'AS IT YS SEYDE TO FORE'.
SOME LINGUISTIC EVIDENCE
IN THE PROCESS OF COMPILING
MIDDLE ENGLISH MEDICAL RECIPES[1]

1. INTRODUCTION

The aim of this paper is to describe the compilation of fifteenth-century English medical recipes. My main interest is to unravel those devices used by medieval compilers and scribes to arrange recipes in the medical manuscript book. The material used for such a study consists of one of the *receptaria* contained in MS Hunter 185 (folios 17r-62r).

The work is organised as follows: first, I describe medieval English medical books, then I present a description of MS Hunter 185. After that, I introduce the framework of discourse analysis (Brown & Yule 1996) which I intend to apply in the data analysis which deals with the organisation of recipes.

2. MEDIEVAL ENGLISH MEDICAL BOOKS

Medieval English medical books are indexed normally according to two main parameters: their contents, and the needs of the audience. The first parameter is adopted in Robbins (1970), in which the medical material is classified into three different groups: prognosis, diagnosis and treatment. This classification does not completely satisfy our expectations, since, in the case of remedy books, for instance, these often contain recipes belonging to the three

---

groups. Thus, this indexing procedure results in a continuous repetition of the same recipe books in the three cataloguing groups.

The second parameter, the audience, seems to be a more plausible criterion for indexation, because the audience required specific type of books which, depending on what the reader expects from them, showed a particular use of language and a specific structure. In this sense, Voigts (1982) proposes the division of the Middle English medical material into two main groups. These groups are (a) remedybooks, and (b) learned treatises. The first group constitutes the bulk of medical books which contain handy information about the treatment of particular sicknesses in easy-to-follow steps. These steps present a fairly simple structure and plain language[1], which sometimes included the use of Latin and Anglo-Norman. The audience of this group is larger than that of learned treatises, as Norri (1992: 33) points out: "Vernacular remedy books have often been associated with lay healers, but these books were also owned by university-trained physicians." Learned treatises, however, were directed to a more limited type of audience such as university scholars. These books are based on classical and medieval medical tradition, and many are written in Latin.

However, Latin was steadily being replaced by English by the fifteenth century[2], partly due to the growth of an incipient middle class bourgeoisie that demanded books of a more practical nature for their own instruction (Parkes 1973: 563). Thus, the need for translations and new written material in English was urgent, if we consider that this middle class population owned very little knowledge, if any, of the Latin language. This insufficient knowledge of Latin was mainly due to the lack of proper instruction in that language, and whenever fifteenth-century people were instructed in Latin, the methodology was oriented towards a specific use, and hence the instruction was far from integral, as claimed by Rodríguez Álvarez in her description of fifteenth-century elementary schools (1997: 39):

> El latín que se daba era mínimo, simplemente se pretendía que los niños pudieran leerlo y pronunciarlo correctamente para poder leer

---

[1] For a detailed study of the structure and the language of the Middle English recipe, see Alonso Almeida (forthcoming).

[2] For the process of "Englishing" of medical material, see Voigts (1995: 184).

textos devocionales y cantar himnos, pero la gramática y el sig-
nificado de los textos carecía de importancia.

As said above, the remedybooks were aimed at a larger readership. Thus,
the number of these books was quantitatively significant, as can be seen by
the extant copies in British and American Libraries[1]. This group has certainly
enjoyed much editorial attention as pointed out by Voigts (1982: 47) if
compared with learned treatises. However, research in this area mainly in-
cludes studies on the description of the contents and the structure of these
books and their indexing, but there is still much to be done on the writing of
the medieval medical *receptarium*, at least, from a linguistic perspective.

3. MS HUNTER 185, FF. 17R-62R

MS Hunter 185 is a Middle English medical recipe book which also contains a
flora medica and an alphabetical list of simples. The manuscript is housed at
the Glasgow University Library (Hunterian Collection, University of Glasgow,
Glasgow). There is no evidence of authorship, or of ownership; although,
according to Young and Aitken (1908: 132), on the vellum fly-leaf, there is
what seems to be "probably the autograph of Henry Swinburne, B. C. L.
(1560-1623)."

