

“USEFUL, SUBSTANTIAL, AND SPLENDID”:  
FRUGALITY, HEALTH, AND ADVICE IN  
*ELIZABETH MOXON’S ENGLISH HOUSEWIFRY* (1749)\*

María José Gómez-Calderón  
Universidad de Sevilla

ABSTRACT

This article approaches *English Housewifry* (Moxon 1749) as a carefully calibrated system for giving advice rather than a mere collection of recipes. Drawing on a copy-text-based analysis of the title programme, Bills of Fare, index, and running prose, it shows how clause-level resources, imperatives, agentless passives, *let*-constructions, prohibitives, and permissive *you may*, create a graded directive logic sensitive to task and risk. Ethical concerns with frugality and health emerge through purpose clauses and evaluative lexis, turning procedure into reasoned counsel. Beyond the clause, layout and scheduling in the Bills of Fare encode seasonality and service order. Framed in Systemic Functional Linguistics, the study reveals a voice of experienced domestic governance: firm where safety matters, flexible where taste and expense allow.

KEYWORDS: Advice-giving, Bills of Fare, Domestic Print Culture, *English Housewifry* (1749); Modality, Paratext, Recipe Genre, Systemic Functional Linguistics

“USEFUL, SUBSTANTIAL, AND SPLENDID”: FRUGALIDAD, SALUD Y CONSEJO  
EN *ENGLISH HOUSEWIFRY* (1749) DE ELIZABETH MOXON

RESUMEN

Este artículo analiza *English Housewifry* (Moxon 1749) como un sistema cuidadosamente calibrado de consejo, más que como una simple recopilación de recetas. A partir del programa del título, los *Bills of Fare*, el índice y la prosa continua, muestra cómo recursos clausales como imperativos, pasivas sin agente, construcciones con *let*, prohibiciones y el permisivo *you may* articulan una lógica directiva graduada, sensible a la tarea y al riesgo. Las preocupaciones por la frugalidad y la salud emergen a través de cláusulas de finalidad y léxico evaluativo, convirtiendo el procedimiento en consejo razonado. Enmarcado en la Lingüística Sistémico-Funcional, el estudio revela una voz de gobierno doméstico experimentada, firme ante la seguridad y flexible en cuestiones de gusto y gusto.

PALABRAS CLAVE: aconsejando, *Bills of Fare*, cultura impresa doméstica, *English Housewifry* (1749), modalidad, paratexto, género del recetario, Lingüística Funcional Sistémica

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.25145/j.recaesin.2026.92.16>

REVISTA CANARIA DE ESTUDIOS INGLESES, 92; abril 2026, pp. 321-339; ISSN: e-2530-8335  
[Licencia Creative Commons Reconocimiento-NoComercial 4.0 Internacional \(CC BY-NC-SA\)](#)



## 1. INTRODUCTION

This article reads Elizabeth Moxon's *English Housewifry* (1749) as a hybrid advisory manual that fuses frugal domestic economy, health care, and social display. I argue that Moxon's book participates in, and helps to shape, an eighteenth-century culture of household expertise in which women marshalled practical knowledge to steward bodies, budgets, and reputations. As a printed artifact, *English Housewifry* straddles manuscript household traditions and an increasingly commercial print marketplace; as a discourse, the recipe genre's imperative voice and stance-marking create a distinctive "advisory" authority that is at once intimate and normative. (Raven 2007; Vickery 2009; DiMeo and Pennell 2013; Leong 2018).

Socio-historically, *English Housewifry* sits in a moment when domestic knowledge was both intensely local and newly mobile in print. The book was printed for Moxon by the Leeds printer James Lister, and sold from Pontefract as well as regional outlets, before enjoying later London circulation, an instance of provincial authorship circulating nationally (and a good example of how subscription, reprinting, and regional booksellers expanded cookbook audiences). The title pages and peritext promise "cuts for the orderly placing the dishes," monthly Bills of Fare, and an index, paratexts that guide readers through the social choreography of meals as much as the kitchen labor that produces them. (Grub Street/ECCO entry noting Bills of Fare and index; Raven 2007; *English Housewifry* title and imprint data).

In eighteenth-century Britain women's recipe books were collaborative, accumulative, and instrumental repositories of what Elaine Leong calls "everyday knowledge," where cures, cosmetics, and foods coexisted, and where kin and neighbourhood networks were crucial channels of authority. Moxon's collection aligns with those practices while leveraging print to codify and standardize know-how. As contemporary comparators Eliza Smith's *Compleat Housewife* (1727) and Hannah Glasse's *Art of Cookery* (1747) show, printed housewifery routinely combined culinary instruction, household physic, and table display, embedding Bills of Fare and carving diagrams as social advice by other means (Smith 1727; Glasse 1747; DiMeo and Pennell 2013; Leong 2018).

In this socio-cultural context, frugality and health run through these texts as ethical as well as practical commitments. Historians of food culture (Lehmann 2003; Thirsk 2007) and of domestic interiors (Vickery 2009) show how kitchens and pantries became sites of calculation, procurement, and bodily care, that is, domains in which a competent housewife was expected to be economical, wholesome, and fashion-conscious at once. Reading Moxon against this scholarship allow us to see how recipe selection, sequencing, and the inclusion of seasonal tables double as advice about provisioning, seasonality, and polite display.

---

\* The research conducted in this paper has been supported by the Agencia Estatal de Investigación, Plan Estatal de Investigación Científica, Técnica y de Innovación 2021–2023, under award number PID2021-125928NB-I00. I hereby express my thanks. Unión Europea · Fondo Europeo de Desarrollo regional "Una manera de hacer Europa."



Accordingly, this study treats recipes as a recognizable genre with characteristic linguistic resources for “giving advice” in the sense indicated in Alonso-Almeida (2013). The register is procedural and highly directive (marked by imperatives and agentless passives), but it also manages risk and contingency via modality (*may, must, should*) and evaluation. Tools from register and genre analysis (Biber and Conrad 2009), systemic-functional linguistics (Martin and White 2005; Halliday 2014), and stance/metadiscourse studies (Hyland 2005) help unpack how Moxon constructs authority while addressing multiple implied users (mistresses, “lower women servants”). Historical pragmatics and work on early modern medical writing further illuminate how directives and evidentials travel across household and learned domains (Martin and White 2005; Hyland 2005; Biber and Conrad 2009; Taavitsainen and Pahta 2011; Halliday and Matthiessen 2014).

