

Gender, commerce and the Restoration book trade: mapping the bookscape of Hannah

Wolley's *The Ladies Directory* (1661)¹

Here I present you with a true, and most easie way of Practising what you shall find mentioned in this little Book; which though but Little, containeth more than all the Books that I ever saw in this Nature, they being Confounders rather than Instructors. (*Ladies Directory*, 2nd edn, 1662, sig. A2r-v)

So wrote Hannah Wolley (c. 1622–1674?), the self-proclaimed “Authress” of this “little Book” of instruction, *The Ladies Directory of Choice Experiments & Curiosities of Preserving in Jellies and Candying Both Fruits & Flowers*, first published in 1661. In this Epistle to readers, we find none of the bashful modesty or shame so often associated with the female writer of the early modern period.² Wolley boldly marked her territory and her expertise as an instructor, from the very outset of her entry into print.

Despite being the most prolific female writer seeking to earn an income from her pen in the English print world before Aphra Behn (1640?-89), Wolley has yet to be the subject of sustained bibliographical, or indeed biographical, study.³ Whether it is because her outputs, conventionally

¹ This article is the long-gestated outcome of a three-month fellowship held in 2019 at the Folger Shakespeare Library, Washington, DC, as part of the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation-funded ‘Before *Farm to Table*: Early Modern Foodways and Cultures’ program (2017-2021). I am extremely grateful to the project’s co-directors, David Goldstein, Amanda Herbert and Heather Wolfe, for their invitation to be a part of this exciting project, to Kathleen Lynch then-Director of Research and Caroline Duroselle-Melish, curator of early modern books, and the other scholars in residence for their expert support and collegiality. Staff at the Library of Congress Special Collections and at the University of Glasgow Library Special Collections were unstintingly helpful in giving access to the two surviving copies of the second edition of the *Ladies Directory*. The article has benefited from the critical editorial skills of Susie West, two anonymous reviewers and this journal’s editor.

Note on the spelling of Wolley: although Wolley’s name is often given as ‘Woolley’, I follow here her own choice of spelling her name with only one ‘o’: see fn. 16 below.

² Janet Todd, *Aphra Behn: A Secret Life* (1st publ. 1996: this edn, London: Fentum Press, 2017), xxvi.

³ Margaret Cavendish, duchess of Newcastle (1623?-73), Hannah Wolley’s almost exact contemporary, was undoubtedly more prolific, but was not under the same pecuniary pressures as either Wolley or Behn.

labelled as “cookery books” (although not all of them are) are too easily consigned to what Margaret Ezell has termed the “extra-literary” hinterlands;⁴ or because she did not lead the more extensively documented, colourful life that Behn did; or, because it was Behn and the “matchless Orinda”, Katherine Philips (1632-64), rather than Wolley, upon whom Virginia Woolf laid laurels in the 1929 essay *A Room of One's Own* – the reasons for the oversight are plentiful.⁵ Yet Wolley is as deserving of the attention of book, literary and gender historians more broadly, as those more frequently studied female writers.⁶

This article aims to redress that balance. Focusing primarily on the publication of Wolley's first book, *The Ladies Directory* (1661), I map its “bookscape”, examining the production of and markets for such “extra-literary” texts in early Restoration London.⁷ By discussing the mechanisms and people that brought the book to press, and the nature and extent of Wolley's involvement with them, I contend that Wolley has no less a claim to being a print and literary innovator than her better-known female literary peers. The work this article undertakes has been done for other literary outputs, not least for canonical male authors, but it is still far less common for women writers, and for non-fiction, and especially didactic or ‘how-to’ texts, despite the sheer proliferation of such works in

⁴ Margaret J. M. Ezell, “Invisibility optics: Aphra Behn, Esther Inglis and the fortunes of women's works,” in *A History of Early Modern Women's Writing*, ed. Patricia Philipp (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018), 27-45, on p. 34. See also Susan Staves, *A Literary History of Women's Writing in Britain, 1660-1789* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 2-5 (although Staves discusses no domestic writing in this work); and Lara Dodds and Michelle M. Dowd, “Happy accidents: critical belatedness, feminist formalism, and early modern women's writing,” *Criticism*, 62, no. 2 (2020): 170-1.

⁵ Virginia Woolf, *A Room of One's Own* (London: The Hogarth Press, 1929).

⁶ See for example, the recent special volume of *Women's Writing* devoted to Behn “at her 350th anniversary”, edited by Elaine Hobby and Claire Bowditch: *Women's Writing*, 27, no. 3 (2020).

⁷ A term coined and discussed by James Raven in his 2010 British Library Panizzi Lectures, published as *Bookscape: Geographies of Printing and Publishing in London before 1800* (London: British Library, 2014).

this period.⁸ This is therefore also explicitly intended as a contribution to reframing a distinctively feminist bibliography/book history proposed by Kate Ozment.⁹

Lastly, but no less importantly, this close analysis of Wolley's first book in her bibliography reveals the crucial, but by no means primary, place it occupied in the development of her public and commercial identities. In setting *The Ladies Directory* within a bibliographic timeline of her other works and showing how it served as a shopfront for other entrepreneurial endeavours, I build on the work of Michelle M. Dowd and Laurie Ellinghausen, to establish her books as but one possible component of Wolley's attempts to shape a respectable vocation as a working woman in Restoration London. This study also illuminates the writing and publication of domestic manuals alongside the teaching of skilled domestic knowledge, as a potential commercial endeavour women could and did engage in as an 'ingenious trade' alongside the Exchange-women, mantua-makers and milliners explored by Laura Gowing, Sarah Birt and others.¹⁰

Where's Wolley?

Wolley's track record as a woman writing and appearing in print in the Restoration period is striking. She is firmly associated with, and personally laid claim to, five distinct titles during her lifetime. One further title may or may not be directly or wholly composed by her, and a further two appeared to which her name was either put contemporaneously without her permission or (probably) *post mortem*, that were repeatedly republished and repackaged into the early eighteenth century. She was

⁸ Adam G. Hooks, *Selling Shakespeare: Biography, Bibliography, and the Book Trade* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016). Janet Todd's magisterial biography of Aphra Behn is an exception, but Todd suggests the value of such a study lies in Behn's contributions to genres which were conventionally coloured by male and elite contributions: Todd, *Aphra Behn*, xxvi. See also Kirk Melnikoff, "Isabella Whitney amongst the stalls of Richard Jones," in *Women's Labour and the History of the Book in Early Modern England*, ed. Valerie Wayne (London: Bloomsbury, 2020), 145-62.

⁹ Kate Ozment, "Rationale for feminist bibliography," *Textual Cultures*, 13, no. 1 (2020): 165.

¹⁰ Michelle M. Dowd, *Women's Work in Early Modern English Literature and Culture* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009); Laurie Ellinghausen, *Labor and Writing in Early Modern England, 1567-1667* (Aldershot/Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2008); Laura Gowing, *Ingenious Trade: Women and Work in Seventeenth-century London* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2022); Sarah Birt, "Women, guilds and tailoring trades: the occupational training of Merchant Taylors' Company apprentices in early modern London," *The London Journal*, 46, no.2 (2020): 146-64.

also (as far as I am currently aware) the first female English writer to be translated into German during her lifetime.¹¹

Wolley's works circulated in an era in which non-elite women were not unknown as printers, booksellers and as "invisible partners", as Helen Smith has painstakingly mapped for pre-1640 London and Maureen Bell up to 1700, but where such women's names on the title page *as authors* – dead or alive – remained a rarity.¹² The "stigma of print" which attached to women who revealed themselves through publication operated as both a constraint upon and contemporary mode of critique of early modern women writers. But, as Dodds and Dowd have argued, it has also served as an "adversarial framework" in which subsequent acts of literary recovery have depicted such works as "difficult, rare and oppositional."¹³ Wolley's output and her autobiographical statements about her motivations for entering into print have seldom been explored in this context, or indeed any other, beyond the histories of recipes, domestic medical practice and domestic knowledge-making. Yet Wolley's works deserve more than this. Her avocation as "Authress" – a status she defiantly sought to protect, claiming in her last securely attributed work, *A Supplement to the Queen-like Closet, or A Little of Everything* (1674), "I will never disown what I do Write, nor am I willing to own what I write not" – also sheds light on the intellectual property and legal-commercial frameworks in which her works appeared, and how these shaped Restoration-era printing and bookselling.¹⁴

¹¹ *The Ladies Delight: or a Rich Closet of Choice Experiments* (London: printed by Thomas Milbourn, 1672) was translated as *Frauen-Zimmers Zeit-Vertreib, oder, Reiches Gemach von ausserlesenen Experimenten und Curiositäten betreffend die rechte Praeservir- und Candier-Kunst* (Hamburg: Auff Gottfried Schultens Kosten, 1674).

¹² M. Bell, "Women in the English book trade 1557-1700," *Leipziger Jahrbuch zur Buchgeschichte*, 6 (1996):13-45; Helen Smith, *'Grossly Material Things': Women and Book Production in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012).

¹³ Although the term 'stigma of print' was first used in relation to late Tudor *male* poets and scribal publication formats: J. W. Saunders, "The stigma of print: a note on the social bases of Tudor poetry," *Essays in Criticism*, 1, no. 2 (1951), 139-64.; cf. Staves, *Literary History*, 18; Maureen Bell, "Women writing and women written," in *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain: Vol. IV, 1557-1695*, eds John Bernard and D.F. McKenzie, with the assistance of Maureen Bell (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 442; Dodds and Dowd, "Happy accidents," 171-2.