MS Hunter 185 was written by different scribes, all of them using late
fourteenth-century Anglicana, and Anglicana Formata. The folios object of
this study are written by a single scribe using Anglicana Formata throughout.
These folios present rubricated running titles and brown upper cases at the
beginning of recipes in order to show the *ordinatio*. These visual aids are
fundamental for the understanding of medical recipe compilations, since they
constitute evidence of the scribe's effort to show the thematic arrangement of
recipes, as we will see later on in this paper.

Folios 17r-62r contain a number of medical recipes written in English and
very few in Latin. The nature of the recipes is varied, and they are organised
generally following the traditional *capitem ad pedem* structure-type, that is,
therapeutic remedies for the head are given at the beginning, and this is fol-

---

[1] See Voigts (1995) and Schmidt (1994).

lowed by remedies for the eyes, the nose, the mouth, and other parts of the body up to the toes. The remedies presented are mainly waters, oils, plasters, salves, ointments, drinks, laxatives, and powders among others.

4. FRAMEWORK OF DISCOURSE ANALYSIS

In the analysis of the linguistic strategies used to compile recipes, I follow the discourse analysis model proposed in Brown & Yule (1996(1983)), henceforth B&Y (1996). Such model constitutes a significant contribution to text analysis for it provides points of view from previous discourse analysis theories, and offers clear descriptions of the strategies involved in the writing of discourse. Substitution, ellipsis and referential expressions are the devices which appear recursively in MS Hunter 185 as a way to establish textual cohesion. Let us move on to the description of the aforementioned devices according to B&Y (1996).

Substitution and ellipsis are described as those techniques whose relationship with other parts of the texts "forces the reader … back into the text to look for a previous expression to substitute, in the case of substitution, or to provide, in the case of ellipsis" (1996: 193). Thus, the use of those two strategies creates cohesive relations among different parts of the texts, since the reader needs the reference given elsewhere within the text so as to fully understand the intended message. In order to illustrate these two concepts, let us concentrate on the following two examples taken from B&Y (1996: 193):

(1a) Jules has a *birthday* next month. Elspeth has *one* too.

(1b) Jules has a *birthday* next month. Jules has too.

The examples above show instances of substitution and elision. The word *one* in (1a) is not understood by the reader unless he goes back to the previous sentence for reference. Thus, *one* stands for *birthday*, establishing a relation of dependence of the second sentence on the first one. In the same vein, in (1b), the omission of any pro-form which stands for *birthday* makes the reader to go back into the text in order to interpret the message conveyed

in the second sentence, linking both sentences by means of a dependence relationship.

The referential elements which may posit any interest for this study is anaphora. Anaphora describes the relationship of two elements within the text where the second refers to the first element back in the text for interpretation (B&Y1996: 192). The following exemplifies this point:

(2) Look at the sun. It's going down quickly.

The previous example illustrates how the use of the anaphoric pronoun *it* links the second sentence to the one before. Thus, the reader must go back in the text to be able to interpret such anaphoric pronoun. This time the referent is the word *sun* which is included as said above in the previous sentence.

5. ORGANISATION OF RECIPES IN MS HUNTER 185, FF. 17R-62R

After the introduction of the description of the manuscript and the linguistic theoretical framework to be used here, let us turn to the analysis of the compilation of recipes. I analyse the extralinguistic strategies which link recipes in the manuscript, then I focus on the linguistic strategies which have the same linking purpose. Chart 1 below illustrates graphically the manifestation of both extralinguistic and linguistic linking strategies.