The essay proceeds by framing *English Housewifery* within the eighteenth-century British book trade and domestic culture; developing a genre-analytic account of its recipes and paratexts; and reading frugality and health as intertwined advisory paradigms that ground Moxon’s authority. Comparative glances to Smith’s and Glasse’s similar works illuminate what is distinctive in Moxon’s northern, provincial positioning, and her balancing of usefulness with “splendour” (Smith 1727; Glasse 1747; Moxon 1741/1749 imprint and peritext).

## 2. SOCIO-HISTORICAL PERIOD AND RECIPE-BOOK PRODUCTION AND DISSEMINATION

Mid-eighteenth-century Britain did more than multiply recipes: it consolidated a domestic knowledge economy in which provisioning, preservation, household physic, polite hospitality, and display became touchstones of middling-sort identity, rehearsed daily at hearth and table (Vickery 2009; Pennell 2016). Rising urbanisation and expanding markets, along with smoother distribution chains, put printed how-to genres within easier reach. These books did not simply instruct, they patterned the year and schooled taste. Housewifery manuals and cookery books offered seasonal drill and menu architecture, setting out what to buy, when to serve it, and how to make it look right on the plate and on the cloth (Lehmann 2003; Thirsk 2007). In that print ecology, *English Housewifery* (1749) reads as a hinge between prudential economy and polite sociability. Its lexicon of frugality and health frames an ethics of domestic management; its “Bills of Fare” and table “cuts” teach the choreography of ordered display for guests who will notice if service falters or variety thins (Wall 2016; Leong 2018).

What also hardens in this period is a programme of taste and labour: technique, timing, and tool are rationalised with a view to repeatability, then mapped onto the calendar and its ceremonies so that thrift and elegance pull together rather than apart (Lehmann 2003; Pennell 2016). Thus, tables of weights and measures, cues about fuel and fire, and instructions for salting, drying, or potting make the kitchen legible as a site of planned work; adjacent chapters and appendices translate that work into sociable outcomes, courses sequenced, dishes balanced, carving signalled



to the carver with labelled “cuts.” It can be argued, then, that the effect is quietly disciplinary and aspirational at once: these texts standardise practice while opening a pathway for readers to perform competence, good judgement with money and materials, and good form in company, within the idiom of the polite home (Thirsk 2007; Vickery 2009; Leong 2018).

In this context, cookery and housewifery books circulated through a mixed print economy that knitted together metropolitan houses with provincial presses, chapmen on the road, and regional booksellers at fairs and shop counters. Reprint culture did the rest, and so titles grew by accretion, with new editions folding in indices, carving tables, and monthly menus as compilers learned from readers’ habits of use and from rivals’ novelties (Gaskell 1995; Feather 2006; Raven 2007). What emerges is not a static handbook but a platform that expands iteratively, its architecture trimmed for consultation, quick look-up, seasonal planning, and the steady training of taste. In this sense, paratexts sit at the centre of that architecture rather than at the margins. Indices promise efficient retrieval for the hurried practitioner; Bills of Fare encode temporal and course sequencing; and “cuts” translate spatial instruction into line and label for the carver who must portion neatly and without delay (Genette 1997; McKenzie 1999; Pennell 2016). None of this is decorative. It is the working apparatus that turns printed advice into reproducible practice at table and in kitchen.

Provincial imprints make the point particularly clearly. Moxon’s Leeds-printed book projects regional expertise into national markets, blending local practice with the smoothing effects of commercial standardisation so that Yorkshire knowledge reads as common currency from Leeds to London (Feather 2006; Raven 2007). Comparative exemplars such as Smith (1727) and Glasse (1747) follow the same compendial logic: culinary instruction, confectionery, and household physic sit under one advisory umbrella, a single binding engineered for repeated consultation and reuse across the year (Trusler 1788; Lehmann 2003). The result is a genre that couples reach with routine and so, networks move the books whereas paratexts make them work.

Evidence suggests that women’s recipe books were not just private jottings: they were social instruments. Compiled over years, they gathered culinary, cosmetic, and medical receipts under one cover, with entries sourced from kin, neighbours, and the occasional practitioner, being thus tested, annotated, and re-filed for later use. The page often records that social traffic featuring attributions, initials, a brief note on where the knowledge came from or for whom it worked, so authority travels through relationships as much as through print (Leong and Rankin 2011; DiMeo and Pennell 2013; Leong 2018). All this results in an accumulative repository of everyday knowledge fitted to domestic time as it was determined by the seasons of the year: preserves when fruit gluts, syrups ahead of winter, ointments when supplies and quiet converge.

Importantly, once in print, that social authority is re-keyed as an authorial ethos of practice, and the persona is tuned to the household’s chain of command. Appeals to years of experience, to economy at the market, and to care for bodies map cleanly onto the mistress’s managerial role. Similarly, procedural clarity and scullery-level detail answer to servants who must execute without hesitation (Vickery 2009;



Pennell 2004a). This has clear consequences at textual level: the discourse addresses two audiences at once. On the bench, instructions must be doable: so, categorical imperatives secure safety-critical steps in preservation or boiling, with timings and signs of doneness that can be recognised under steam and noise. In the ledger, they must be defensible: advisability markers, graded recommendations, and named alternatives handle matters of taste and expense: fresh herbs if in season, a cheaper spice if the purse tightens, a second-best cut when the market is thin (Lehmann 2003; Pennell 2016; Wall 2016). That is actually the key rhetorical balance achieved: firmness where failure risks spoilage or harm, and discretion where preference and cost legitimately vary. In that sense, women's domestic authorship reads as normative governance in print as much as standard-setting and accountability for household work, rather than just passive transcription (Vickery 2009; DiMeo and Pennell 2013).

Consequently, I treat the recipe as a conventionalised instructional genre organised into recurrent moves that ease uptake in a busy kitchen: naming or target; resources; procedure; contingency or correction; outcome or serving (Biber and Conrad 2009; Pennell 2016). Thus, a typical entry signals the dish at the head, lists quantities and kit in a compact cluster, and then moves through short action steps. Significantly, it reserves space for what might go wrong and how to fix it, and it closes with a cue to taste, texture, or presentation. Even a simple preserve recipe shows this pattern: title and fruit; sugar, vessel, heat source; sequential actions; an *if/when* clause to manage scum or over-boil; and finally, a storage note or serving hint. As a result, readers learn the rhythm quickly, which seems to be Moxon's point.