¹⁴ Hannah Wolley, *A Supplement to the Queen-like Closet, or A Little of Everything. Presented to all Ingenious Ladies and Gentlewomen* (London: printed by T.R. for Richard Lownds, 1674), 132. Patricia Pender and Rosalind Smith, "Introduction: early modern women's material texts: production, transmission and reception,"

These frameworks are certainly in tension with modern conceptualisations of the author's preeminence. In her unpicking of some of the strands of the controversy around the bookseller Dorman Newman's publication of *The Gentlewoman's Companion* (printed by Anne Maxwell, 1673), a book with Wolley's name on the title-page, but which she vehemently disavowed in print, Elaine Hobby notes that the multiple hands at work in the making of the text between the covers "draws attention to the impossibility of assigning certain authorship to any part of a book of this kind."¹⁵ More recently, Margaret Ezell in her discussion of the multiplication of 'Wolley'-attributed titles in 1675, has stressed the need to "consider the individuals who took the raw ingredients of the text and literally cooked the books to suit the tastes of the time". In a more collaborative reading, Patricia Pender and Rosalind Smith see the work required to bring a text to print and then to readers as a form of "choral" practice.¹⁶

The *contretemps* with Newman and the work which Wolley did lay claim to, and on which Wolley alleged Newman's *The Gentlewoman's Companion* was piratically based – *A Guide to Ladies, Gentlewomen and Maids* (also printed for Dorman Newman, 1668) – maps the limits of Wolley's control over her words, once her manuscripts entered into the hands of the printers and booksellers she worked with across two decades.¹⁷ Wolley's use of the printed word to decry her mistreatment, in the 1674 *A Supplement*, is also evidence of the unprecedented sectoral disruption

in *Material Cultures of Early Modern Women's Writing*, eds Patricia Pender and Rosalind Smith (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2014), 2.

¹⁵ Elaine Hobby, "A woman's best setting out is silence: the writings of Hannah Wolley," in *Culture and Society in the Stuart Restoration*, ed. Gerald MacLean (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 194.

¹⁶ Margaret J.M. Ezell, "Cooking the books, or the three faces of Hannah Woolley," in *Reading and Writing Recipe Books, 1550-1800*, eds Michelle DiMeo and Sara Pennell (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2013), 174; Pender and Smith, "Introduction," 2-3.

¹⁷ Hobby does not clarify what text the 'The Ladies Guide' Wolley referred to in *A Supplement* was, although she probably assumed it was the much earlier *Ladies Directory*: "Best setting out," 181. The sole surviving copy registered on the ESTC of the actual title, *A Guide to Ladies, Gentlewomen and Maids* first published in 1668, also by Dorman Newman, is held at the Folger Shakespeare Library (ESTC R235816). While listed in the catalogue since its purchase by the Library in 1990, only one scholar before 2018 appears to have made the connection with Wolley: *Women in Service in Early Modern England: The early modern Englishwoman: a facsimile library of essential works. Series III, Essential works for the study of early modern women*, Part 3 v. 5, ed. Jeannie Dalporto (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008), xix.

and reconfiguration of the Restoration London book trade, following the disasters of 1665-6, and the production mechanisms and marketing machinations writers were subject to under early modern forms of copyright.¹⁸

The dispute with Newman came towards what we now believe to have been the end of her life; in *A Supplement*, alongside her denunciation of him, Wolley alluded to suffering from the palsy.¹⁹ Although I have yet to find a record of Wolley's death in either London or Essex parochial registers, the 'new' texts bearing her name but filleting her earlier works, appearing in and after 1675 – notably *The Accomplished Ladies Delight* (1675 and subsequent editions) and *The Compleat Servantmaid* (1677 and subsequent editions) – and the absence of any response in print from Wolley, argue for her being dead by 1675, if not earlier.²⁰ No scholarly work has to date focused on *the beginning* of Wolley's career in print, over a decade earlier, a frankly puzzling omission.²¹ Wolley's early works can tell us just as much about the opportunities for and constraints upon a female writer as the controversial, but more frequently cited, *Gentlewoman's Companion*.²²

Pathways to print

¹⁸ Jacob F. Field, *London, Londoners and the Great Fire of 1666* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2017), 107-109.

¹⁹ Partial or episodic paralysis following on from a stroke, or other neurological damage: Wolley, *A Supplement*, 16.

²⁰ Hobby cites a will created by a Hannah Wolley in Manuden, Essex in 1669, but this is not the same Hannah Wolley. The Hannah of this study was at that time going by the name Hannah Wolley Chaloner, was probably still working in London, and was (unlike her testator namesake), able to write and sign her own name, as a January 1671/2 marriage allegation document bearing her signature shows: Hobby, "Best setting out," 183, nn.9 & 11; cf. London Metropolitan Archives, Diocese of London Marriage Allegations, DL/A/D/002/MS10091/027, marriage allegation for Richard Wolley, bachelor of Thaxted, Essex, and Anne Mauger of St Giles in the Fields, spinster, signed by 'Hanna Wolley Chaloner' of Thaxted, dated 20 January 1671/2.

²¹ 'Jane Sharp', given as the author of *The Midwives Book* (S. Miller: London, 1671) may have been one such invention: Katherine Phelps Walsh, "Marketing Midwives in Early Modern London: a Reexamination of Jane Sharp's *The Midwives Book*," *Gender and History*, 26, no.2 (2014): 237.

²² *The Gentlewoman's Companion* (London: printed by Anne Maxwell for Dorman Newman, 1673) remains the text many scholars still resort to as evidence of Wolley's views on subjects such as education and marriage, even though Wolley vehemently rejected it as *her* writing: see for example, Manuela D'Amore, "From contexts to texts: signs of proto-feminism at the end of the century: tradition and innovation," in *Essays in Defence of the Female Sex: Custom, Education and Authority in Seventeenth-Century England*, eds Manuela D'Amore and Michele Lardy (Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars, 2012), 97.

Wolley's life experiences up until 1660, were not only crucial testimonials to her expertise she cited in print, but also enablers of it. Her curriculum vitae primed her publications as showcases for her diverse skills and entrepreneurial offer, rather than merely as the urgent acts of a needy widow, as they have sometimes been framed (although the two could, and often did, overlap). Wolley's biography is nonetheless patchy, and what is known has sometimes been garbled and incorrectly cited; what follows is based on my current biographical research that has revised, corrected and added key details.²³

Wolley was probably born in or around 1622 or 1623, possibly in one of the textile-producing towns around Colchester (Essex).²⁴ No secure record of her baptism has been found but the details given in her autobiographical segments in *A Guide to Ladies* and *A Supplement*, suggest her parents were unusually supportive in educating her: she could read and write with sufficient mastery to take on educating other children at the age of fourteen, probably as an apprentice in a girls' school.²⁵ Her skills in music, languages and with the needle then helped her become an upper-echelon servant with the Maynard family of Easton Lodge, Little Easton (Essex), around 1640.²⁶ Wolley served Lady Anne Maynard (d. 1647), the recent widow of Sir William, first Lord Maynard (1586-

²³ Wolley's biography in the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, contains some of this information, but also some errors: John Considine, "Wolley [other married name Challiner], Hannah (b. 1622?, d. in or after 1674), author of works on cookery, medicine, and household affairs." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. 23 Sep. 2004; Accessed 1 Aug. 2022.

<https://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-29957>.

²⁴ No records survive for Wolley's marriage to her first husband, Jerome or Jeremy Wolley (d. 1656), which would have provided key information about Wolley's natal name. An extensive search of Essex parochial records for the late 1610s and 1620s produces surprisingly few 'Hannahs' amongst the baptised. One possibility is that Wolley may have been the daughter Hannah, baptised on 13 February 1622/3 in Great Dunmow, to linen draper Francis Raymond (d.1639) and his second wife Elizabeth (m. after 14 February 1620, when Mary, Raymond's first wife died): Essex Record Office, D/P/11/1/1, parish registers for Great Dunmow. This is suggestive, as Great Dunmow is close to both Easton Lodge, where Wolley later worked, and Thaxted, where she was residing in 1671/2: see fn. 21 above.

²⁵ *A Guide to Ladies*, 93-8. Wolley's account of how to flourish as a female apprentice, also provided in *A Guide to Ladies*, focuses on serving in a girls' boarding school (pp. 37-52). The account is the first to detail the experiences of female apprentices and advocate for them, in print: Laura Gowing, *Ingenious Trade: Women and Work in Seventeenth-century London* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2022), 186-7.

²⁶ If Wolley were the daughter of Francis Raymond (see fn. 24 above), his death in December 1639 may have necessitated this move; for his burial on 15 December 1639, see Essex Record Office, D/P 11/1/2, Great Dunmow parish registers: and D/AMW/4/6, for the last will and testament, proved 4 June 1640. Wolley notes having worked for Maynard for some seven years before her first marriage, which is usually dated to around 1647.

1640), describing herself as her right-hand woman, at a very difficult time in Lady Anne's life.²⁷ Not surprisingly, Wolley drew on both these pre-marriage experiences in her robust arguments in support of women's education; and in her detailed practical advice about the skills needed to work in such households, in *A Guide to Ladies*.

Wolley married her first husband, Jerome or Jeremy Wolley (d. 1656), in *circa* 1647, during his tenure as headmaster of the Newport Free Grammar School, about 10 miles from Easton Lodge.²⁸ Although the patchy survival of Essex parish registers from the 1640s-1650s make confirmation of their marriage date impossible, it is also possible they wed in the elaborate domestic chapel at Easton Lodge: the couple appear to have met via mutual service to the Maynards.²⁹ Once married, Hannah served alongside her husband at the school for upwards of "three score" boys.³⁰ As Wolley made clear in both autobiographical segments, the regular work she did in this capacity underwrote her inclusion of medical preparations in her books, in a society where the value of therapeutic interventions was rooted as much in trust as scientific proofs of efficacy: "Parents trusted me without

²⁷ Paul Hunneyball, "Maynard, Sir William (1586-1640)," <http://www.historyofparliamentonline.org/volume/1604-1629/member/maynard-sir-william-1586-1640> (accessed 14 July 2021). See also Nicholas Tyacke, *Anti-Calvinists: the Rise of English Arminianism c.1590-1640* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990), esp. 192-4; John Walter, "Confessional politics in pre-Civil War Essex: prayer books, profanations and petitions," *Historical Journal*, 44, no.3 (2001): 686-7.