In chart 1, the extralinguistic strategies in MS Hunter 185 are represented by means of the dotted arrow, which corresponds to the *marginalia*, and the bold type-face, which corresponds to the rubrics. The linguistic strategies comprise the organisation of recipes from head-to-toe structure, which is here represented by means of an arrow, and the subgroupings of recipes with a same topic, here represented by boxes. In addition, linguistic strategies include the use of referential expressions within the recipe boxes, which I describe in the chart by means of curved two-headed arrows and parentheses; and the use of cross-references in the manuscript, represented in the chart by means of dotted two-headed arrows.

The presence of these strategies in MS Hunter 185 are analysed below. I shall begin by presenting the extralinguistic elements, and finally, I will move on to the analysis of the linguistic elements.

Chart 1

Key: RxA: Recipes Group A
RxB: Recipes Group B
RxC: Recipes Group C

Linguistic strategies:
from-head-to-toe organisation Ø ellipsis
thematic boxes ( ) reference particles
co-reference (anaphora, ellipsis , substitution)
cross-referential expressions

Extralinguistic strategies:
marginalia
bold type-face rubrics

5.1. EXTRALINGUISTIC ELEMENTS

The organisation of the topic from head to toe requires visual techniques which help to reduce the time employed by the reader to locate the information needed. Those techniques are the use of rubricated running titles, and a marginal apparatus.

The former facilitate the search of specific information. The entire title is written in red ink, including the key word, which indicates the recipe contents. It should be also noted that, in many cases, the title may contain up to four lines. Besides, occasionally the title does not offer any indication of the purpose of the recipe. In the manuscript studied here, we can see how this represented a serious problem for the reader, as shown by the fact that the reader has underlined the key word in a long title and in the recipe body text [1]:

(3)

---

[1] Transcriptions mine. Abbreviations have been silently expanded throughout. Original spelling and punctuation have been retained in the transcription. Bold type-face indicates rubrics.

A good medicyne for to stanche blood wha*n*
ne a master <u>veyne</u> is cutte & pe wou*n*de be large
T*ak a pese of salt beef pe leue & non*
of pe fatte a muche as wil in pe wounde
& let hit be leyd in pe hote asschis in pe
fuyre • & let roste it til it be pur¥ hoot / &
also hoot pruste hit in to pe wounde • &
bynde hit faste • & hit schal staunche a
noon • & neuere steyne more vp warantise
(MS Hunter 185, f.35r, ll. 2118-2126)

(4)
Here it tellip wharfore pis oyneme*nt*
is good T*his plaster is good for olde*
brusoures & for akyng of lymmes hit
destruyep an hard posteme & it is so -
uueraynely <u>*good for broken bones pe*</u>
surgerens of Salerne vsep it for alle (…)
(MS Hunter 185, f. 49r, ll. 2784-2789)

In (3), the reader makes clear what the recipe is for by means of underlin-ing in a different coloured ink the key word *veyne* in the title. In (4), the reader must read through the whole recipe if he wants to know the use of the plaster described. This is the reason why the reader underlines the string *good for broken bones pe*.

The latter, to indicate the location of specific pieces of information, is also a useful way to identify recipes. This visual aid consists in the addition of keywords, numbers, signs, or even, drawings to the margins of the manuscript, in order to indicate the purposes of a particular recipe. In MS Hunter, marginal notes also seem to have been added by readers rather than by the scribe himself. This observation follows from my own preliminary palaeographical studies. The following examples illustrate this point[1]:

(5)
Also for pe / scabbes of a mannes body • T*ak horho / ne cely-*
   doyne & warmot & sorel / de boys & helena campana • an^a
   & seep hem in faire / rennyng water • til half be wasted &

---

[1] Heads in the manuscripts are here represented by the "face" symbol.