It is also important to notice that, linguistically, recipes compress work through forms that privilege action over actor. The consequence is that imperatives dominate; agentless passives keep attention on process rather than on who does it; non-finite clauses pack stages into tight chains; and dense material process sequences carry the labour from bench to fire to board with minimal fuss (Biber and Conrad 2009; Halliday and Matthiessen 2014). Typography and numeration do real cognitive work and so, headings mark targets cleanly; Arabic numerals, fractions, and unit labels stabilise measure; line breaks and small clusters help the eye locate the next step. In effect, layout becomes a silent assistant who points, counts, and keeps time.

From an SFL perspective, the genre is a compact showcase of mood, modality, engagement, and graduation (Martin and White 2005; Halliday and Matthiessen 2014). Mood choices calibrate authority and solidarity: bare imperatives for routine actions and declarative-imperatives of the "you put ..." type where the writer adopts a more companionable voice. Modality and modulation grade necessity and allowance: *must* for safety or spoilage risks; *should* for good practice; *may* for permission, substitution, or thrift; *let*-imperatives for coordinated action with helpers. On their part, engagement resources acknowledge alternatives and contingencies, sometimes with a quiet warning: *or else* marks a consequence the cook will want to avoid, and *you may* signals legitimate variation. Graduation sharpens or softens intensity through adverbs and comparatives: *finely*, *gently*, *very clean*, *a little longer*. These adjustments guide sensory judgement where scales and thermometers do not.

Two genre-internal features are especially salient for Moxon. First, contingency management: *if/when* staging linked to heat, thickness, or freshness that teaches



a cook to read the material world in real time. Instructions pivot on observable signs a mid-eighteenth-century kitchen recognises, like change of colour, the way a syrup falls from the spoon, or the first simmer rather than a rolling boil, and they place the *if/when* clause exactly where decision points occur. Second, non-verbal orchestration through paratext. Monthly Bills of Fare align labour with the calendar, balancing expense, season, and company size; similarly, “cuts” translate spatial knowledge into diagrams that cue plating and carving without a word (Genette 1997; Pennell 2016; Wall 2016). Taken together, the verbal and graphic layers deliver a tightly engineered advisory system designing for a working environment: procedures one can execute under steam and noise, and planning aids one can consult at a glance (Biber and Conrad 2009; Pennell 2016).

My approach models advice-giving as guidance that balances authority with solidarity while assigning responsibility across the household. In SFL terms, authority is realised through obligation, marked by *must* and *should*, alongside categorical process instructions that leave little room for deviation; impersonal and passive forms keep the focus on the work rather than the worker; *let*-constructions distribute agency across participants in the kitchen – “let it stand,” “let the pan be well scoured” – (Martin and White 2005; Halliday and Matthiessen 2014). The surface effect is brisk and executable: “boil to the height,” “strain very clear,” “set by to cool.” Responsibility is therefore allocated cleanly, task by task.

In turn, stance is tuned more finely. Advisability formulas (“it is best to...”) and permission markers (“you may...”) open space for choice. Likewise, engagement with alternatives (“or else...”) warns of failure modes that a competent cook will wish to avoid; evidentials (“I have found...,” “it has been proved...”) fold experience into instruction without theatrics (Martin and White 2005; Halliday and Matthiessen 2014). Metadiscourse helps capture how writers justify and hedge procedure: boosters anchor non-negotiables where spoilage or safety is at stake, while downtoners soften matters of taste and expense. Likewise, attitude markers register prudence, care, or thrift where audiences are stratified between mistress and staff (Hyland 2005; Hyland and Jiang 2021). The page thus speaks both firmly and companionably, as circumstances require.

In the same line, ethical warrants supply the telos of counsel. Frugality and health give reasons to comply, and they surface in purpose clauses (“to keep,” “that it may keep”) as well as in evaluative lexis (“clean,” “wholesome,” “saving”), that legitimises directive force without bluster (Lehmann 2003; Thirsk 2007; Pennell 2016). A line such as “skim very clean, or it will turn” does two jobs at once: it secures safe keeping and codes the moral economy of good householding.

Operationally, it can be claimed that authority and stance in *English Housewifery* function as distribution and calibration of modality across recipe bodies and paratext. We expect stronger obligation where risk and preservation are salient, salting, boiling to a point, sealing against air, etc., and greater advisability or permission where taste and cost dominate, seasoning, garnishing, substitutions (Martin and White 2005; Taavitsainen and Pahta 2011). Monthly Bills of Fare and carving “cuts” support this system: the bills coordinate prudence with sociability at calendar scale, and the diagrams externalise spatial instruction so that agency can be



shared and timing kept. In short, obligation does the safety work, whereas advisability and permission manage preference and purse.

### 3. ELIZABETH MOXON (FL. 1740-1754): THE AUTHOR

Very little about Elizabeth Moxon can be stated with confidence beyond what her book lets slip (cf. Pennell 2004b). The evidence keeps her within the Leeds-Pontefract milieu in the 1740s and 1750s. Early title pages report that copies were sold “by the Author at Pontefract,” a formula that implies residence or at least regular presence there. Her authorial ethos rests on practical mastery, as it is stated that the book is “the result of thirty years practice and experience,” and on a declared reach to two audiences, namely “Mistresses of Families” and “higher and lower Women Servants.” That dual address frames the work throughout: managerial counsel at the top of the household; executable procedure at the bench.

On the other hand, print-historical summaries align on the broad outline. *English Housewifry* first appears in Leeds with J. Lister in 1741. Editions circulate beyond Yorkshire since 1743, and reprints continue into the later eighteenth century—in fact, a London issue surfaces as late as 1808. Interestingly, local histories and library notes emphasise Moxon’s provincial authorship and ties to the Leeds trade, and likewise references to Lister and notices in the *Leeds Mercury* recur, while conceding that the usual biographical anchors (birth, marriage) remain uncertain (according to records in [secretlibraryleeds.net](http://secretlibraryleeds.net)). Recent public-history work has fixed Moxon more visibly in place: a blue plaque in Pontefract now commemorates the book and its author, a small but telling sign of her standing within women’s print culture. It cannot be claimed more than the record allows, yet the pattern is clear enough: provincial expertise, a national readership, and a persona built on long practice and shared domestic labour.

### 4. *ENGLISH HOUSEWIFRY* (1749): THE BOOK

The book emerges from a provincial printer-bookseller network. First issued at Leeds by James Lister in 1741, it was sold locally, by J. Swale in Leeds and “by the Author at Pontefract,” before later impressions were increasingly marketed in London, including Griffith Wright’s Leeds-London circulation in the 1760s/1769, and a London issue of 1808 with added introductory matter on fish seasons. Surviving catalogue records confirm multiple Leeds states and subsequent metropolitan reprints, a pattern that speaks to the title’s long tail and broad uptake across regions and decades ([name.umd.umich.edu](http://name.umd.umich.edu)).