²⁸ Jeremy was the eldest son of Richard Wolley (15??-1634), the minister of St Mary's, Widdington (Essex), and his wife Joan. He attended Queen's College, Cambridge (matriculated Easter term 1628; MA 1635); John Venn, *Alumni Cantabrigienses... from the Earliest Times to 1751* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1922-7); available online at <http://venn.lib.cam.ac.uk/> (accessed 19 February 2019), unique identifier WLY628J. His subscription to become master of the Newport Grammar School, dated 7 March 1637, is reproduced in W.T. Phillips, "The History of Newport (Essex) Grammar School, 1588-1938," (M.Ed. thesis, Durham University, 1968), 68. One of the few documents bearing Jeremy's name, a land conveyance of the acres in Newport left to him in his father's will, may be part of arrangements towards a marriage settlement: Essex Record Office, D/DC 41/462, conveyance of land in Widdington by Jeremy Wolley, 'gentleman', to Benjamin Skott, 'yeoman', for £110, dated 19 April 1647. Hannah and Jeremy's eldest surviving child, Richard Wolley (d. c.1705), had to be born in 1647 or early 1648, as he is given as 24 on the marriage allegation document cited at fn.20 above. This information, and his connection to Hannah Wolley, is not mentioned in his *ODNB* article: Helen Berry, "Wolley, Richard (fl. 1667–1694), Church of England clergyman and author." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. 23 Sep. 2004; Accessed 1 Aug. 2022. <https://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-29845>.

²⁹ "I married an eminent School-master who had interest in the same persons I had, by educating their Children": *A Guide to Ladies*, 98. There is no record of their marriage in the parish registers of either St Mary the Virgin, Newport Pond (Essex Record Office, D/P 15/1/1), or of Little Easton (D/P 180/1/1).

³⁰ *A Guide to Ladies*, 98.

the help of any Physician or Chirurgion: likewise the Neighbours in eight or ten miles round came to me for Cure.”³¹

At some time before 1654, Jeremy’s headmastership became untenable, possibly because of connections with the ultra-Royalist Maynards, and the Wolleys moved to Hackney, then a leafy village north-east of London.³² By this time, the couple had at least two children, and possibly as many as four. Contrary to previous biographical accounts of this time in Hackney, there is no explicit record of them having *run* a school there, but it is possible that Jeremy worked in one of the many private boarding schools in the suburb, or that the Wolleys were somehow supported by Sir Henry Wroth (1604/5-1671) and his wife, Anne (1632-77: m. 1653), one of Lord and Lady Maynard’s daughters, who resided at Durants in Enfield (a few miles north of Hackney).³³ Hannah may also have worked in a school at this time, although with infant children, it is unlikely she would have had much time to do so, without the support of servants of her own.

Although it is commonly stated that Jeremy died around 1660/1, he actually died several years earlier. Hannah was granted letters of administration in the absence of a will, on 16 October 1656, which suggests his death was both sudden and unexpected.³⁴ Hannah, then aged no more than 33 and with a young family, may well have been forced to return to work, either teaching in a Hackney boarding school, or as a governess in a household. How this combined with the raising of her children, we can only guess, but she probably took advantage of family and patronage connections to ensure her eldest, Richard was schooled and able to attend Queen’s College, Cambridge, like his father, as a sizar from 1662.³⁵

³¹ *Supplement*, 12.

³² Wolley was replaced as headmaster of the Newport Free Grammar School in 1654: F. Thompson (compiler), *Newport Free Grammar School: A Brief History* (Saffron Walden: The Old Newportonian Society, 1987), Appendix.

³³ For the biographies of Sir Henry and his wife, see L.L. Ford, "Wroth, Sir Robert (c. 1539–1606), landowner and politician." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. 23 Sep. 2004; Accessed 1 Aug. 2022. <https://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-30083>.

³⁴ Considine, “Hannah Wolley,” c.f. National Archives (TNA), PROB 6/32m fol. 254r, grant of letters of administration for the estate of Jeremy Wolley, of Hackney to his relict, Hannah, 16 October 1656.

³⁵ Berry, “Richard Wolley”.

After this date there is scant information about Wolley's personal life, even in her own autobiographical material, until her second marriage, on 16 April 1666, to the widower, Francis Chalenor/Challinor, at St Margaret's Westminster.³⁶ Chalenor may well have been a member of the Chal(l)enor family of Cuckfield, East Sussex, and involved in education himself.³⁷ He and Wolley possibly ran a school together during the late 1660s, as there is a tantalising reference in the Sussex cleric Giles Moore's memoranda of the placing of Moore's niece, Martha, at school in London with a "Mistress Chaloner" in the spring of 1669, as well as payments to her again in the summer of 1671.³⁸ Wolley's repeated offers in print of personal tuition (which I will return to) bear testimony to her deep pedagogic skills, gained across some three decades' involvement in both domestic and institutional education.

Wolley was already a widow for the second time by January 1671/2, when she was recorded as such in the marriage allegation she signed witnessing her son Richard's freedom to marry.³⁹ Indeed, her later years seem to have been spent with Richard, with whom she advertised herself as living in Golden Cup and Ball Court, just off Ludgate Hill, at the time of writing of *A Supplement*, in 1673-4.⁴⁰ This is the last date and location in which we can securely place Wolley, and although there is as yet no confirmed record of her death in either relevant London or Essex registers), it is likely that she died sometime between the publication date of *A Supplement* and 1675, when the *Accomplished Ladies Delight* was published in at least two different imprints.⁴¹

³⁶ *Allegations for Marriage Licences Issued by the Dean and Chapter of Westminster, 1558-1699; Also, for Those Issued by the Vicar-General of the Archbishop of Canterbury, 1660 to 1679*, eds J. L. Chester & G. J. Armytage, Harleian Society, vol. 23 (1886), 115.

³⁷ F. W. T. Attree, "Notes on the Family of Chaloner of Lindfield," *Sussex Archaeological Collections*, 44 (1901): 133. Attree also suggests that Francis (born in or before 1622 to Ninian and Jane Chaloner), may well have been the Francis who married Wolley in 1666.

³⁸ Cited in Kenneth Charlton, *Women, Religion, and Education in Early Modern England* (London: Routledge, 1999), 141.

³⁹ See fn. 20 above.

⁴⁰ *Supplement*, 'Advertisment', sig.A4r.

⁴¹ I have consulted the parish registers for St Martin's Ludgate and neighbouring parishes; St Margaret's Westminster; and various Essex parishes, including: Great Dunmow, Thaxted, Easton, Newport, Widdington

Wolley's life pre-publication was clearly the foundation for much of the expertise and knowledge she later channelled into her published works. While this is a recognisable trajectory for domestic management texts in the eighteenth century, where female authors would lay claim in their prefaces to experience as housekeepers, professional cooks or as cookery school entrepreneurs as proof of their expertise, Wolley was the first such female writer in this vein to manifest and monetise her *curriculum vitae* in and through print.⁴²

Gendering London's Restoration bookscape

Books anticipate (and expect) readers, so what was the state of the market for the sort of books Wolley published in 1661? The 1660s and 1670s, especially after the passing of the Licensing Act of 1662, saw a noticeable slowdown in the overall numbers of books printed.⁴³ While texts with 'woman' or a variant thereof in the title increased in number over the period, with a marked upswing after 1670, those actually written *by* women between 1640 and 1700 were miniscule in number, less than one per cent of published works.⁴⁴

The decade immediately after the Restoration was a particularly fallow one for women writers, which makes Wolley's activity in exactly that period significant in unpacking what remain, for book historians and literary scholars alike, two pressing questions: how did writers get into print, and what were the commercial decisions and arrangements through which the book was produced and disseminated? Examining the emerging genre of domestic manuals helps us towards an answer to

and Manuden (all places with which Wolley herself or members of her family had association), with no record of burial yet forthcoming.

⁴² Gilly Lehmann, *The British Housewife: Cookery Books, Cooking and Society in Eighteenth-Century Britain* (Totnes: Prospect Books, 2003), 84, 137-9, 155-6. Male cooks promoted their expertise and experiences in this way from the early 17th century onwards: see for example John Murrell, *A Delightfull Daily Exercise for Ladies and Gentlewomen* (London: printed for Thomas Dewe, 1621), sig.A4r; William Rabisha, *The whole body of cookery dissected, taught, and fully manifested, methodically, artificially, and according to the best tradition of the English, French, Italian, Dutch, &c.* (London: printed by R. W. for Giles Calvert, 1661), sigs A3r-v.

⁴³ 'An Act for preventing the frequent Abuses in printing seditious treasonable and unlicensed Bookes and Pamphlets and for regulating of Printing and Printing Presses', 14 Car. II, c. 33 (1662).

⁴⁴ Bell, "Women writing," 43, 438-39.

both.⁴⁵ Alongside ballads, pamphlets and other forms of “cheap print”, didactic texts, especially those focused on domestic knowledge and practical self-education, from casting accounts to being one’s own doctor, became a visible component of booksellers’ stock, with traders like George Conyers specialising in “cheap practical manuals on every conceivable subject.”⁴⁶ This is made visible in Robert Clavell’s 1673 *Catalogue of all the Books printed in England since the dreadful fire of London in 1666* which included a specific category for “Cookery, Preserving, Candyng, etc.”, alongside octavos and smaller texts on horsemanship, “merchandizing”, “husbandry and gardening”, copy-books, and so on.⁴⁷

Attending to the generically similar works in circulation, not only immediately before *The Ladies Directory* appeared in 1661 but also across her career in print, suggests that she and the printers and booksellers who produced her books were keenly attuned to what else was on bookshop shelves, and what material and textual formats were attracting buyers.⁴⁸ Wolley was not averse to reconfiguring and re-treading earlier work herself, either. As the subtitle to the 1674 *Supplement to the Queen-Like Closet* announced, Wolley arguably saw all of her output as being “a little of everything”, which readers – themselves hardly homogenous, as Wolley also recognised – could usefully combine and consume in different formats.

The lost book

⁴⁵ I prefer “domestic manuals” to the terms used elsewhere (e.g. “books for the household,” “cookery books,” and so on). While Wolley’s books all pertained to the sphere of the household (although also sometimes beyond it), they were intended to be “how-to” books, rather than simply read for pleasure: “manual” implies that interactive element in a way that “book” alone does not: Glaisyer and Pennell, “Introduction,” 3.

⁴⁶ Natasha Glaisyer and Sara Pennell, “Introduction,” in *Didactic Literature in England, 1500-1800: Expertise Constructed*, eds Natasha Glaisyer and Sara Pennell (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003), 4; Henry R. Plomer, *A Dictionary of the Booksellers and Printers Who Were at Work in England, Scotland and Ireland from 1668 to 1725*, ed. Arundell Esdaile (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1922), 80.