*perwi^{t}h / wassch hem euery day wel ones til pe seke / be
hool pourgh pe • grace of god* Also for / *scabbes in a mon or
in a womman* § / *T*ak pe rote of horshelue & seep it in /
water til hit be nessche & tak olde sche / pes talwe & medle
hem wel to gedre / in a mortere & do it in a lynnen clop / &
anoynte pe sore a gayn pe fuyre & / he schal be hol* Also
anop*er* for pe same / *T*ak horhoue & seep it in rennynge /
water til half be wasted & wessche pe / seke perwi^{t}h pe
water as hoot as he may /suffre • & anoynte hem wi^{t}h pe
water oyne / ment pa^t is made of pese herbes Tak / pe rote of
pe rede dokke and of celi- / doyne & wermot also & sorell
de boys / an^a & bray hem to gedre & tempre hem / to gedre
wi^{t}h mayes boter & make an / oynement per of & pa^t wil
hele eny maner / of scabbes certayn* A̲lso an other for /
scabbes § *T*ak pe rededokke rotis & pym / purnell &
scabiose & sorell de boys & / selydoyne & stampe hem &
tempre hem to / gedre wi^{t}h mayes boter & fry¥e hem / wel to
gedre & streyne hem in to a clene / vessell & perto a good
quantite of powder / of brymstone & fry¥e • hit wel to gedre
til / it be cold & perwi^{t}h anoynte pe seke til he / be hol*

(MS Hunter 185, ff. 23v-24v)

(6)

For schorned heuedes and scattede / heuedes T*ak poo dolyon ij
handfules / ar he be floured pe while he is tendre & / sep
hym wel in to a potel of strong ly¥e / til half be wasted &
panne let wessche pe / schaled hed in strong pisse ry¥t hoot
& schaue / clene of pe scalles & let no¥t for no bledyng / &
panne make a plaster of pe poo delyon & / let hit on pe hed
wel warme & so let it ly / a day & a ny¥t & panne tak it of
& tak rye / mele & rennyng water & mak a pap ri¥th /
pykke & spred it on a clop pa^t wil ouer sprede pe / sore &
ley it on pe sore hed & let it lye iij day / es • & iij ny¥t or it
be remeued & tak it panne / of & wessche pe hed in strong
pisse a ¥eyne / & schaue it clene to pe flessch & tak rede /
oynones as mony as wil suffice for a plaster / ouer pe* <u>sore</u> *&
let boyle hem wel in water / & stampe hem & tempre hem vp
wi^{t}h jus of Cala /mynte & tempre hem vp wi^{t}h olde barewes /
grece faire j molte & j pured & vse pis last til / pe seke hed
be hool for pys wil hele it sy / kyrly pourgh godes grace*

(MS Hunter 185, f. 27r)

(5) illustrates the remedies for the head highlighted by means of drawing a head in the margins, so that the reader interested in this specific bit of information can identify it in a very specific area of the text rather than having to read through the whole manuscript. (6), which also shows remedies for the head, presents another drawing which could be identified as a head, though, in this case, its shape is less well outlined than in the previous example. These two drawings are attributed to a sixteenth-century owner of the book who presented it to one of his friends' son who suffered from "a sore hedde", possibly a scabby head, as indicated on the fly-leaf verso. Thus, the book's owner could have drawn the heads to indicate where to identify these specific remedies.

Having analysed the extralinguistic elements, let us move on to the following where I analyse the linguistic strategies which assist in the compilation of recipes in MS Hunter 185.

5.2. LINGUISTIC ELEMENTS

A first glance at the organisation of recipes in MS Hunter 185 reveals a thematic organisation which arranges recipes from head to toe, in an attempt to establish some order to what apparently owns none. Thus, the scribe offers remedies for the head in the first place, followed by remedies for the eyes, the nose, etc., and groups them according to their therapeutic function. This grouping, in turn, facilitates the consultation of the material in a short amount of time, since the reader can follow those lexical items which refer to the parts of the body in a descendant order.

The 'from-head-to-toe' technique shows the organisation of the information by contents, but sometimes the lack of *tabula* to indicate where to find specific information related to a particular sickness rendered the searching task a difficult one. It should be noted at this point the practical nature of these books normally resorted to in order to find urgently therapeutic solutions to cast out states of sickness.