The 1749 Leeds printing with James Lister lays out its programme at the threshold. The title page inventories scope and apparatus with unusual candour: above four hundred and fifty receipts; “cuts” for the orderly placing of dishes and courses; monthly Bills of Fare; an alphabetical index. It also states the book’s ethic



in plain terms. Content is explicitly “confined to things useful, substantial and splendid,” “calculated for the preservation of health,” and governed by “the measures of frugality,” all presented as “the result of thirty years practice and experience.” Paratext works here as a contract with the reader as the tools for consultation and performance are named upfront, and the value frame, health, economy, display, is spelled out rather than implied.

As said above, the same title page identifies a stratified readership of “Mistresses of Families” and “higher and lower Women Servants,” which goes a long way towards explaining the text’s calibrated directive force. Where safety and keeping are at stake, the language settles into obligation and categorical process; where taste or expense legitimately vary, the voice admits advisability and permission. The apparatus thus aligns with that dual address. Bills of Fare coordinate planning at the household level, and the “cuts” externalise spatial know-how for smooth service. In effect, the threshold text signals both what the book contains and how it expects to be used: both as a manual of practice that serves managerial oversight and bench-level execution at once.

As a compendial domestic manual, *English Housewifry* gathers culinary, confectionery, and household physic under one cover, *soops, made-dishes, pastes, pickles, cakes, creams, jellies, made-wines*, but its distinctiveness lies in the paratext that turns scattered advice into coherent working systems. Three components do the heavy lifting: table “cuts” that diagram spatial arrangement and the order of service; monthly Bills of Fare that encode seasonality and course sequencing; and an alphabetical index that supports quick retrieval and routine recombination in everyday practice. These features, already present in the Leeds printings and copied forward in later reissues, show how provincial manuals operationalised counsel through layout and scheduling as much as through wording. The effect is eminently practical: a reader plans the month, sets the table to pattern, and finds the relevant receipt in seconds, which is useful, repeatable, delegable.

## 5. METHODS AND CORPUS

This study takes the 1749 Leeds printing of Elizabeth Moxon’s *English Housewifry* by James Lister as its copy-text. Evidence is drawn from two strata: the paratext, the title programme, monthly Bills of Fare, and the alphabetical index, and the running recipe prose. The aim is straightforward: to read the manual both as a system of guidance (signalled at the threshold) and as a body of procedures that users could execute under pressure at hearth and board.

For searchable text and stable line anchoring, I work with the Project Gutenberg diplomatic transcription (images edition), which preserves eighteenth-century spelling, punctuation, lineation, and page breaks. Citations report the recipe headword and the relevant page/line span as reproduced there; where hyphenation occurs at line ends, I record tokens as printed and note any modernised reconstructions in square brackets only when necessary for quantitative counts. Long *f*, *u/v* and *ij* conventions are retained in quoted examples; and numerals, weights, and measures



are transcribed verbatim. Ambiguous readings are checked against the page images bundled with the edition, so examples can be verified without access to a separate facsimile.

Analytically, the paratext is treated as functional infrastructure rather than ornament: the Bills of Fare are read for calendar mapping and course sequencing; the “cuts” (where present) for spatial and service cues; the index for the book’s retrieval logic and opportunities for recombination in everyday practice. Within the recipe bodies, I annotate move structure (target, resources, procedure, contingency/correction, outcome/serving), mood choices (imperative and declarative-imperative), and the calibration of modality and engagement at decision points (*must/should/may; if/when; or else; you may*). Contingency markers tied to heat, thickness, colour, freshness, or keeping are flagged in situ, alongside attitude and evaluative lexis where health and frugality supply warrants for compliance. All examples are keyed to the Gutenberg lineation to keep the analysis auditable and, I hope, easy to replicate.

Two units of analysis are distinguished:

1. Clause-level instruction in the recipe body (imperatives; declaratives used imperatively; let-constructions; passives; modalized clauses).
2. Paratextual advice systems that organise action beyond the clause: monthly Bills of Fare (calendrical sequencing) and “cuts” for table placement (spatial instruction).

Drawing on SFL and stance/genre work (Hyland 2005; Martin and White 2005; Biber and Conrad 2009; Halliday and Matthiessen 2014), I coded: (a) mood: imperative; declarative-imperative (“you put...”); *let*-imperative (“let it.../let them...”); impersonal/passive (“it is...”, “to be...”); (b) modality/modulation: obligation (*must/should/must not*), advisability/permission (*it is best/you may*), ability/enablement (*can*); (c) engagement: alternatives (“or else”), conditionals (“if/when”), evidentials (“I have found”), audience design (“to your taste”); (d) graduation: downtoners/boosters (*gently, nicely, very, a little*); (e) ethical warrants: lexis of frugality/*saving* and health/*wholesome*; purposive clauses (*to keep [it] from...*); and (f) paratextual orchestration: monthly menu architecture; index labels that encode keeping/preserving and seasonality. The aim is not to provide a full count of every token in the book but a profile of directive and advisory resources that grounds the interpretive discussion which follows.

## 6. RESULTS

This section maps the machinery that turns Moxon’s advice into action. I begin at clause level with the forms that carry work through the kitchen: imperatives that chain material processes in quick succession; declarative-imperatives that construe option rather than duty; *let*-constructions that hand timing to materials and schedules; and prohibitives keyed to points of risk. I then track how contingency is taught in situ through *if/when* staging, and how engagement cues such as “you may...



the same way” license reuse across ingredients and occasions. Ethical warrants of frugality and health give reasons to comply, while the Bills of Fare and the promised “cuts” relocate part of the guidance into layout and calendar so that necessity is implied by design as much as by verbs. Read together, all these resources plot a gradient of directive force calibrated to hazard, taste, purse, and role, yielding a voice that is firm where it must be and permissive where it can be.

Imperatives carry the procedural spine. A head clause sets the action in motion, and short clauses then chain material processes in quick succession: take, put, boil, skim, strain. Time is managed locally with *let*-clauses that hold the pace where needed, as in “Take a neck of beef... [then] let it stew ’till the meat is tender” (Vermicelly Soop). The result is a rhythm the bench can follow: do this now, allow that to develop, return when a recognisable sign appears. Also, declarative-imperatives soften command by addressing the performer as a generic you. Forms such as “you may broil a few slices of the beef” or “you may make asparagus-soop the same way” construe permission and option rather than duty. They often come after a base method to license variation, economy, or reuse: thus, the cook can shift cut, substitute vegetable, or scale the number of dishes without breaching the core procedure.

