts, gracefull at a feast, with many excellent receipts for preserving, conserving, and candying of all manner of fruits, with the making of marchpain, marmalet, and quindenis. By persons of quality whose names are mentioned. London: Printed by W. Bentley, and are to be sold by W. Shears, at the sign of the Bible, in S. Pauls Church yard., 1653.

The Mother and Daughter. London: Printed for P. Brooksby, at the Golden-Ball, near the Hospital-gate, West-smithfield, 1672-96.

The Poets Dream: or, The Great Out-Cry and Lamentable Complaint of the Land Against Bayliffs and their Dogs. London: Printed for P. Brooksby at the Golden Ball near the Bear Tavern in Pye Corner, 1683.

The Poplar Feast: Or, A Cat-Pasty. London: Printed for C. Dennison, at the Stationers-arms within Aldgate, 1685-88.

The Red Cow's Speech, to a Milk-Woman, in St. J-----s's P----k. London: Printed for C. Heffer, the Royal Exchange, 1750.

The Sorrowful Lamentation of the Pedlars, and Petty Chapmen, for the Hardness of the Times, and the Decay of Trade. London: Printed for I. Back, at the Black-boy on London-bridge, 1685.

The Sorrowful Wife: Or, Love in a Tub. London: Printed for J. Blare at the Looking-glass on London Bridge, 1685-88.

The Wiltshire Wedding, Between Daniel Do-Well, and Doll the Dairy-Maid. With the Consent of her Old Father Leather-Coat, and her Dear and Tender Mother Plodwell. London: Printed and sold in Bow-Church Yard, 1700.

The Woman to the Plow and the Man to the Hen-Roost, or, A Fine Way to Cure a Cot-Quean. S.I.: Printed for J. Wright, J. Clarke, W. Thakeray and T. Passinger, 1675.

The Woody Queristers. London: Printed for I. Clarke, W. Thackeray, and T. Passinger, 1684-1686.

The Young-man & Maidens Fore-cast; Shewing how they Reckon'd their Chickens Before they were Hatcht. London: Printed for P. Brooksby, 1680.

Topsell, Edward. *The Historie of Foure-Footed Beastes.* London: Printed by William Iaggard, 1607.

Tryon, Thomas. *A Pocket-Companion, Containing Things Necessary to be Known by All that Values their Health and Happiness Being a Plain Way of Nature's Own Prescribing, to Cure Most Diseases in Men, Women and Children, by Kitchen-Physick Only. To Which is Added, an Account How a Man may Live Well and Plentifully for Two-Pence a Day. Collected from The Good Housewife Made a Doctor.* London: Printed for George Conyers, at the Golden Ring in Little-Britain, 1693.

Tryon, Thomas. *The Good Houswife made a Doctor, or, Health's choice and Sure Friend being a Plain Way of Nature's Own Prescribing to Prevent [and] Cure Most Diseases Incident to Men, Women, and Children, by Diet and Kitchin-Physick Only.* London: printed and sold by Andrew Sowle, in the Holloway-Lane, near Shoreditch, 1685.

W., J. *Systema Agriculturae; The Mystery of Husbandry Discovered*. 4th edition. London: Printed for Tho. Dring, at the Harrow at the corner of Chancery-lane in Fleetstreet, 1687.

Woolley, Hannah. *The Compleat Servant-Maid: or, The Young Maidens Tutor Directing them How they may Fit, and Qualifie Themselves for Any of these Employments. Viz. Waiting-Woman, House-Keeper, Chamber-Maid, Cook-Maid, Under-Cook-Maid, Nursery-Maid, Dairy-Maid, Laundry-Maid, House-Maid, Scullery-Maid. Whereunto is Added a Suppliment Containing the Choicest Receipts and Rarest Secrets in Physick and Chyrurgery; Also for Salting and Drying English Ham equal to Westphalia. The Compleat Market-Man and Market-Woman, in Buying Fowl, Fish, Flesh, &c. and to Know their Goodness or Badness in Every Respect, to Prevent being Cheated*. London: Printed for Eben Tracy at the Three Bibles on London Bridge, 1700.