However, this type of organisation is, to a certain extent, arbitrary, and scribes very often ignored it in their own books. This irregularity in the or-

ganisation lies in the fact that scribes inserted recipes, say, for prognostica-
tion in between remedies for scabbed hands and headache, as seen below:

> (7)
> For wertes in mannes hondes
> *or wommanes hondes oþer in oþer places* •
> *A*noynte þe wertes whereuere þei be…
> For to
> *wite ¥if a man schal lyue or dy¥e*
> *þat is jwounded T*ake þe jus of …
> …
>   For þe hedache
> *T*ak & seep verueyne & beteyne & …
> (MS Hunter 185, ff. 24v-25v, ll. 1650-1683)

In relation to the thematic organisation, thematic subgroups can be also
found. These subgroups (boxes in chart 1) are characterised by the presence
of referential devices, namely co-reference (represented in chart 1 by means
of a double-sided arrow) and cross-reference (represented in chart 1 by
means of a dotted double-sided arrow). The former applies to those devices
which establish a connection among the different recipes of a same group.
The latter refers to those elements which connect recipes which may even be-
long to different groups. These elements are described below.

5.2.1. RECIPE GROUPS

As indicated above, recipes are normally grouped thematically, so that
remedies for a specific sickness are gathered together. These recipes are
tightly linked by means of cohesive ties, mainly anaphora, substitution and
ellipsis as can be seen below.

Co-referential ties in recipe groups are given in the title of the recipes, and
the understanding of the contents of the second and following recipes

depends on the first recipe in a given group, both in the case of anaphora and ellipsis. The following instance exemplifies this aspect[1]:

(8)
For þe wormes in a mannes body þat men
clepyth lubrikes Tak beteyne & sauen &
dry¥e hem & make poudere of hem & let þe
seke drynke þerof in hoot water & also sone as
þe poudere is doune in to þe body it wil
slee þe wormes & brynge hem oute sykerly
For þe same Tak syngrene & feþerfoye   *
& myntes & stampe hem & ¥ef hem drynke
For þe same Tak & drynke stancrop   *
with wormot

(9)
For to sle trenchis in a man
nes body Tak fayre bakoun & diseit smale
morcelles þe mountance of a litel messe
& tak a good handful of beteyne & wassch
it clene & grynde it smale & take þe potel
of gotes melke & do it in a fayre vessel &
do perto þy bakoun & þy beteyne • let hem
seþe to gedre til þy bakoun be j • now¥ & let
þe seke ete þat mete warme & he schal be
hool certeyne For þe same Tak a saucer   *
ful of jus of calamynte & as muche of
Centorie & of hony & of vynegre ana & þe
ferþe part of a sponeful of salt & medle al
þys to gedre & loke þat þey be ri¥t salt &
boyle hem a litel ouer þe fuyre & do hem in a
clene vessel & let þe seke vse þerof fastyng a
saucerful at ones & þe same day at vnderne
& an oþer at none & he þat schal vse þis medi
cyne let hym be fastyng til mydouere noon
& he schal be hool
(MS Hunter 185, ff. 40v-41r, ll. 2377-2405)

---

[1] From now on, I will include the following symbol * in the examples in order to in-dicate where a new recipe within a group begins.

In the previous recipes (examples in (8) and (9)), we can see how they are connected thematically by means of the string *for þe same*. In order for the reader to understand the purpose of the recipe, he must go back to the first recipe in the group for reference. Thus, in (8), *þe same* refers back to the previous title in full *For þe wormes in a mannes body þat men clepyth lubrikes*, which exemplifies substitution and ellipsis. Substitution consists here in the replacement of the entire meaning of the title in the first recipe by the word *same*, which is semantically identical, though the structure of the title of the first recipe is rather more complex than the pronominal string *þe same*, which is formed by a simple noun phrase. Ellipsis is understood here in the sense that the head of the noun phrase *þe same* lacks an element of the nominal category such as the word *sickness*, or even the hyperonym *thing*.