Drawing on *let*-constructions, we see that they distribute agency to the process itself, which is especially useful in brewing, confectionery, and other long procedures: “Let it work a night and a day in the tub”; “let them have one boil... so let it stand six or eight days.” Here the schedule is the actor. Responsibility is offloaded to ferment, cool, rise, and settle procedures. This reduces face-threat for subordinates and stabilises timing across a household where tasks run in parallel. Prohibitives cluster where risk is salient. In turn, obligation is calibrated by hazard using *must not* or *don’t*, typically with an explicit rationale that teaches cause and effect: “You must not let it boil... it will discolour it” (green pea soup); “you must not baste it with the water at all” (hare). The warning is often coupled with an alternative path by employing either *or-* or an *or else*-clause, so that failure modes are named and avoided before they occur.

Likewise, evaluative declaratives codify etiquette and plating norms rather than technique, as for example in “It is proper either for a side-dish or bottom dish.” Such statements align a dish with the service map taught elsewhere by Bills of Fare and cuts. They fix social placement, portioning, and course order, so that procedural success in the kitchen translates into orderly display at table.

All these choices trace a clear gradient of guidance. Imperatives do the heavy lifting of process; declarative-imperatives and *you may* formulas open room for choice; *let*-constructions hand timing to materials and mechanisms; prohibitives secure safety and appearance at critical junctures; evaluatives anchor the result in service conventions. The result is that authority is notably strongest where spoilage or harm is at stake. In contrast, permission grows where taste and purse legitimately vary.

As observed, Moxon grades directive force with care by using modality (Alonso-Almeida forthcoming), moving along a clear scale from obligation to permission. At the firmer end sit *must* and *must not*, typically where timing and chemistry are unforgiving: so, “you must make it about half an hour before you want it” fixes posset to service time; “you must not let it boil” warns against curdling or



discolouration. In the middle ground, advisability and permission open controlled latitude: “you may lard your turkey with fat bacon”; “you may put in a little horse-radish and some mushrooms.” Finally, open-textured frames devolve calibration to the performer: “salt it to your taste,” “season it to your taste.” The sequence actually reads like a lesson in risk management. Non-negotiables protect keeping qualities and appearance; options accommodate palate, purse, and market availability.

What follows is a layered authority that suits the book’s dual address. Thus, categorical forms secure safety-critical stages and public-facing finish; permissive and taste-based cues license substitution, embellishment, and thrift without loss of face. The pragmatic effect is kindly but firm governance meaning something along “do this, or the dish fails”; consider these variants, if supplies or guests demand it; adjust seasoning to the table you know. In short, obligation handles the hazards as much as permission and taste handle preference and cost.

Thanks to her expertise, Moxon is also able to manage contingency as part of the method rather than as an afterthought. Conditionals recur at the precise points where judgement is required, modelling how a competent cook reads heat, colour, thickness, freshness, or age of meat and then acts accordingly: “if you think the soup not green enough, boil a handful of spinach...”; “if it be too stiff put in a spoonful or two of cream”; “if the turkey be young, an hour and a quarter will roast it.” As seen, the clause pairs do two jobs at once. The conditional *ifs* diagnose a state and also prescribe a fix. In effect, the page teaches the habit of noticing and correcting.

From an SFL perspective, these *if/when* clauses are the genre’s key logical scaffolding. They introduce conditional relations that tie observable cues to next steps, and they also carry interpersonal work. “If you think...” recruits the performer’s perception, legitimising local assessment in a way that a bare imperative cannot. Graduation terms such as enough and too stiff set scalar thresholds the eye and hand can calibrate; time triggers with when organise attention across parallel tasks, keeping the cook oriented to moments that matter. The lexis of repair is tellingly modest (“add a handful,” “loosen with cream,” “extend” or “reduce time”) so that correction is incremental and thrifty.

Clearly, in Moxon’s book placement is part of the pedagogy. Contingency clauses sit exactly where the decision point arises, adjacent to the material process they govern, which minimises searching and reduces error under pressure. Repairs are framed as first resorts rather than admissions of failure; they keep labour and ingredients in play. What emerges is, arguably, a proceduralised reasoning system: perceive, evaluate, and adjust, exactly as in modern days for both professional and amateurish cooks. The recipe does not simply tell you what to do: it scripts how to think in the kitchen.

Related to this is engagement which, here, is both persuasion and pedagogy, Moxon’s text widens the solution space with licensed alternatives: “You may make lobster soup the same way”; “You may stew part of a brisket, or an ox cheek the same way”; “You may make olives of veal the same way,” so the reader learns to treat methods as portable across ingredients and occasions. The phrasing does more than offering variety. It exploits the book’s compendial design so that one master procedure spawns a family of dishes. Redundancy is conscientiously avoided, print



space is saved, and the user is encouraged to recombine techniques with what the market or larder will bear. In practice, this is a lesson in economy of description that becomes economy at the stove: keep the base method, swap the core item, adjust seasoning to context.

Again, from an SFL perspective these are classic engagement resources that expand the dialogic space. The permissive *you may* entertains options rather than imposing duty; on their part, *the same way* and *as before* act as endophoric pointers that knit entries into a network, thus signalling cohesion and reducing cognitive load at the point of action (Martin and White 2005). That is, in metadiscourse terms, such cues behave like code glosses and frame markers, guiding interpretation of what follows and how to apply it elsewhere, which strengthens the book's claim to usability across audiences and tasks (Hyland 2005). The commercial effect is not incidental, as readers who can re-use a method for brisket, ox cheek, or lobster will return to the volume as a working tool. The rhetorical effect is equally clear, and authority is shown as methodical competence that invites collaboration, not as fiat.

In fact, ethical warrants in Moxon's discourse are not decorative common-places. They organise what counts as good advice. The title page sets the programme in plain terms, "confined to things useful, substantial and splendid... calculated for the preservation of health... upon the measures of frugality," and the recipes keep faith with it. Purpose clauses make the telos explicit at the point of action: to keep [it] from running (stability), to keep all the year (storage), to keep it sound (safety). Evaluative labels do similar work (wholesome, clean, saving) so that procedural steps read as care for bodies and prudence with materials, not mere technique. Even the index encodes this ethic as a retrieval logic: multiple *to keep* entries ("Barberries to keep...", "Cake... to keep all the Year") invite the reader to search by outcome, i.e., longevity, and thrift, rather than by ingredient alone.