⁴⁷ *The Term Catalogues, 1668-1709*, 3 vols. ed. Edward A. Arber (London: privately printed, 1903-6), vol.1, u.p.; Robert Clavell, *Catalogue of all the Books printed in England since the dreadful fire of London in 1666* (London: S. Simmons for R. Clavel, 1673), 48.

⁴⁸ Zachary Lesser, *Renaissance Drama and the Politics of Publication: Readings in the English Book Trade* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 26-51; Heidi Brayman Hackel, *Reading Material in Early Modern England: Print, Gender and Literacy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 88-90; Ezell, “Cooking the books,” 173-5.

Frustratingly, the first, 1661 edition of Wolley's *The Ladies Directory* no longer survives in a print (or digital proxy) copy in a public repository anywhere in the world, according to the *ESTC*. The sole such volume, once in the collection of the great culinary bibliophile and bibliographer, Arnold W. Oxford (1854-1947), and sold at some point before his death to the British Library, was destroyed during World War Two.⁴⁹ Fortunately, a trace of the book survives in Oxford's own bibliographic entry in his 1913 *English Cookery Books, to the Year 1850*. The title is lengthy, and differs in important respects, from that of the second, 1662, edition, which will be considered later in this article:

The Ladies Directory in Choice Experiments & Curiosities of Preserving and Candyng of Fruits and Flowers. Also an Excellent Way of making Cakes and Other Comfits; With Rarities of many Precious Waters (among which are several Consumption drinks, approved of by the Doctors) and Perfumes. By Hanna Woolley, who hath had the Honour to perform such things [for] the Entertainment of His Late Majesty, as well as for the Nobility.⁵⁰

It continues with a forthright declaration-*cum*-warning:

To prevent Counterfeits: Take Notice, that these books are nowhere to be had, but from the Authress, and at Peter Drings, at the Sun in the Poultry, Book-seller; and at Tho. Milbourns, Printer, in Jewen Street, near Aldersgate: who also sells for her a most excellent Cordial Powder, and very sovereign Pils.

⁴⁹ Oxford was firstly a progressive Anglican minister, and then, remarkably, had a second career in medicine. On top of this he was a noted Freemason, yet has no Oxford *DNB* entry. Although his bookplates mark many a historic culinary work in rare books collections around the world, there is no record of when the collection he recorded so lovingly, in *Notes from a Collector's Catalogue: with a Bibliography of English Cookery Books* (London: John & Edward Bumpus, 1909) and *English Cookery Books, to the Year 1850* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1913), was dispersed. The British Library catalogue entry for "obsolete shelfmark" 7944.a.58 can be seen at <http://explore.bl.uk/BLVU1:LSCOP-ALL:BLL01003965605> (accessed 20 July 2021).

⁵⁰ Oxford, *English Cookery Books*, 31-2.

The title-page ends with the imprint: “Printed by Tho. Milbourn for the Authress 1661.”

To have a woman’s name on a title-page was not wholly unusual in 1661, although to have a living woman’s name was somewhat more so. But this is not what is most striking here. Using the *ESTC* as our guide, this is the first book printed in England to use the gendered variant ‘auth[o]ress’ on a title-page, and remained the only one to do so until the eighteenth century.⁵¹ While Anne Bradstreet had written the text published in 1650 as *The Tenth Muse, Lately Sprung up in America*, she is identified on the title-page as merely “a Gentlewoman in those parts,” and her name first appears only in the prefatory material.⁵² Bradstreet was also not, in one sense of the word, “author” of this work: her brother-in-law John Bradstreet oversaw its passage to print, without her apparent knowledge.⁵³

The use of both Wolley’s name and “Authress” twice on the title-page meant that the reader would be left in no doubt as to who the text’s progenitor was. The book was also “nowhere to be had, but from the Authress” and its printer and sole bookseller. Alerting the reader to the possibility of non-authorised texts – those “Counterfeits” – was another technique to claim both authenticity AND authorial right: only this *Ladies Directory* was the genuine article. While the language of counterfeiting and protections against it was not unknown in early modern publishing and advertising (especially of proprietary medical preparations, of which more later) and in the wider currency economy of Restoration London, where the crimes of clipping and coining were rife, here Wolley used it in tandem with “Authress”, to authenticate *her* book as a specific material object in time and

⁵¹ ‘Printed for the author’ was a common enough phrase on title pages at the time, but this form was not. The *ESTC* gives the next such chronological usage as *Advice to Sappho. Occasioned by her verses on the imitator of the first satire of the second book of Horace. By a Gentlewoman* (London: printed for the authoress and sold by J. Roberts, 1733). This is attributed to Lady Mary Wortley Montagu (*ESTC* T21063). The online *Oxford English Dictionary*, too, gives only two pre-1800 examples of the word in this specific usage, neither of which is Wolley: “authoress, n.”. *OED* Online. March 2019. Oxford University Press.

<http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/13336?redirectedFrom=Authoress> (accessed April 22, 2019).

⁵² “printed at London: for Stephen Bowtell, at the sign of the Bible in Pope’s Head-Alley, 1650” (Wing B4167). N. H. Keeble, “Bradstreet [née Dudley], Anne (1612/13–1672), poet,” *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. 23 Sep. 2004; Accessed 1 Aug. 2022.

<https://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-3209>.

⁵³ Gillian Wright, *Producing Women’s Poetry, 1600-1730: Text and Paratext, Manuscript and Print* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 66–67, 253.

space, which only she, Dring, and Milbourn could supply. As Ellinghausen notes, claims like these mark a “a major moment in the history of authorship as a vocation,” but also in the understanding of the material text as a commodity that should be authenticated through the assertive authorial voice-in-text.⁵⁴

Bringing the book to press

Although the importance of Wolley’s titular self-description shouldn’t be underplayed, the 1661 titlepage records three parties involved in its production, all of whom might have hoped to make a return on their inputs. Indeed, as a legal commodity the *printed* book was not Wolley’s at all. It was its printer, Thomas Milbourn, who registered the copy of “a booke entituled *The Ladies Directory in choice experiments & curiosities of preserving in jellies and candying fruits & flowers by Hanna Woolley*” in the Stationers’ Company Register on 16 July 1661.⁵⁵

Milbourn (also sometimes Milborne), was a printer-publisher based in the now-lost Jewin/Jewen Street, to the north-east of St Giles Cripplegate church, who had gained his freedom of the Stationers’ Company in 1634.⁵⁶ As a Stationer, Milbourn was one of the 33 authorised printing houses listed in the 1668 survey of printers and presses undertaken by the Privy Council, where he was listed as operating two presses, with no apprentices, but two workmen in his employ.⁵⁷ This puts him in a somewhat select group of printer-publishers, a vocation which seems to have been good to him, as he remained active for some fifty years.⁵⁸ Milbourn was also involved in later texts bearing

⁵⁴ Ellinghausen, *Labor and Writing*, 8.

⁵⁵ *A Transcript of the Registers of the Worshipful Company of Stationers: from 1640-1708 A.D.: vol. II, 1655-1675*, ed. George E. B. Eyre, Roxburgh Club (London: privately printed, 1913), 299.

⁵⁶ Plomer, *Dictionary*, 205.

⁵⁷ Barnard and D.F. McKenzie (eds), with Bell, *History of the Book IV*, Appendix 2, “Survey of printing presses, 1668,” (transcription of TNA SP 29/243, prepared by D.F. McKenzie), 794-6. See also Michael Treadwell, “The Stationers and the Printing Acts at the End of the Seventeenth Century,” in the same volume, 755–776.

⁵⁸ His main trade in this area was as printer-publisher of English Stock outputs, such as almanacs. The last datable title bearing Milbourn’s imprint in the *ESTC* is 1689: [Johan Rudolph Glauber], *The Works of the Highly Experienced and Famous Chymist John Rudolph Glauber...Translated into English, and published for publick good by the labour, care, and charge, of Christopher Packe, philo-chymico-medicus* (London: printed

Wolley's name as author, including the 1672 compilation *The Ladies Delight*: involvement which may be traced back to this original registration of *The Ladies Directory*.⁵⁹

Assignment of early modern copyright in England was not about creating or confirming authorial rights, but firmly directed at shoring up the “monopolistic aims” of the Stationers.⁶⁰ Milbourn had, in entering the copy as his, created his unique right to see off any other attempt to print copies of *The Ladies Directory*. This would be the case, even had Wolley sought to place a subsequent edition (even an amended and revised edition), with another printer or bookseller. Milbourn's copyright was what materialised Wolley's authorship but it also meant that the text legally ceased to be Wolley's to control without extensive legal intervention on her part to wrest it back.

Beyond these stated facts on the (destroyed) title page – that Wolley authored the text, Milbourn printed and registered the book, and both, with Peter Dring, helped sell it — remarkably little is yet known about the financing of early modern book publication outside of subscription-based models, apart from the costs involved at the point of printing and binding, or the profits that could be made therefrom.⁶¹ Although both Milbourn and Dring were named as co-distributors, it was Wolley's name and her unspecified address that was given as first port of call for any would-be purchaser, and may indicate her or a patron as the primary financial investor in the project.⁶² In an arrangement such

by Thomas Milbourn for the author, 1689) Wing G845, ESTC R21872: for printer-publishers, see Lesser, *Renaissance Drama*, 31-4.

⁵⁹ *The Ladies Delight* has been the subject of debate about its production. It is a compilation of elements of *The Ladies Directory*, *The Cook's Guide* and medico-surgical recipes, the origins of which have not yet been identified. As Wolley may well have been living outside London at the time of publication, Milbourn may have used the opportunity to wring more out of the copyright he held in *The Ladies Directory*.

⁶⁰ Joseph Loewenstein, *The Author's Due: Printing and the Prehistory of Copyright* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2002), 155.

⁶¹ Loewenstein, *Author's Due*, 95; Lesser, *Renaissance Drama*, 32-37. Claire Bowditch has recently explored the topic of Aphra Behn's financial gains from her publications, which considered Behn's gains (or not) from print runs of her plays based on costs of printing, paper, labour and so on: Claire Bowditch, “‘A purse that seldom fails’: Aphra Behn's Finances and Readers' Legacies,” unpublished paper given at “‘This Reading of Books is a Pernicious Thing’: Restoration women writers and their readers,” held (virtually) at the Huntington Library, San Marino, CA, 15-16 April 2021.