(9) also exemplifies a case of substitution and of ellipsis. In this sense, *þe same* stands for *For to sle trenchis in a mannes body*. The word *same* refers back to the entire title, and also the head of the noun phrase *þe same* is filled here by a pronoun, exactly in the same fashion as in (8). The fact that the recipes whose titles are *For þe same* needs the presence of a first title in full may be interpreted as their being less effective than the first one, though there is little evidence that the scribe intended so.

Sometimes, the title of the second and the following recipes in a group includes the Latin word *Item* 'the same'. The interpretation of this Latin element, which manifests a new case of substitution, is found both in the first recipe of the group and in the very same title where it is included:

> (10)
> Item for hym þat is scoldet on his
> pyntel þat is y clepid þe potegal § Tak
> a lynnen clop þat is clene and wassche & brenne
> it & make powder þerof & tak oyle of egges
> & anoynte þe sore & put þe powder in þe
> holes when pei bep anoynted & þat schal
> helpe hem & make hem hool §
> (MS Hunter 185, ff. 42r-42v, ll. 2471-2477)

In this example, the Latin word *Item* refers back to line 2449 in the manuscript *For scoldyng of a mannes pyntel*. In addition, in this case, the

reference for the word *item* is also found later in the same title, as the purpose of the recipe is repeated by means of a relative clause *pat is scoldet on his pyntel*. Thus, the reader does not have to go back into the text for reference.

Many other recipes are introduced by means of the word *also*, which, in addition to representing an example of economy in language, it also stands as another case of substitution, and to some extent, of ellipsis, as can be seen in the following example:

> (11)
> For pe emeraudes
> so pat pei haue none grete pappes §
> Tak welle cresses & stampe hem & steue
> hem in • a pot with oute water & make a plaster
> & ley to pe emeraudes § Also for pe same   *
> Tak litarge of golde & make powdere
> perof & tempre hit vp with oyle of violet
> & make a plaster & ley perto Also for pe same /   *
> Tak moleyne • & styue hit in good red
> wyn & make a plaster & ley perto § Also   *
> Tak Rewe & louache of eyper j lyke me
> che & grynde hem in a mortere & put perto
> hony & fry¥e hem to gedre & mak a plaster
> & ley per to as hoot as he may suffre &
> alle pese medicynes bep gode for pe emeraudes
> (MS Hunter 185, ff. 46r, ll. 2639-2654)

In the previous recipes, the word *also* might be well replaced by the string "another medicine" or "another remedy". In the second and third recipes in (11), *also* is followed by *for pe same* which, as seen above, stands for information given in the title of the first recipe *For pe emeraudes so pat pei haue none grete pappes*. In the last recipe in this group, the title *also* is an example of substitution and ellipsis. Substitution here lies in the fact that it stands for the whole title in the first recipe, and the element which is elliptical is *for pe same*, whose meaning is included in *also*.

The anaphoric pronoun *another* is also part of some of the titles of the recipes included in MS Hunter 185. The following example illustrates the anaphoric use of *another* in our recipes:

(12)
For to make a buyle
drawe to gedre and brek § Tak galbanum
& clense it at a fuyre & make per of a plaster
& ley per to ij dayes or it be remoued Also   *
an other for pe same Tak a rosted ox
non • & pe lylye rote & souredokkes & stampe
hem to gedre with barewes grece & with oyle of
olyue & make a plaster & ley to pe sore
(MS Hunter 185, f. 23r, ll. 1594-1601)

In this example, *an other* refers to a new recipe which is good for *to make a buyle*[1] *drawe to gedre and brek*, thus linking thematically the second recipe in the group to the first one. There is also the elision of the word *medicine* which normally collocates with the word *another* in the occurrences of the former in MS Hunter 185, as seen in lines 1581-1582 *Also an oper medicyne* which constitutes the first instance of the words <an oper> and <medicyne> in the manuscript.