Rhetorically, these warrants licence the book's directive force. Where keeping and health are in play, obligation hardens; *must* and *must not* are easy to accept when the alternative is spoilage or harm. Where the stakes are taste and purse, advisability and permission take over, but still under the same ends of saving and preserving. The effect is a teleological style of counsel: do this so that it keeps; avoid that so it stays clean and wholesome. In short, we can claim that in Moxon's text economy and health are not, in effect, afterthoughts. They are the reasons one is given to comply, and they are built into the very grammar and navigation of the book.

It is also observable that there is organisation above the clause. The Bills of Fare operate as calendrical algorithms that compose courses month by month, and they do so with a syntax of placement rather than a grammar of *must* and *should*. Thus, a line such as "At the Top Gravy Soop... At the Bottom a Ham... For the four Corners..." instructs without overt modality; order, symmetry, and seasonal fit do the normative work. What the cook and server learn is not only what to make but how to distribute labour and dishes across a table that *must* read correctly at a glance. In SFL terms, periodicity and staging are pushed into the paratext: the bills set macro-theme and sequence for the meal so clause-level commands can stay local and procedural.



Lastly, the promised “cuts for the orderly placing the dishes and courses” complement this calendrical script with spatial instruction. The diagrams externalise the service map as a simple graphic that a carver or footman can follow under pressure. They stabilise roles, reduce hesitation, and encode the social script of politeness through geometry and adjacency. Necessity is therefore redistributed. It sits in the layout and in the service code rather than in the verb phrase. Follow the bill and the cut, and the household performs competence: as the hot arrives where it should, the show pieces hold the eye, and the sequence moves cleanly from top to bottom and out to the corners.

## 7. DISCUSSION

The foregoing shows Moxon running a careful economy of directives, tuned to task and risk rather than delivered at a single pitch. Where preservation, curdling, or discolouration threaten, obligation rises to the surface: *must* and *must not* carry the weight, sometimes with an explicit consequence to secure compliance. Where taste, expense, or substitution are in play, the voice relaxes into advisability and permission (*you may, it is proper*) so option space opens without loss of guidance. This pattern sits neatly with SFL accounts of modulation (obligation vs. inclination) and engagement (expanding or contracting the dialogic field), the text contracting decisively at hazard points and expanding where preference and purse legitimately vary (Martin and White 2005; Halliday and Matthiessen 2014).

The *let*-construction deserves particular emphasis. It allocates agency to processes, e.g., *let it work, let it rise, let it stand*, which shifts the interpersonal load from persons to schedules and materials. Two things follow. First, face-threat is softened meaning that the mistress can direct without sounding peremptory, and servants can act under the authority of time and process rather than an ever-present “do this now.” Second, temporal discipline is encoded in the grammar itself. The construction parcels labour across hours or days, coordinates parallel tasks, and makes deference to the clock a shared norm in a stratified household. In SFL terms, it calibrates modulation while keeping engagement open: duty where safety is at stake; allowance where judgement and circumstance ought to decide. Governance, in short, is established without confrontation, i.e., firm where it must be, permissive where it can be (Martin and White 2005; Halliday and Matthiessen 2014).

It appears Moxon had in mind an intended audience for his book, and so these “Mistresses of Families” and “higher and lower Women Servants” force a bifocal design for *English Housewifery*. Cooks receive executable chains of action, short imperatives that move from bench to hearth with minimal friction; mistresses are offered rationales they can stand over in the ledger and in company, with economy, health, and seasonality set out as reasons for doing things this way rather than that (Vickery 2009; Pennell 2016). Phrases such as *to your taste* and *which you please* hand the final calibration to the user. That stance fits delegated management: authority sets boundaries and outcomes, while day-to-day judgement sits with the performer who is close to the materials.



The paratext and the prose divide labour accordingly. Bills of Fare speak to the mistress's remit for hospitality and display, laying out a month's sequence of courses, placements, and seasonal fit so that a meal reads correctly before a guest lifts a spoon. "Cuts" externalise the service map for carver and attendants, fixing roles and order without fresh instruction at table. Within the recipes, procedure chains, contingency cues, and time holders such as "let it stand" support the executant who must keep several processes in motion at once. According to SFL principles, tenor is calibrated for each role, and modality therefore tightens to obligation where keeping and safety are at stake; permission and advisability expand the dialogic space where taste and purse can vary. The result is readable in two directions at once, defensible from above and doable below, which is exactly what a stratified household requires.

It emerges from the previous discussion that Moxon's month-by-month menus and the index are working parts of the manual, not decoration. The menus translate social and seasonal norms into sequences that can be reproduced, so the cook can stage a dinner in January or June with the same assurance. The index, for its part, turns keeping and preserving into search paths that mirror the book's own values of frugality and health. In Genette's terms, the paratext helps produce the illocutionary force of the work itself, since it does some of the instructing rather than merely pointing to it (Genette 1997). Actually, Moxon's promise of "cuts" reinforces this diagrammatic counsel. Even if some digital copies omit the figures, they are integral to the title programme. Advice can be given in lines and placements as surely as in clauses, and, when it is, procedure becomes easier to recover, to delegate, and to repeat.

Interestingly, read against near-contemporaries such as Smith (1727) and Glasse (1747), Moxon's northern imprint and bifocal address look entirely conventional. However, what distinguishes *English Housewifery* is the way Bills of Fare, an Index keyed to outcomes, and extensive brewing and keeping repertoires work together to make economy and storage the organising principles of the book. The indexing of "to keep all the year" is telling. It presumes readers who plan across seasons, who shop outside metropolitan markets, and who must stretch ingredients through gluts and lean spells, which aligns with middling-sort provisioning habits beyond London (Lehmann 2003; Thirsk 2007). In practical terms, the menus translate seasonality into reproducible sequences; the keeping sections stabilise preservation techniques; and the index turns longevity into a search path. Therefore, advice here is not only a list of steps: it is a system that helps a household store, retrieve, and redeploy work.

What emerges is a distinctive authorial ethos: long practice as warrant, obligation calibrated to risk, and an ethics of care that binds health to thrift. Rather than issue bald commands, Moxon reasons procedurally. She embeds diagnostics and repairs in *if-then* frames, licenses variation with you may, and reserves must or must not for those junctures where failure carries a cost in spoilage, safety, or display. The effect is guidance that feels authoritative without sounding peremptory, a negotiated mode of advice-giving consistent with women's household print in the long eighteenth century (DiMeo and Pennell 2013; Leong 2018).