⁶² I have searched through the digitally available returns for the City of London and parts of Middlesex and Westminster for the 1662 and 1664 Hearth Tax, and drawn a blank, but it would be useful to do this for London's parishes in other years the tax operated, where returns exist and have not yet been published: see

as this, the printer and bookseller were probably no more than equal or subordinate financial partners in the text's production. Milbourn may have offset a proportion of the costs of printing and packaging the text against profit from selling copies and the possible gain from holding the copyright, while Dring may have struck a bargain with Milbourn (as printer-publisher) over the profits to be made from selling the books in custom bindings from his shop. But neither man was likely the commissioning force behind *The Ladies Directory*. Instead, Wolley or a patron not only provided the manuscript text Milbourn's workmen printed, but probably also the money upfront to pay for some, if not all of those production costs. This she would then hope to recoup through selling the books herself. This was not an unknown practice in 1661, but it was far from common.⁶³

This makes sense too, in terms of the type of deal struck between Wolley, Milbourn and Dring. How likely was it that Milbourn, experienced printer as he was, would have taken a financial risk on the uncertain venture of publishing an unknown woman's work, in a genre which had, up until that date, been dominated by lofty-sounding titles such as Lord Patrick Ruthven's *The Ladies Cabinet Opened*, *The Queen's Closet Opened*, and *The Closet of the Eminent Sir Kenelm Digby*?⁶⁴ Although the rising tide of women-focused writings by the 1640s might have persuaded printers and booksellers to seek out "women-authored" novelties, all publishing ventures were (and remain) a gamble on what the reading public's appetites might find toothsome, and this work was arguably more "commercially unattractive" than other prospects crossing Milbourn's counter in 1660-1.⁶⁵ At

London Hearth Tax: City of London, 1662 (2011), *British History Online* <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/london-hearth-tax/london/1662> (accessed 21 July 2021); *London Hearth Tax: Westminster 1664* (2011), *British History Online* <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/london-hearth-tax/westminster/1664> (accessed 21 July 2021); *London Hearth Tax: City of London and Middlesex, 1666* (2011), *British History Online* <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/london-hearth-tax/london-mddx/1666> (accessed 21 July 2021).

⁶³ Loewenstein, *Author's Due*, pp. 49-50.

⁶⁴ Anon., *The ladies cabinet opened: vvherein is found hidden severall experiments in preserving and conserving, physicke, and surgery, cookery and huswifery* (printed by M. P[arsons] for Richard Meighen: London, 1639); later editions were attributed to Lord Patrick Ruthven (c. 1572?-1651); W. M., *The Queens closet opened: incomparable secrets in physick, chyrurgery, preserving, candying, and cookery* (printed [by R. Wood] for Nathaniel Brooks: London, 1658); Sir Kenelm Digby (1603-65), *The closet of the eminently learned Sir Kenelme Digbie Kt. opened* (printed by E[llen]. C[otes]. for H. Brome: London, 1669).

⁶⁵ Bell, "Women writing," 438; Lesser, *Renaissance Drama*, 38, 46-48; Bernard Capp, "The book trade and the distribution of print in the 1650s", in *The Book Trade in Early Modern England: Practices, Perceptions, Connections*, eds Victoria Gardner and John Hinks (New Castle, DE/London: Oak Knoll Press/British Library,

the same time, he and Dring might well have seized the opportunity to diversify their outputs, and capitalise (as other booksellers of the time were doing, as we shall see), on that rising tide, seeking out new customers via new stock. For both printer and bookseller, this appears to have been their first venture into this genre.⁶⁶

It is of course possible that, while Wolley was characterised as the ‘Authress’, the business side of the publication was managed by someone else, such as a husband or (as in the case of Anne Bradstreet), a brother (-in-law).⁶⁷ Yet, if there was a man working on Wolley’s behalf, it was probably not an immediate family member. Her father and her first husband were both dead by 1661, her second husband not yet on the scene, and her eldest son was only a teenager.⁶⁸ Whatever the case, the rarity of the sort of negotiations we might imagine between Milbourn and Wolley, or someone acting on her behalf, surely meant that Wolley had few precedents to follow or insist upon.⁶⁹

We know nothing about what Wolley might have received as payment, if indeed *any* money came her way in her dealings with Milbourn and Dring. Early modern authors might receive but a few shillings for their manuscript, with only ‘laureates’ like John Milton (and his heirs) receiving more, and playwrights depending on the takings of their benefit night performances, as much as on the sales of the playbook.⁷⁰ This poor return may not necessarily have been coloured by gender,

2014), 220; John Barnard, “London publishing, 1640-1660: crisis, continuity and innovation,” *Book History*, 4 (2001): 5.

⁶⁶ Zachary Lesser, “From text to book,” in *Women Editing/Editing Women: Early Modern Women Writers and the New Textualism*, eds Ann Hollinshed Hurley and Chanita Goodblatt (Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars, 2009), 124–6.

⁶⁷ Bell, “Women Writing,” 438.

⁶⁸ Berry, “Richard Wolley”.

⁶⁹ Bell, “Women Writing,” 442.

⁷⁰ Ann Rosalind Jones, *The Currency of Eros: Women’s Love Lyric in Europe, 1540-1620* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1990); Stephen B. Dobranski, *Milton, Authorship, and the Book Trade* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), and for authorial payments more broadly, see idem, “Authorship in the Seventeenth Century,” *Oxford Handbooks Online* DOI: 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199935338.013.002 (online publication May 2014), accessed 26 July 2021.

either: Marcy L. North notes that male writers were no less likely to be poorly paid than their female counterparts.⁷¹

Given there is no evidence from the first edition of a dedicatee recorded in Oxford's bibliography, we can only speculate at possible patrons; but given that subsequent works by Wolley included dedicatory epistles to people who clearly supported her in practical ways, it is reasonable to do so. Beyond her immediate family, there is one other possibility for such support: the Wroths at Durants, who may have been the family Hannah and Jerome turned to when they moved to Hackney in *circa* 1654. Lady Anne and her infant daughter Mary (b.c. 1659), were the joint dedicatees of Wolley's next book, *The Cook's Guide* (1664). The "Epistle Dedicatory" to this work is unambiguous in its gratitude: "The Duty I owe to your Ladyship and the rest of your Noble Familie commands more than this Booke is able to express." This is certainly the dedicatory style of the hopeful, patron-pursuing writer, but Wolley goes on to plead that "ill fate hath made me altogether incapable of any worthy Return of your Love and bounty": this speaks to a more than symbolic or aspired-to connection.⁷² The Wroths had some literary connections with Royalist writers, such as Thomas Fuller (1607/8-1661), who dedicated a section of his enormous *Church History of Britain* to Sir Henry, but these are the only two dedications the couple seem to have attracted.⁷³

Another, more speculative Essex connection, and one for which there are tantalising suggestions of friendship, might have provided the practical publishing contacts Wolley sought. William Winstanley (1634-98) was the prolific author of the *Poor Robin* almanacs, as well as writing the Royalist Restoration 'martyrology', *England's vworthies* in 1660, published by Nathaniel

⁷¹ Marcy L. North, "Women, the Material Book and Early Printing," in *The Cambridge Companion to Early Modern Women's Writing*, ed. Laura Lunger Knoppers (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 68, 81.

⁷² Wolley describes herself as having been governess to three of Lady Anne Maynard's daughters, of whom Anne was probably one: *A Guide to Ladies*, 97. Hannah Wolley, *The Cooks Guide* (London: printed for Peter Dring, 1664), W3276, sigs A2r-v.

⁷³ Thomas Fuller, *The Church-History of Britain from the Birth of Jesus Christ until the year M.DC.XLVIII* (London: John Williams, 1655), dedication to section III of Book VIII (p. 29 of that book).

Brooke.⁷⁴ Winstanley was Wolley's contemporary, educated in Saffron Walden, and residing (despite sojourns in Cambridge and east London), in the family home, Berries, at Quendon (Essex) approximately 2.5 miles south of Newport Grammar School. Circumstantial evidence connects the younger Wolleys with Winstanley's parents, the lawyer Henry and Elizabeth (née Leader), who lived at Quendon until 1670, when William and his second wife, Ann, inherited the property.⁷⁵ There is nothing concrete to connect Wolley to Winstanley, but their movement in the 1640s and 1650s in similarly pro-Royalist circles in north and mid-Essex, is suggestive. In short, without some degree of patronage, or extant contacts in the capital's printing trades, it is highly unlikely Wolley – then a youngish widow and single parent – would have single-handedly negotiated her way into the arrangement she made with Milbourn and Dring.

In the absence of any contract or recorded deal struck between the three, understanding how each anticipated making a return on their investment – in kind or in cash – is a matter for speculation, too. In lieu of any actual payment for a manuscript itself, receiving copies was a more common transaction between author and printer/bookseller. This was clearly part of their arrangement, but it does not make clear which of them needed to sell more copies to make up their respective spending on the project. Unlike the Puritan divine, Richard Baxter (1615-91), who distributed his author copies *gratis* to his Kidderminster parishioners, Wolley probably needed to sell most, if not all, of the copies she may have received.⁷⁶ Perhaps Wolley worked as the Devon cleric Thomas Larkham did in 1650s: he recorded in detail his laborious attempts to hawk copies of his 1652 collection of sermons, *The*

⁷⁴ William E. Burns, "Winstanley, William (d. 1698), compiler of biographies and poet." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. 23 Sep. 2004; Accessed 27 Jul. 2021.

<https://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-29760>; William Winstanley, *Englands vvorthies. Select lives of the most eminent persons from Constantine the Great to the death of Oliver Cromwel late Protector. By William Winstanley, Gent* (London: printed for Nath. Brooke, 1660), W3058. Brooke's name is well-known to historians interested in didactic literature in the 1650s and 1660s, and especially recipe collections, as the stationer who brought both *The Queen's Closet Opened* (first published 1656) and Robert May's *The Accomplished Cook* (first published 1660) to press: Plomer, *Dictionary*, 34; Elizabeth Lane Furdell, *Publishing and Medicine in Early Modern England* (Rochester, NY: University of Rochester Press, 2002), 44-45.

⁷⁵ Alison Barnes, *William Winstanley: The Man Who Saved Christmas* (Saffron Walden: Poppyland Publishing, 2007), makes this connection, but provides no supporting evidence.