So far, the use of substitution, ellipsis, and anaphora have been described, especially those cases which serve the function of creating thematic groups of recipes within the *receptarium*, thus forming a clearer structure which gives shape to the remedybook. Below, I shall describe the use of other discourse particles which link recipes belonging to different groups, mainly by means of cross-references (represented in chart 1 by means of a dotted double-sided arrow), and which also favour cohesion within the recipe book.

5.2.2. LINKING THE RECIPE GROUPS

We have seen previously how recipes are tightly linked in groups by means of anaphora, ellipsis, and substitution. These devices show a high degree of frequency. However, linking particles, which establish connection among the different groups of recipes, are less frequent; though, admittedly, they still

---

[1] <Buyle> 'swelling'.

play a significant role in the process of compilation of recipes. These particles constitute evidence of a serious attempt to perform editorial work by the scribe. In other words, the presence of these particles shows that the scribe knew, and could handle, the material he was compiling to such an extent that he was able to establish cross-references among recipes[1].

Beforesaid (ll. 1338-1339) and its variants *before j seid* (l. 1413), *jsayde aboue* (l. 1593); and *as it is seide be fore* represent the majority of the internal cross-reference expressions employed by the scribe to make reference to re-cipes given earlier in the *receptarium.* The following instances exemplify this point[2]:

(13)
        For pe sa
me a plastyr Tak smalache wermot
hony salt vynegre ana a saucerful & perto
a quancyte of Ry¥emele & boyle hem to
gedre & make a plastyr on a clop & ley
to pe sore & vse pis plaster & pe drynke *be
foresaid* & pou schalt be hool •
(MS Hunter 185, ff. 17r-17v, ll. 1333-1339)

(14)
        Also for pe felon
pat makep the to swelle Take beteyne &
camamylle heyhoue & egremoyne • ana
an hanful & wessche hem & stampe hem
wel • & take hertes grece & lyue hony of eyper
a quantite & do perto barly mele half a quartron
& frye hem wel to gedre • & let schaue pe
hed & ley pe plaster a boue • as • hot as pe
seke may suffre • & ¥ef hem to drynke plan

---

[1] Traditionally, *receptaria* are considered to be characterised by adaptation and accre-tion (Voigts (1982: 44), Norri (1992: 34), Taavitsainen (1992: 329)); the latter im-plies some sort of pilling up of recipes as mere records of therapeutic knowledge. Thus, the presence of these internal cross-references support the idea of an incipient editorial work by the scribe who carefully connects recipes in our manuscript. Also, by means of these cross-references the scribe avoids the repetition of already-stated information such as how to mix the products in order to produce the medicine.

[2] Italics highlights the examples I refer to in the text.

tayne þe same drynke *þat is jsayde a boue*
for þe hed ache
(MS Hunter 185, f. 23r, ll. 1584-1594)

(15)
Also an other for þe same Tak
pullyole de montayne þat is to say
hillwort or brodewort a good handful
& wessch hit clene & schere hit smal
& do it in a mortere • & grynde hit smal &
do perto half an vnce of poudere of peper
& an vnce of poudere of comyn & med
le hem to gedere haluendel be wasted
& do perto also a potel of good wyn &
penne • seep it *as it ys seyde to fore* &
let þe pacient vse þis after mete & not
before & but ones after none & at eue
last & algate hoot & he schal be hool
(MS Hunter 185, ff. 33v-34r, ll. 2062-2074)