Woolley, Hannah. *The Cook's Guide: or, Rare Receipts for Cookery Published and Set Forth Particularly for Ladies and Gentlwomen; Being Very Beneficial for All Those that Desire the True Way of Dressing of All Sorts of Flesh, Fowles, and Fish; the Best Directions for All Manner of Kickshaws, and the Most Ho-good Sawces: Whereby Noble Persons and Others in their Hospitalities May be Gratified in their Gusto's. Never Before Printed*. London: printed for Peter Dring at the Sun in the Poultry, next door to the Rose-Tavern, 1664.

Secondary Sources

Books

Adams, Carol J. *The Sexual Politics of Meat: A Feminist-Vegetarian Critical Theory.* London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2019.

Barclay, Katie. *The History of Emotions: A Student Guide to Methods and Sources*. London: Macmillan Education Limited, 2020.

Bates, Catherine. *Masculinity and the Hunt: Wyatt to Spenser.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.

Clark, Alice. *Working Life of Women in the Seventeenth Century.* London: Frank Cass & Co. Ltd., 1968.

Clark, Sandra. *Women and Crime in the Street Literature of Early Modern England.* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003.

Colley, Linda. *Britons: Forging the Nation 1707–1837: with a New Preface by the Author* London: Pimlico, 2003.

Coren, Stanley. *Pawprints of History: Dogs and the Course of Human Events*. New York: Free Press, 2003.

Crawford, Julie. *Marvelous Protestantism: Monstrous Births in Post-Reformation England*. Baltimore, The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2005.

Dawson, Mark. "Oats and Oatcakes: Farming and Diet in the North Midlands in the Post-Medieval Period". In *Farmers, Consumers, Innovators: The World of Joan Thirsk*, edited by Richard Jones & Christopher Dyer, 125-138. Hatfield: University of Hertfordshire Press, 2016.

de Vries, Jan. *The Industrious Revolution: Consumer Behaviour and the Household Economy, 1650 to the Present*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.

DiMeo, Michelle and Rebecca Laroche. “On Elizabeth Isham’s “Oil of Swallows”: Animal Slaughter and Early Modern Women’s Medical Recipes”. In *Ecofeminist Approaches to Early Modernity,* edited by Jennifer Munroe and Rebecca Laroche, 87-104. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011.

Dolan, Frances. *Dangerous Familiars: Representations of Domestic Crime in England, 1550-1700.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1994.

Ellis, Markman. “Suffering Things: Lapdogs, Slaves, and Counter-Sensibility”. In *The Secret Life of Things: Animals, Objects, and It-Narratives in Eighteenth-Century England*, edited by Mark Blackwell, 92-116. Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press, 2007.

Fairchilds, Cissie. *Women in Early Modern Europe, 1500-1700.* Harlow: Pearson Longman, 2007.

Fletcher, Anthony. *Gender, Sex and Subordination in England 1500-1800.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995.

Fraser, Antonia. *The Weaker Vessel: Woman’s Lots in Seventeenth-Century England.* London: Phoenix Press, 2002.

Fudge, Erica. “Saying Nothing Concerning the Same: On Dominion, Purity, and Meat in Early Modern England”. In *Renaissance Beasts: Of Animals, Humans, and Other Wonderful Creatures*, edited by Erica Fudge, 70-86. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2004.

Fudge, Erica. *Perceiving Animals: Humans and Beasts in Early Modern English Culture*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2002.

Fudge, Erica. *Pets.* New York: Routledge, 2014.

Griffin, Carl. “Topologies of Tenderness and Violence: Human-Animal Relations in Georgian England”. In *The Routledge Companion to Animal-Human History* edited by Hilda Kean and Philip Howell, 322-344. London: Routledge, 2018.

Harvey, Karen. *The Little Republic: Masculinity & Domestic Authority in Eighteenth-Century Britain*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.

Harvey, Karen. *The Impostress Rabbit-Breeder: Mary Toft and Eighteenth-Century England.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2020.

Herbert, Amanda. *Female Alliances: Gender, Identity, and Friendship in Early Modern Britain*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2014.

Hindle, Steve. “Work, Reward and Labour Discipline in Late-Seventeenth-Century England”. In *Remaking English Society: Social Relations and Social Change in Early Modern England,* edited by Steve Hindle, Alexandra Shepard and John Walter, 255-280. Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2013.

Hunt, Margaret R. *The Middling Sort: Commerce, Gender, and the Family in England, 1680-1780.* Berkley, University of California Press, 1996.