⁷⁶ Loewenstein, *Author's Due*, 95; Capp, "Book trade," 225; Dobranski, "Authorship".

Wedding Supper, and his 1656 publication, *The Attributes of God*, to family, friends, attendees at the busy Exeter Assizes and his parish school pupils and parents.⁷⁷

Selling texts, teaching texts

In Restoration London there were potentially more outlets, and more prospective readers readily to hand than Larkham had on his Devon doorstep. However, the probable strategy of selling copies direct from her door also suggests that Wolley's market for the book may already have been identified and the book's packaging shaped by it.⁷⁸ Wolley's prior working experiences argue that she was already, in the late 1650s and early 1660s, working within what John Gallagher labels "the extracurricular economy" as a private tutor in domestic skills. Both in the second, 1662, edition of *The Ladies Directory* and in the 1668 *A Guide to Ladies*, Wolley confidently advertised those services: "if you are desirous to learn any art women usually teach, I shall be willing to wait on you, at your own homes, certain daies in the week, and I shall not be unreasonable in my demands."⁷⁹ This cross-platform self-promotion indicates that Wolley was building a commercial offer not just in print, but in person too.

The scope and scale of this sort of educational provision is only now being mapped, but it is evident from publications later in the century and Wolley's own in-text advertising, that it was a well-established service for female clients in later Stuart London, and other major urban centres, alongside private dancing- and writing masters and language specialists.⁸⁰ Such provision filled a now-visible gap for those adolescent women who may not have been able to attend or afford one of the private boarding or day schools that mushroomed in the London suburbs in the mid-seventeenth century. These women required accomplishment in the sorts of "fine work" which would make them either

⁷⁷ Capp, "Book trade," 226-8.

⁷⁸ Loewenstein, *Author's Due*, 50.

⁷⁹ John Gallagher, *Learning Languages in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019), 11 and ch. 1; *Ladies Directory* (1662 edition), sig. A3v; *A Guide to Ladies*, quotation on 22, but see also 26, 31, 95.

⁸⁰ This wider point is also made by Gallagher, *Learning Languages*, 33-35.

marriageable or employable: decorative needlework, confectionery and pastry-making. Wolley's insistence on such skills was likewise borne out of her own experiences and especially her "hindrances" by the losses of the Civil War and Interregnum periods: "for I wish all young Gentlewomen not to lose their time, but improve it what they can, and give their minds to learn," as insurance against the time that "riches hath wings, and flies [sic] away."⁸¹

Three rare late seventeenth-century texts record the connection between face-to-face instruction, and domestic manuals as handbooks to accompany such instruction: *The True Way in Preserving and Candyng... Made Publick for the Benefit of all English Ladies and Gentlewomen; especially for my Schollars* (London, 1681; second edition 1695); *The Young Cook's Monitor; or Directions for Cookery and Distilling Being a Choice Compendium of Excellent Receipts. Made Public for the Use and Benefit of My Schollars... by M.H.* (London, 1683; second enlarged edition, 1690); and Mary Tillinghast's *Rare and Excellent Receipts, Experienc'd and Taught by Mrs Mary Tillinghast and now Printed for the Use of her Scholars Only* (London, 1690).⁸² As Elizabeth Spiller's edition of Tillinghast acknowledges, little is known about any of these writers in existing specialist bibliographies. The 1690 second edition of M. H., "with large additions" is given on the title page as "Printed for the author at her House in Lime Street, 1690," in a relatively wealthy part of the City, which suggests that 'M.H.' was at least attempting to appear well-heeled.⁸³ Rarer still is the trade card, dating to approximately 1680, which invites women (it is addressed explicitly to "Madam"), to attend a dinner put on by the "Ladies & Gentlewomen Practitioners in the Art of Pastery and Cookery" taught by one Nathaniel Meystnor.⁸⁴ Perhaps the best known teacher-cook is

⁸¹ *A Guide to Ladies*, 23.

⁸² The British Library copies of the Tillinghast and second edition of the *Young Cooks Monitor* were bound together, sometime during the 19th century: BL shelfmarks C.189.aa.10 (1) and (2).

⁸³ *Seventeenth Century English Recipe Books: Cooking, Physic and Chirurgery in the Works of Queen Henrietta Maria and Mary Tillinghast*, ed. Elizabeth Spiller (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008), xlii. See also BL shelfmark C. 189.aa.(1). So far no other data for this address or author has been uncovered.

⁸⁴ Illustrated in Ivan Day, "From Murrell to Jarrin: Illustrations in British Cookery Books, 1621-1820," in *The English Cookery Book: Historical Essays*, ed. Eileen White (Totnes: Prospect Books, 2004), 130. Meystnor was a Windsor vintner, involved in borough politics in the 1680s: Andrew Barclay, "The Court, Civic Politics and Architecture in Windsor, 1685-88," *The Court Historian*, 25, no.1 (2020), 51-64.

Edward Kidder (c. 1665/6-1739). Kidder was quite the pastry entrepreneur, running schools in several different central London locations from at least the early 1700s.⁸⁵ Indeed, although the printed version of *Receipts of Pastry and* appeared no earlier than 1720, a number of engraved/manuscript versions of Kidder's receipts circulated earlier, indeed possibly as early as 1702.⁸⁶ By the early eighteenth century, the core specialities of these books, pastry-making and preserving, were also being explicitly advertised as essential components of girls' boarding school curricula to "render ... them accomplished."⁸⁷

So, while Wolley's printed volumes lack explicit reference to being produced for scholars, these later works and enterprises support the idea that *The Ladies Directory* was conceived of as supplementary material for a very defined audience, and that some of that targeted audience may already have been well-known to Wolley as extant private students. This entrepreneurial service, offering bespoke, at-home tuition laid the foundation for the likes of Tillinghast and Kidder to develop their 'schools' later in the century, but may also have been the ultimate goal of Wolley too, had not the plague and fire devastated the metropolitan economy so completely.

In the 'medical marketplace'

One further detail on the 1661 *The Ladies Directory* title-page sheds light on another possible component of Milbourn's, Dring's and Wolley's arrangement, and provides an early example of a common commercial sideline for later seventeenth-century booksellers and printers. Milbourn was also selling an "excellent cordial water and Sovereign pills" of Wolley's making on her behalf, the

⁸⁵ *London Magazine* 8 (1739), 205. See also Simon Varey, "Kidder, Edward (1665/6–1739), cookery teacher and writer." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. 23 Sep. 2004; Accessed 1 Aug. 2022. <https://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-50454>. See also Peter Targett, "Edward Kidder: His Book and his Schools," *Petits Propos Culinaires*, 32 (June 1989): 35-44; and David Potter, "Some notes on Edward Kidder," *Petits Propos Culinaires*, 65 (Sept. 2000): 9-27.

⁸⁶ Simon Varey, "New light on Edward Kidder's *Receipts*," *Petits Propos Culinaires*, 39 (Dec. 1991): 48. The engraved, printed title-page of Brotherton Library (Leeds University) MS 75 is inscribed 'London 1702', and is followed by 71 folios of manuscript recipes similar to, if not verbatim copies of, the recipes which appear in the published Kidder texts: Leeds University, Brotherton Library, Special Collections, Blanche Leigh Collection, MS 75, title-page.

⁸⁷ Advertisement for a girls' boarding school "on mile-End Green," *The Spectator*, 342 (2 April 1712): 2.

first indication of the pharmaceutical skills Wolley laid claim to in her later autobiographical accounts. Wolley's later bookseller, Richard Lowndes was a named distributor of various proprietary medicines from the late 1650s, while Dorman Newman sold a "a veritable pharmacy of extraordinary medicaments" from his Poultry shop after 1670.⁸⁸ In this context, Wolley's ability to produce such commodities surely made her an attractive proposition – and brought in a potential alternative revenue stream – for all involved.

Wolley's therapeutic expertise was another skill she was prepared to monetise but women's commercial participation in this developing sector of the early modern therapeutic economy is still only glimpsed in advertisements and legal cases. Although many of the better-known proprietary medicines of the late seventeenth- and early-eighteenth centuries were branded through seeming male 'expertise', however superficial that veneer of medical expertise was – 'Dr' Lockyer's pills, Dr Stoughton's Drops, Lucatello's Balsam – women were not only involved in the preparation and trial of some of these compounds: at several removes, they might also have been the initiators of them.⁸⁹

The title-page offer of Wolley's compounds for sale is earlier than all these proprietary medicines' first advertisements – another apparent 'first' for her. Lionel Lockyer's pills were first puffed in a flier printed in 1664, while the first dated pamphlet advertisement for Daffy's Elixir was issued in 1673.⁹⁰ Although many women were deeply implicated in domestic production of remedies for home and community use, it remained rare for a woman's name to be attached to a ready-made remedy or tailored cure (unless that name was aristocratic, as in the case of the Countess of Kent's

⁸⁸ For Lowndes as a distributor of medicines, see *The Kingdoms Intelligencer*, 8 (18-25 February 1661), p. 11; and *The Newes Published for the Satisfaction and Interest of the People*, 72 (8 September 1664). See also Furdell, *Medicine and Publishing*, 42, 133; P. Isaac, "Pills and print," in *Medicine, Mortality and the Book Trade*, eds R. Harris and M. Myers (New Castle, DE/London: Oak Knoll Press, 1998), pp. 25-49; Louise Hill Curth, "Medical Advertising in the Popular Press: Almanacs and the Growth of Proprietary Medicines," *Pharmacy in History*, 50, no.1 (2008): 11.

⁸⁹ Furdell, *Publishing and Medicine*, 108-9.

⁹⁰ [Lionel Lockyer], *An Advertisement Concerning those Most Excellent Pills, called, Pillulæ radiis solis extractæ* (London: n.s., 1664), not listed in Wing; [Anthony Daffy], *Elixir Salutis: the choise drink of Health, or Heath-bringing Drink* (London: printed with allowance to the author by T. Milbourn, 1673), Wing D105A. See also David Boyd Haycock and Patrick Wallis, *Quackery and Commerce in Seventeenth-Century London: The Proprietary Medicine Business of Anthony Daffy*, *Medical History Supplement* (London: The Wellcome Trust Centre for the History of Medicine at UCL, 2005), 4, 12, n.59.

powder).⁹¹ It was only in the late 1730s that a non-elite woman, Joanna Stephens, publicised and capitalised upon her infamous snail-and soap-based cure for the stone, in her own right.⁹²

The second edition

We turn now to the surviving second edition of *The Ladies Directory*, published in 1662, to explore what the now-destroyed first edition *might* have looked like and contained. There are also elements to this edition which were clearly not part of the first, suggesting that the market and opportunities within it had somewhat changed between the two imprints. How the original co-producers came together in this edition—or did not—is helpful in mapping the changing relationship between original author and the book's other stakeholders.