As a matter of fact, read against its paratext and procedures, *English Housewifery* sounds like a seasoned provincial housewife-manager. A seasoned



practitioner who claims long experience, Moxon curates a repertoire that runs from soups and made-dishes to preserving and home-made wines, and addresses a stratified household of mistresses and women servants. Her managerial horizon is plain enough in the mix of cost-sensitive choices, health-oriented justifications, and table choreography. Advice is never purely technical, it is yoked to prudence (frugality), care (wholesomeness), and display (orderly placing). In sociolinguistic terms, this is not just a courtly chef's register but the calibrated speech of domestic governance (Vickery 2009; Pennell 2016; Thirsk 2007), pitched to instruct without unnecessary face-threat and to travel across roles in the household.

Interestingly, the book also makes the supporting female knowledge network visible. Later additions foreground "gentlewomen" contributors, and so the procedural grain presupposes the bench-level labour of maids and dairywomen who execute steps and enact the writer's prudential reasoning. Print does not erase that collectivity but, on the contrary, it formalises it. Men of the trade, printers and booksellers, supply the apparatus that renders domestic know-how consultable and recombinable: indices with "to keep all the year" entries, monthly Bills of Fare that map season to sequence, and "cuts" that diagram service. Yet the epistemic warrants remain feminine and local, i.e., experience, thrift, season, and care (cf. DiMeo & Pennell 2013; Leong 2018; Genette 1997; Raven 2007).

At the level of language, Moxon's ethos coheres with the advisory profile established earlier. Obligation and prohibition surface where risk or spoilage is salient; advisability, permission, and analogy ("the same way") open option space where taste and expense govern; *let*-constructions distribute agency to processes and time. This is the grammar one expects when authority is experiential rather than institutional, and when audience design must satisfy both the planner's ledger and the performer's bench. In SFL terms (Martin & White 2005; Halliday & Matthiessen 2014), the text continually calibrates modality and engagement to manage risk, delegate judgement, and keep the social relation smooth (Hyland 2005).

Crucially, some things remain indeterminate. Biographical particulars about Elizabeth Moxon are thin, as discussed above, and hypotheses about civil identity or a publisher-engineered persona cannot be settled on present evidence. That uncertainty does not undercut the practitioner profile the text performs or the collective authorship it stages; if anything, it sharpens the methodological point. Here, authority rests less on named biography than on textualised practice and networked validation implying the convergence of shared procedures, seasonal scripts, and reproducible layouts (Lehmann 2003; Raven 2007; DiMeo & Pennell 2013).

All these strands, namely, seasoned practitioner ethos, collaborative female networks, calibrated directive language, and paratextual infrastructures, clarify what kind of "woman behind the book" the evidence supports. *English Housewifery* reads best as a collective apparatus of women's domestic expertise: authored by a practised housewife speaking to a stratified household, augmented by neighbouring gentlewomen, operationalised by women servants, and typographically engineered by the eighteenth-century book trade so that prudence, care, and display become portable. On that ground, the conclusion can rest its claim that advice-giving, for instance, in this mid-eighteenth-century domestic print is a form of governance.



## 8. CONCLUSION

This article has read *English Housewifry* (1749) as a deliberately calibrated apparatus for giving advice. At clause level, Moxon balances obligation, *must/must not* for risk-sensitive stages, with advisability and permission, *it is best/you may* where taste, expense, or substitution are in play, while distributing agency through *let*-constructions and impersonal voice. That grammar is underwritten by explicit ethical warrants of frugality and health: purpose clauses (*to keep...*, *that it may keep*) and evaluative lexis (*wholesome, clean*) convert procedure into reasoned counsel. The contrasts are easy to hear on the page: “you must not let it boil... it will discolour it” sits alongside “you may lard your turkey with fat bacon,” and storage aims such as “to keep all the year” anchor the rationale rather than decorate it.

Organisation above the sentence does its share of the work. Monthly Bills of Fare translate social and seasonal norms into reproducible sequences; promised “cuts” turn table geography into diagrams. In effect, some interpersonal labour moves from modality to design: order, symmetry, and calendar logic guide compliance without another *must*. Audience design explains the tone. Named readers require bifocal readability: cooks are given doable chains of action; mistresses are offered defensible reasons in the ledger of economy, health, and seasonality. Devices such as “to your taste” and “which you please” relinquish final calibration to users in a way that fits delegated management. Contingency clauses teach how to reason with materials, tools, and seasons, so diagnosis and repair become part of the craft.

Methodologically, an SFL-informed coding of mood, modality, engagement, and graduation, integrated with paratextual analysis, yields a compact map of advice-giving as household governance. Obligation concentrates where failure is costly, while permission and advisability widen the solution space where preference and purse may legitimately vary; and *let*-constructions encode temporal discipline without unnecessary face-threat. Read this way, *English Housewifry* speaks with the voice of experienced domestic authority. As said above, it is firm where it must be, permissive where it can be.

This study is anchored to a single mid-century Leeds printing, and privileges a functional profile over exhaustive counts. That choice yields a clear map of guidance, but it narrows claims about variability across impressions and decades. A further constraint lies in the survival of graphical matter: the full suite of “cuts” is inconsistently reproduced in digital surrogates, which limits close analysis of spatial advice. Finally, comparative points to Smith and Glasse remain just that, glances, since no cross-title statistics are reported here.

Future work may proceed along six linked tracks: edition tracing will collate early Leeds impressions against later reprints, including London issues, to test stability and change in modality, permissive option and paratext, concretely, by comparing modal density (per 10,000 words), the proportions of *must/should/may*, and the presence, placement, and wording of Bills of Fare and “cuts”. Comparative baselines will build like-for-like profiles for Eliza Smith and Hannah Glasse to locate Moxon on an obligation-advisability continuum, adding a targeted lexicon for keeping/wholesome as a measurable warrant set and reporting log-odds or proportion



differences with confidence intervals; similarly, corpus integration will scale the analysis to a tagged dataset (e.g., CoWITE, Alonso-Almeida 2025a, 2025b) to obtain normalised frequencies for directive types, conditionals, and evaluative adverbs across decades, with move-annotation (target/resources/procedure/contingency/outcome) so rates can be reported by move as well as by text; paratext modelling will encode Bills of Fare and “cuts” as structured data (course position, namely Top/Bottom/Corners/Removes, season, dish type, service order) to quantify layout-encoded advice, with network visualisations to display recurrent menu pairings and seasonal substitutions. In the same way, socio-material linkage will correlate contingency cues with seasonal price series and availability (meat, sugar, butter, fresh greens, etc.) to test how external constraints shape interpersonal calibration, anticipating stronger obligation where inputs are costly or perishable. In turn, reception evidence will integrate ownership marks, marginalia, stains, and probate inventories to triangulate actual use with the advisory design inferred here, aligning annotated pages, where possible, with the most frequently consulted index entries.