Kussmaul, Ann. *Servants in Husbandry in Early Modern England.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981.

Lamb, Jonathan. “The Rape of the Lock as Still Life”. In *The Secret Life of Things: Animals, Objects, and It-Narratives in Eighteenth-Century England*, edited by Mark Blackwell, 45-62. Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press, 2007.

Laurence, Anne. *Women in England 1500-1760: A Social History*. London: Phoenix Press, 1996.

Marsh, Christopher. *Music and Society in Early Modern England.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.

McRae, Andrew. *God Speed the Plough: The Representation of Agrarian England, 1500-1660*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Muldrew, Craig. *Food, Energy, and the Creation of Industriousness: Work and Material Culture in Agrarian England, 1550–1780.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.

Pennell, Sara. *The Birth of the English Kitchen 1600-1850.* London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2016.

Pennell, Sarah and Michelle DiMeo. "Introduction". In *Reading and Writing Recipe Books, 1550–1800,* edited by Michelle DiMeo and Sarah Pennell, 1-22. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2013.

Pollock, Linda. *With Faith and Physic: The Life of a Tudor Gentlewoman.* London: Collins & Brown, 1993.

Raber, Karen. "Animals at the Table: Performing Meat in Early Modern England and Europe". In *Interspecies Interactions: Animals and Humans Between the Middle Ages and Modernity* edited by Sarah Cockram and Andrew Wells, 107-122. London: Routledge, 2018.

Raber, Karen. "From Sheep to Meat, From Pets to People: Animal Domestication 1600-1800". In *A Cultural History of Animals in the Age of Enlightenment* edited by Matthew Senior, 73-100. Oxford: Berg, 2007.

Randles, Sarah. "Materiality". In *Early Modern Emotions: An Introduction*, edited by Susan Broomhall, 17-20. London: Routledge, 2017.

Sharpe, Pamela. *Adapting to Capitalism: Working Women in the English Economy, 1700-1850.* Basingstoke: MacMillan Press Ltd, 2014.

Shepard, Alexandra. "The Worth of Married Women in the English Church Courts, c.1550–1730". In *Married Women and the Law in Premodern Northwest Europe*, edited by Cordelia Beattie and Matthew Frank Stevens, 191– 212. Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 2013.

Shoemaker, Robert B. *Gender in English Society 1650-1850: The Emergence of Separate Spheres.* Harlow: Pearson Education Limited, 1998.

Stobart, Anne. *Household Medicine in Seventeenth-Century England*. London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2016.

Tadmor, Naomi. *Family and Friends in Eighteenth-Century England: Household, Kinship, and Patronage.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Tague, Ingrid H. *Animal Companions: Pets and Social Change in Eighteenth-Century Britain.* University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2015.

Thirsk, Joan. *Food in Early Modern England: Phases, Fads, Fashions 1500-1760.* London: Hambledon Continuum, 2006.

Thomas, Keith. *Man and the Natural World: Changing Attitudes in England 1500-1800.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996.

Valenze, Deborah. *Milk: A Local and Global History.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 2011.

Valenze, Deborah. *The First Industrial Woman.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995.

Vickery, Amanda. *The Gentleman's Daughter: Women's Lives in Georgian England*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999.

Whittle, Jane and Elizabeth Griffiths. *Consumption and Gender in the Early Seventeenth-Century Household: The World of Alice Le Strange*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.

Articles

"Beat, v.1". *Oxford English Dictionary*. 2021. Accessed Jan. 18th, 2021. https://www.oed.com/view/Entry/16609?rskey=l8h3U4&result=6&isAdvanced=false#eid.

Blundell, Richard and Angela Tregear. "From Artisans to "Factories": The Interpenetration of Craft and Industry in English Cheese-Making, 1650-1950". *Enterprise & Society* 7, no. 4 (2006): 705-739.

Boddice, Rob. "The History of Emotions: Past, Present, Future". *Revista de Estudios Sociales* 62 (2017): 10-15.

Brown, Laura. "The Lady, the Lapdog, and Literary Alterity". *The Eighteenth Century* vol. 52, no. 1 Animal, All Too Animal (2011): 31-45.

de Vries, Jan. "The Industrial Revolution and the Industrious Revolution". *The Journal of Economic History* Vol. 54, No. 2 (1994): 249-270.