That there was a second edition is itself notable. Beyond the staples of the Stationers' Company English Stock monopoly, subsequent editions of texts were by no means inevitable or common. The fact that the second (altered) edition followed only a year after the first suggests this was, by early Restoration measures at least, a title that shifted copies.⁹³ Nonetheless, only two now survive in public collections: one in the Ferguson Collection, Glasgow University Library Special Collections; and one, part of the Katherine Golden Bittings collection, held at the Library of Congress, Washington, DC..⁹⁴ More may be owned privately but it is also likely that, as practical books of instruction, the copies were used until they fell apart (figure 1 below is clearly from another, no longer surviving copy).

⁹¹ The Countess of Kent's powder was not originally a commercially distributed remedy, but recipes for it circulated extensively, and many different versions can be found in manuscript recipe collections: Elaine Leong, *Recipes and Everyday Knowledge: Medicine, Science and the Household in Early Modern England* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 2018), 167-8.

⁹² Philip K. Wilson, "Stephens, Joanna (d. 1774), medical practitioner." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. 23 Sep. 2004; Accessed 1 Aug. 2022. <https://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-40525>.

⁹³ It is possible that Milbourn and Dring wanted to shift unsold sheets from the first printing, but that could have been done without quite the same level of updating that appears to have occurred.

⁹⁴ University of Glasgow Library Special Collections, Ferguson Collection, shelfmark Ferguson Af -d.45; and Library of Congress, Katherine Golden Bitting Collection on Gastronomy, shelfmark TX811.W6.

In the Epistle to the 1662 edition, we get our first glimpse of the promotion of the text as an “easie” and useful handbook.⁹⁵ Wolley’s claims to practising her arts before the “late king” [Charles I] no longer grace the title-page, although they are there in the Epistle, marking a slight but strategic shift in anticipated audience tastes: proof of courtly experience was now, as the gloss of Charles II’s Restoration wore off, less marketable than the practical value of the text. Badged as a “directory”, this text was not simply a ‘cabinet’ or ‘closet’ opened, with overtones of display, secrecy and spectacle. These were recipes to roll up one’s sleeves to try, not to marvel at; as Wolley urged her would-be readers, “prove [that is, try] any one of them, and do it with a diligent care, and then I am sure you will be Encouraged to the rest.”⁹⁶

For example, the directions for making a “cordial cherry water,” include precise ingredient quantities (not commonplace in early modern printed recipes), and clear, step-by-step instructions: “let [the ingredients] steep in an earthen pot four and twenty hours, and as you put them into the Limbeck to distill them, bruise them with your hands; make a soft fire under them, and distill them by degrees.” In another recipe for a caraway seed cake, the instructions are thoroughgoing, to the point of specifying types of paper for covering the cake in the oven – “two brown papers, and lay a white paper on the top of them” -- the shape of the cake (oval) and even the materials for the cooling cloths: “when you draw it, cover it with a course [sic] linen-cloth warmed, and over it a woollen one.”⁹⁷

With only a couple of nods to highly fashionable preparations – notably the brief and very early printed recipe for “Spanish chaculata” [drinking chocolate] – the small book delivers what Wolley promised: instruction rather than confounding secrets, with an emphasis on thrift, the hallmark of the canny domestic paragon. At the same time, these were all recipes which could equip the would-be lady’s waiting woman, who needed to be able to “preserve well”; or a housekeeper who

⁹⁵ *Ladies Directory* (1662), sig. A2r.

⁹⁶ *Ladies Directory* (1662), sig. A3r. See also Wendy Wall, “Reading the home: the case of *The English Housewife*,” in *Renaissance Paratexts*, eds Helen Smith and Louise Wilson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 181.

⁹⁷ *The Ladies Directory* (1662), 18-19, 77-8.

needed aptitude not only in preserving, but in distilling and preparation of sick dishes, too. The book was thus not intended to entertain, but to train.⁹⁸

Adding value in the second edition

Without a surviving copy of the first edition, it is tricky to identify what changed (if anything) between the two editions. Nevertheless, there are differences to note, in what A. W. Oxford did *not* record about the first edition he owned; and in changes to the information provided on the respective title-pages

The first difference is not textual but visual. Both surviving copies of the second edition have a printed pictorial frontispiece facing the title-page, which is not mentioned at all in Oxford's description of the first edition [**FIGURE 1 here**].⁹⁹ This scene reiterates the aspirations of the text, by locating readers in an idealised stillroom suitable for the optimal production of the book's preserving recipes. The engraved lettering of the book's title suggests the image was especially commissioned from John Chantry (fl.1650s-1660s), whose name can just be seen below the frame of the image, in the bottom right-hand corner. Very little is known about him, but he was cut from similar cloth to other book trade engravers.¹⁰⁰ Making this additional investment was about ensuring the book seemed different to the first edition, even if its contents may not have been (which of

⁹⁸ Wolley provides detailed job descriptions for this and other domestic service roles in *A Guide to Ladies*, 23, 25-6.

⁹⁹ One copy of the frontispiece, detached from the text, survives in the National Portrait Gallery, D30400): <https://www.npg.org.uk/collections/search/set/143/Fleming+Collection%3A+Fleming%27s+Granger+%28Vol+5%29> (accessed 9 April 2020).

¹⁰⁰ See for example, Anthony Griffiths is brutal in his *ODNB* entry for the frontispiece engraver, William Marshall, calling some of his work simply "wretched": "Marshall, William (fl. 1617–1649), engraver." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. 23 Sep. 2004; Accessed 1 Aug. 2022. <https://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-18154>. For another example of Chantry's book work see British Museum, Prints and Drawings, 'The True Originall Picture of Mary Carleton... taken by her own order in the year 1663', 1867,0309.819, which was repackaged as a frontispiece in *The Memoires of Mary Carleton: commonly stiled, the German Princess* (printed for Nath: Brooke at the Angel in Cornhill near the Royall Exchange; and Dorman Newman, at the Kings-Arms in the Poultry, 1673), Wing G35B.

course, we cannot know). Although engraved frontispieces were, by 1660, a common paratextual feature, there were notably only a couple of precursors to be found in domestic manuals.¹⁰¹

The second key difference between this second edition and the first is announced by an absence from the title-page: the text is still printed by Milbourn, but Peter Dring has become the main named distributor and Wolley is no longer named as “Authress”-publisher. The removal of Wolley’s name in this regard is not unsurprising. As she did not own the copyright in the title, she had no real control over subsequent editions; it was up to Milbourn to decide whether to go to print or not. This time, Milbourn and Dring bore the costs of production – and thus any profits – and showed their faith in this enterprise by including the pictorial frontispiece. Both of these up-front cost commitments reiterate that they now saw Wolley’s text as a safe bet, rather than a longshot.

Although this omission might indicate her being marginalised by Milbourn and Dring, this was not necessarily exploitative in the same vein as the shabby treatment she received from Dorman Newman in 1673. In fact, she was still content to work with Dring as her bookseller two years later in 1664, when publishing *The Cook’s Guide*. At the same time, we might wonder whether, as a newcomer to publishing in 1661, she lacked the experience or confidence to assert what limited rights she did have. In the 1668 autobiographical section of *A Guide to Ladies*, a world-weary Wolley looked back on “all manner of griefs” and “hinderance in undertakings,” hinting at obstacles strewn in the path of commercial endeavour, alongside the other trials and tribulations encountered since her first husband’s death.¹⁰² Certainly, there may be no connection here at all to her pre-Fire London bookseller and printer —indeed, what greater hindrance to a life and to “undertakings” than plague

¹⁰¹ Randall Anderson, “The rhetoric of paratext in early English books,” in *Cambridge History of the Book in Britain*, vol. 4, 637-44. The 1660 first edition of Robert May, *The Accomplished Cook, or the Art and Mystery* (London: sold at the Angell in Cornhill by N. Brooke, 1660), retailing for five shillings bound, contained a conventional portrait frontispiece, supposedly of May himself. A slightly earlier Brooke publication also appeared with a figurative frontispiece by Robert Vaughan (d.c.1663), featuring a male figure dressed in the garb of a high-status man-cook in an elite household or professional setting: *The Perfect Cook Being the Most Exact Directions for the Making all kinds of Pastes* (London: printed at London for Nath. Brooks at the Angell in Cornhill, 1656), Wing M706. See Ivan Day, “From Murrell to Jarrin: illustrations in British cookey books, 1621-1820,” in *The English Cookery Book*, ed. Eileen White (Totnes: Prospect Books, 2004), 98-150.

¹⁰² *A Guide to Ladies*, 98.

and fire— but this lament does suggest that the course of Wolley’s publishing ventures in the 1660s did not run entirely smoothly, or to her profit.

Wolley’s medicaments are also no longer in evidence on the title-page. Instead of advertising her own preparations, the 1662 edition makes much of the recipes for “rare waters” the text contains, and names a number of now-well-known preparations: “Dr Stephens’ Water, Dr Matthias’s Palsie Water; and an excellent water against the Plague; with severall Consumption Drinks, Approved of by the Ablest Physicians.”¹⁰³ The main text still contains several recipes which might in fact be the “excellent cordial water” advertised in 1661, and several more waters, syrups and a small number of sick dishes (a broth and a custard) that qualify as ‘kitchen physick’ preparations; but Wolley’s expertise in such preparations is erased from the front matter.¹⁰⁴ These changes point to a shifting market awareness of what potential readers might be looking for in such a book: as Lyn Bennett and others have noted, the 1650s saw an upsurge in publications of self-help medical texts, especially boosted by Nicholas Culpeper’s outputs, and a smattering of similar preparations would have added to the text’s saleability.¹⁰⁵ The removal of any reference to Wolley’s own preparations *for sale* may however hint at caution on the part of both female producers of medical treatments, and booksellers, to be associated with them, in the face of mounting opposition from the Royal College of Physicians towards unlicensed practitioners.¹⁰⁶

Instead of medical preparations, the Epistle includes an alternative offer for the reader: try these recipes, and if they prove popular “by those who know both me and my Practice herein, I shall then present you with some of my Choicest Cookery.”¹⁰⁷ Again, we catch here a suggestion that,

¹⁰³ *Ladies Directory* (1662), title-page.