All these steps together would turn the present profile into a comparative, data-rich account of advice-giving in eighteenth-century household print, clarifying how women’s domestic authority was grammatically staged, typographically engineered, and historically circulated.

Reviews sent to the authors: 23/11/2025

Revised paper accepted for publication: 28/01/2026



## WORKS CITED

### PRIMARY SOURCES

- GLASSE, Hannah. 1747. *The Art of Cookery Made Plain and Easy*. Printed for the Author.
- MOXON, Elizabeth. 1749. *English Housewifry: Exemplified in Above Four Hundred and Fifty Receipts*. James Lister. Project Gutenberg, eBook no. 10072, available at <https://www.gutenberg.org/cache/epub/10072/pg10072-images.html>. Accessed 28 September 2025.
- SMITH, Eliza. 1727. *The Compleat Housewife: Or, Accomplish'd Gentlewoman's Companion*. J. Pemberton.
- TRUSLER, John. 1788. *The Honours of the Table; Or, Rules for Behaviour during Meals; with the Whole Art of Carving*. Literary-Press.

### SECONDARY SOURCES

- ALONSO-ALMEIDA, Francisco Jesús. 2013. "Genre Conventions in English Recipes, 1600-1800." In *Reading and Writing Recipe Books, 1550-1800*, ed. Michelle DiMeo, & Sara Pennell, 68-92. Manchester UP. <https://doi.org/10.7765/9781526129901.00011>.
- ALONSO-ALMEIDA, Francisco, ÁLVAREZ-GIL, Francisco, ORTEGA-BARRERA, Ivalla, QUINTANA-TOLEDO, Elena, BATOR, Magdalena, DE LA CRUZ CABANILLAS, Isabel, SÁNCHEZ-CUERVO, Margarita Esther, & María José GÓMEZ CALDERÓN. 2025. *Corpus of Women's Instructive Texts in English (1800-1899) (CoWITE19)*. U Las Palmas de Gran Canaria. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15097949>
- ALONSO-ALMEIDA, Francisco Jesús, ÁLVAREZ-GIL, Francisco, & Ivalla ORTEGA-BARRERA. 2025. *Corpus of Women's Instructive Texts in English (1700-1799) (CoWITE18)*. U Las Palmas de Gran Canaria. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15151249>.
- ALONSO-ALMEIDA, Francisco Jesús. Forthcoming. "Gender-Based Evidence of Modalisation and Modulation Strategies in Nineteenth-Century Institution English Recipes." In *Historical Medical Discourse: Corpus Linguistic Perspectives*, ed. Gavin Brookes, & Tony McEnery. Routledge.
- BIBER, Douglas, & Susan CONRAD. 2009. *Register, Genre, and Style*. Cambridge UP.
- DI-MEO, Michelle, & Sara PENNELL, eds. 2013. *Reading and Writing Recipe Books, 1550-1800*. Manchester UP.
- ECCO. "Eighteenth Century Collections Online (ECCO-TCP): 'English housewifry: Exemplified in above four hundred and fifty receipts...'" Permalink: <https://name.umdl.umich.edu/004889672.0001.000>. Accessed 28 September 2025.
- FEATHER, John. 2006. *A History of British Publishing*. 3rd ed. Routledge.
- GASKELL, Philip. 1995. *A New Introduction to Bibliography*. St. Paul's Bibliographies.
- GENETTE, Gérard. 1997. *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation*. Trans. Jane E. Lewin. Cambridge UP.
- HALLIDAY, M.A.K., & Christian M.I.M. MATTHIESSEN. 2014. *Halliday's Introduction to Functional Grammar*. 4th ed. Routledge.
- HYLAND, Ken, & Feng (Kevin) JIANG. 2021. *Academic Discourse and Global Publishing: Disciplinary Persuasion in Changing Times*. Routledge.
- HYLAND, Ken. 2005. *Metadiscourse: Exploring Interaction in Writing*. Continuum.



- LEHMANN, Gilly. 2003. *The British Housewife: Cookery Books, Cooking and Society in Eighteenth-Century Britain*. Prospect Books.
- LEONG, Elaine, & Alisha RANKIN, eds. 2011. *Secrets and Knowledge in Medicine and Science, 1500-1800*. Ashgate.
- LEONG, Elaine. 2018. *Recipes and Everyday Knowledge: Medicine, Science, and the Household in Early Modern England*. Chicago UP.
- MARTIN, J.R., & P.R.R. WHITE. 2005. *The Language of Evaluation: Appraisal in English*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- McKENZIE, D.F. 1999. *Bibliography and the Sociology of Texts*. Cambridge UP.
- NUYTS, Jan, & Johan VAN DER AUWERA, eds. 2016. *The Oxford Handbook of Modality and Mood*. Oxford UP.
- PENNEL, Sara. 2004a. "Perfecting Practice? Women, Manuscript Recipes and Knowledge in Early Modern England." In *Early Modern Women's Manuscript Writing*, eds. Victoria E. Burke, & Jonathan Gibson, 237-259. Ashgate.
- PENNEL, Sara. 2004b. "Moxon, Elizabeth (fl. 1740-1754), writer on cookery." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (online ed.). Oxford UP. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/65446>. Accessed 28 September 2025.
- PENNEL, Sara. 2016. *The Birth of the English Kitchen, 1600-1850*. Bloomsbury.
- RAVEN, James. 2007. *The Business of Books: Booksellers and the English Book Trade, 1450-1850*. Yale UP.
- TAAVITSAINEN, Irma, & Päivi PAHTA, eds. 2011. *Medical Writing in Early Modern English*. Cambridge UP.
- THIRSK, Joan. 2007. *Food in Early Modern England: Phases, Fads, Fashions, 1500-1760*. Hambledon Continuum.
- VICKERY, Amanda. 2009. *Behind Closed Doors: At Home in Georgian England*. Yale UP.
- WALL, Wendy. 2016. *Recipes for Thought: Knowledge and Taste in the Early Modern English Kitchen*. U Pennsylvania P.