Dolan, Frances E. "Mopsa's Method: Truth Claims, Ballads, and Print". *Huntington Library Quarterly* 79, no.2 (2016): 173-185.

Dwyer Amussen, Susan. ""Being Stirred to Much Unquietness": Violence and Domestic Violence in Early Modern England". *Journal of Women's History* 6, no.2 (1994): 70-89.

Fudge, Erica. "How a Man Differs from a Dog". *History Today* 53, 6 (2003): 38-44.

Fudge, Erica. "Milking Other Men's Beasts". *History and Theory* 52, no. 4 (2013): 13-28.

Fussell, G.E. "The Evolution of Farm Dairy Machinery in England". *Agricultural History* 37, no. 4 (1963): 217-224.

Goldsmith, Sarah. "Dogs, Servants and Masculinities: Writing about Danger on the Grand Tour". *Journal for Eighteenth-Century Studies* 40, no. 1 (2017): 3-21.

Guerrini, Anita. "A Diet for a Sensitive Soul: Vegetarianism in Eighteenth-Century Britain". *Eighteenth-Century Life* 23, no. 2 (1999): 34-42.

Guerrini, Anita. "Health, national character and the English diet in 1700". *Studies in History and Philosophy of Biological and Biomedical Sciences* 43 (2012): 349-356.

Hallam, Elizabeth A. "Turning the Hourglass: Gender Relations at the Deathbed in Early Modern Canterbury". *Mortality* 1, no. 1 (1996): 61-82.

Ingram, Martin, "Ridings, Rough Music and the "Reform of Popular Culture" in Early Modern England". *Past and Present* 105 (1984): 79-113.

Leong, Elaine. "'Herbals She Persueth': Reading Medicine in Early Modern England". *Renaissance Studies* 28, no. 4 (September 2014): 556-578.

Leong, Elaine. "Making Medicines in the Early Modern Household". *Bulletin of the History of Medicine* 82, no. 1 (2008): 145-168.

Marsh, Christopher. "*The Woman to the Plow; And the Man to the Hen-Roost:* Wives, Husbands and Best-Selling Ballads in Seventeenth-Century England". *Transactions of the RHS* vol. 28 no. 1 (2018): 65-88.

Ramos, Adela. "Species Thinking: Animals, Women, and Literary Tropes in Mary Wollstonecraft's A Vindication of the Rights of Woman". *Tulsa Studies in Women's Literature* 37, no. 1 (2018): 41-66.

Roberts, Michael. "Sickles and Scythes: Women's Work and Men's Work at Harvest Time". *History Workshop* no. 7, 1 (1979): 3-28.

Shepard, Alexandra. "Crediting Women in the Early Modern English Economy". *History Workshop Journal* 79 (2015): 1-24.

Smith, Kate. "In Her Hands". *Cultural and Social History* 11, no. 4 (2014): 489-506.

Snell, Keith. "Agricultural Seasonal Unemployment, the Standard of Living, and Women's Work in the South and East, 1690-1860". *Economic History Review* 34, no. 3 (1981): 407-37.

Steele Brokaw, Katherine. "Popularity, Performance and Repetition". *Huntington Library Quarterly* 79, no.2 (2016): 339-342.

Tague, Ingrid H. "Satire and Sentiment in British Elegies and Epitaphs for Animals". *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 41, no. 3 (2008): 289-306.

Valenze, Deborah. "The Art of Women and the Business of Men: Women's Work and the Dairy Industry c. 1740-1840". *Past & Present* 130 (1991): 142-169.

Warburton, Greg. "Gender, Supernatural Power, Agency and the Metamorphoses of the Familiar in Early Modern Pamphlet Accounts of English Witchcraft". *Parergon* 20, no. 2 (2003): 95-118.

Whittle, Jane. “A Critique of Approaches to ‘Domestic Work’: Women, Work and the Pre-Industrial Economy”. *Past and Present* 243, no.1 (2019): 35-70.

Whittle, Jane. “Housewives and Servants in Rural England, 1440-1650: Evidence of Women's Work from Probate Documents”. *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 15 (2005): 51-74.

Wyett, Jodi L. “The Lap of Luxury: Lapdogs, Literature and Social Meaning in the ‘Long’ Eighteenth Century”. *Literature Interpretation Theory* 10 (2001): 275-301.