¹⁰⁴ For example, see recipes 63 and 64, ‘A rare cordial water’ and ‘Another cordial water’, *Ladies Directory* (1662), 38-9. There are however no recipes in the edition for any sort of pill, lozenge or troche.

¹⁰⁵ Lyn Bennett, *Rhetoric, Medicine and the Woman Writer, 1600-1700* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018), 69, 132-3.

¹⁰⁶ Doreen A. Evenden, “Gender differences and the licensing of male and female surgeons in early modern England,” *Medical History*, 42 (1998): 194-216; Andrew Wear, *Knowledge and Practice in English Medicine, 1550–1680* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 463-8.

¹⁰⁷ *Ladies Directory*, (1662), sig. A3v.

while addressed to “ALL” ladies and gentlewomen, there might already be a receptive audience who experienced her tuition, either in school or privately. The promised book did come, in 1664, as *The Cook’s Guide*. This trail and the subsequent publication is an important clue in understanding more fully Wolley and her collaborators’ negotiation of and agile response to, the particularities of the emerging early modern print market for didactic, and especially domestic literature.

Composite texts & “detachable formats”

The promise of a further instalment was canny commercial practice in a period where the composite text offered up a range of selling options for booksellers. Examples of these multi-part but separable books include *A Choice Manual of Rare and Select Secrets in Physick and Chyrurgery* (1653) and *The Queens Closet Opened*.¹⁰⁸ Both originally appeared as single volumes but each contained two distinct parts. *A Choice Manual* was published first in 1653, in two distinct imprints. One, by Gertrude Dawson for the bookseller William Shears, comprised a first part, ‘A Choice Manual’, and a second part, ‘A True Gentlewoman’s Delight’, which had a separate title-page, ‘Epistle Dedicatorie’ and distinct pagination and registers. The other, printed by Richard Norton, is very similar in layout, but with dedicatory epistles for both parts.¹⁰⁹ *The Queen’s Closet Opened*, which appeared two years later, in 1655, printed for Nathaniel Brooke, was cast in the same mould, with two ‘parts’: ‘The Queen’s Cabinet Opened, or the Pearl of Practice’, and ‘The Queen’s Delight’, again with the second part having its own title-page, pagination and registers.¹¹⁰

¹⁰⁸ These specific bi- and tripartite forms were first explored by Lynette Hunter, “Sweet secrets from occasional receipts to specialised books: the growth of a genre,” in *Banqueting Stuffe: the Fare and Social Background of the Tudor and Stuart Banquet*, ed. C. Anne Wilson (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1991), 36-59, but without discussion of the publishing decisions which might have led to such formats.

¹⁰⁹ *A choice manual of rare and select secrets in physick and chyrurgery; collected, and practised by the Right Honourable, the Countesse of Kent, late deceased. As also most exquisite ways of preserving, conserving, candying, &c. Published by W.I. Gent* (London: printed by G[ertrude] D[awson], and sold by William Shears, at the sign of the Bible in St Paul’s Churchyard, 1653), ESTC R11656; cf. *A choice manual of rare and select secrets in physick and chyrurgery; collected and practised by the Right Honourable, the Countesse of Kent late deceased. As also most exquisite ways of preserving, conserving, candying, &c. Published by W.J. gent.* (London: printed by R. Norton, 1653), ESTC R179200.

¹¹⁰ *The Queens closet opened. Incomparable secrets in physick, chirurgery, preserving, candying, and cookery; as they were presented to the Queen by the most experienced persons of our times, many whereof they were*

While subsequent editions of each single volume version of both books appeared in the 1650s, 1660s and well into the 1670s, publishers also saw each part of these volumes as what Jeffrey Todd Knight has labelled a “detachable format”.¹¹¹ So in 1653, Gertrude Dawson and William Shears also sold *A True Gentlewoman’s Delight* as a separate publication (Wing K317A), as did Norton (Wing K317B). Dawson and Shears reissued *A True Gentlewoman’s Delight* on its own in 1659 (Wing K317BA), and in 1671 Shears’ widow, Margaret Shears repackaged it again: this time not as a duodecimo, but as a tiny 10.5cm by 5.4cm volume (technically a *24mo*), which survives in the Library of Congress: truly palm-sized and pocketable.¹¹²

The Queen’s Closet Opened follows a similar trajectory, moving between composite volume and separately bound parts.¹¹³ Brooke, with his wide offering in culinary and domestic titles, offered his customers pick-and-mix components, allowing them to build a bespoke domestic manual, to their particular tastes and needs.¹¹⁴ Although both the *Choice Manual* and *Queen-like Closet* are now more likely to survive in chunky bindings in special collections libraries, it is salutary to remember that they started life at a printers, as gatherings, “malleable and experimental – a thing to actively shape, expand and resituate as one desired.”¹¹⁵ These “detachable formats were also what the market-aware

honoured with her own practice, when she pleased to descend to these more private recreations. Never before published. Transcribed from the true copies of her Majesties own receipt books, by W.M. one of her late servants ([London]: printed for Nathaniel Brook at the Angel in Cornhill, 1655), Wing M96.

¹¹¹ Jeffrey Todd Knight, *Bound to Read: Compilations, Collections, and the Making of Renaissance Literature* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2013), 18.

¹¹² *A True Gentlewoman’s Delight: Wherein Is Contained All Manner of Cookery: Together with Preserving, Conserving, Drying, and Candyng. Very Necessary for All Ladies and Gentlewomen* (London: Printed by A[nne] M[axwell] for Margaret Shears, 1671), Library of Congress Bittings Collection TX705.K43. This version shares features with the 1663 edition of *A Choice Manual*, printed by Gertrude Dawson (Wing K314), including an alphabetised index, rather than the table of contents by page, which appeared in the 1653 edition.

¹¹³ The Library of Congress holds a 1660 duodecimo edition of the second part of this composite text, *A Queens Delight*, identical to the text Brooke had published only the year before, in 1659, in an edition of *The Queen’s Closet Opened*. This copy does not show up on the ESTC as a separate edition, which may suggest it is a later orphan from the 1659 composite, separated out by a keen collector or dealer. However, it is bound with another of Brooke’s culinary publications, *The Compleat Cook* (first published 1655: Wing M88), which itself is sometimes listed (as in the case of the 1659 edition [Wing M91]) as occasionally bound as part of *The Queen’s Closet Opened: W. M., A Queens Delight* (London: printed by R. Wood, for N. Brooke, 1660), Library of Congress Katherine Golden Bittings collection, AG104.Q32.

¹¹⁴ Knight, *Bound to Read*, 66, 70.

¹¹⁵ Knight, *Bound to Read*, 4.

Wolley would have seen on London's booksellers' shelves. So, while I have focused here on just the first of Wolley's books, it is surely more appropriate to situate *The Ladies Directory* not as a standalone text, but as a first instalment in what her printer and bookseller hoped might be a series to compete with these other contemporary composites.

Conclusion

Although they are respectively extinct and endangered in bibliographic terms, the first two editions of *The Ladies Directory* still supply suggestive lines of enquiry into how a woman writer might enter into print, who her collaborators were and what might have interested and engaged those involved in seeing such a text to the press and onto bookshelves. Although the first edition carries all the hallmarks of a speculative venture, the second shows that the success of the first bred a strategy for continuation: a foothold in the market established, Milbourn and Dring and possibly (although not inevitably) Wolley worked together to add value, and set up the promise of a new but complementary volume. Wolley's two pre-Fire outputs were, I argue, conceived to be compiled together, as well as sold separately, in line with the contemporary publishing trend for flexible formats.¹¹⁶ While the second edition of *The Ladies Directory* no longer promoted Wolley's own medicinal preparations, its contents enabled purchasers to undertake to make similar therapeutics and distillations, as well as offering Wolley as a potential in-person tutor for those who wished to be "further enformed."¹¹⁷

While it is now a commonplace of early modern publishing history to see books as artefacts of collaborative labour in their writing, compilation and production, they were also but one component in the economic activity of those involved in them. The text was never intended to be

¹¹⁶ A strategy also pursued by Wolley and her subsequent publisher, Richard Lowndes, in the production and packaging of *The Queen-like Closet* and *A Supplement*. Most later editions of the first text are usually bound with either 1674 or later editions of the second. Many such compilations have later bindings, so could have been brought together at that point, rather than at original time of purchase. Only closer inspection of the bindings would clarify this.

¹¹⁷ 'Epistle', *Ladies Directory* (1662 edition), sig. A3v.

separate from the other services and commodities Wolley and her printers and booksellers could provide, be that one-to-one tuition or precious pills. Instead, the printed text was part of a multi-pronged approach Wolley pursued, to monetise her hard-won expertise, and provide security for herself and her family. Had the plague and then fire not struck in quick succession, with their catastrophic impacts not only on London at large, but on the publishing and bookselling sectors in particular, Wolley may well have accumulated enough of a following—if not income—to establish her own school or workshop, in the manner of a Mary Tillinghast or Edward Kidder. As it was, neither *The Ladies Directory* nor *The Cook's Guide* was ever printed again in distinct editions.

Wolley's self-described "unsettled condition" after 1666 saw her —fatefully—pursue a different path with Dorman Newman. The consequences of that publishing partnership not only strained her relationship with the print trade as a whole and thwarted some of her later ambitions, but have cast a very long bibliographic shadow indeed. By recovering the path-breaking characteristics of her first known publication, we can now better see and understand Wolley's earlier, innovative practice as not only an "authress" but also one of Restoration London's "industrious, ingenious ... women making a living,"¹¹⁸ in the fertile and febrile bookscapes of the city.

LIST OF FIGURES:

Figure 1: *Ladies Directory* (1662 edition) frontispiece/ National Portrait Gallery D30400

¹¹⁸ Gowing, *Ingenious Trade*, 250.