(16)
Also for þe emaraudes a good
medicyne / • Tak a stool with a sege *as*
hit is saide before for þe fluxe & ri¥t so
vse þis medicyne for þe emaraudes
as of þe hote tiles þer he takeþ frank
encens he schal take poudere of myrre
& of encense • ana & ¥ef he haue grete
pappes bynde a boute þe pappes a rede
selkys þred faste bi þe grounde & <u>kerue</u>
a wey þe pappes a boue þe þrede • &
þus serue hym ry¥t boldelich & tak an •
handful of wermot & wassch hit & stampe
it & fry¥e hit with oyle of olyue & make
a plaster & ley þerto as hoot as he may
suffre • & a noon as he be on his bed & a
morwe vse þis stool with þe sege & with
þese powdres & with jnne iij dayes he
schal be hool on warantise bote loke
þat he haue þis plaster durynge iij ny¥tes
or iiij at þe moste •
(MS Hunter 185, ff. 45v-46r, ll. 2620-2639)

In (13), the scribe offers a remedy for the *fistula*; this remedy is the second in his group and consists in the making of a plaster to cure the sick. In this case, this treatment must be applied together with a drink described in the previous recipe in the manuscript. Instead of rewriting the making of the drink, the scribe uses the string *pe drynke beforesaid* which forces the reader to go back in the *receptarium* to find the information he needs. This time the location of such information represents an easier enterprise, since the reader looking for information on *fistula* might have read the previous recipe as well, since it is located just before it.

However, two related recipes may sometimes be well aprt, as can be seen in (14) which contains information on swellings. Here, the scribe connects this recipe with another found in lines 1573 to 1575[1] by means of the string *pe same drynke pat is sayde aboue for pe hed ache*. As one may suppose, the expression *is sayde aboue* is rather unspecific for any reader to find successfully the drink the scribe refers to. Thus, the scribe adds the complement *for pe hed ache* in order to make clear the drink that should be prepared.

(15) *seep as it ys seyde to fore* finds its referent in the previous recipe in the manuscript. The reader is told to perform the same action with the ingredients as in the previous recipe, that is, the ingredients must be soaked in "good wyn from a potel" (l. 2057).

Finally, (16) shows a similar use of cross-reference expressions, where the reader must look back into the text in order to find the referent. In this case, the reader is told to use the same type of chair with a hole (normally used to help pregnant women when they give birth) which is described in a previous recipe in lines 2247-2249: "*T*ak a stool with a sege pat is closed al a bowte & tak an hoot tyle pat is glowyng hoot & ley hit vnder pe sege & let pe seke sitte doun on pe sege & make pe sege on pis manere". This recipe is found nearly 400 lines earlier in the *receptarium*, which indicates that the reader must locate the information without any other aid, save for the title in rubrics in line 2246 *Also for pe fluxe*.

---

[1] Lines 1573-1575 reads: "*Also here is for pe felon T*ak & drynk plantayne & make powdere of pe same & ley per to."

Sometimes, the reader is given more precise indications of where to find specific information:

(17)
       For to
make a drynke for alle manere of feuer oþer
posteme & for alle sekenesse þat is in mannes
body þat euer may be holpe with eny medicyne
Tak euery day a quantite of þe powdere
in þe recet be fore þat makeþ mencyoun
of þe dropsie in þe wombe & tak jsope
Rose maryne • violet verueyne • Beteyne
herbe jon • Monsere Red planteyne þe
whiche is a powdere anance Sauge
ffeperfoye • & ache ana an • handful & was
sche clene pyn herbes & do hem in to a
mortere • & stampe hem a litel • & do hem in to
an erpen pot … (MS Hunter 185, ff. 54r-54v, ll. 3029-3051)

In this example, the scribe indicates the reader where to find the information to produce the medicine to help the sick to overcome a state of fever. As happened in some of the examples described above, the recipe the scribe refers to is found very early in the text. Thus, the scribe gives specific details to the reader so that he can find quickly the information required. In fact, the extra information given here *þe dropsie in þe wombe* coincides word-for-word with the rubricated title of the recipe the scribe mentions: "*For þe dropsie in þe wombe & in þe feet*…" (ll. 2559-2561). This may greatly benefit the reader in his search for this information.

In MS Hunter 185, the reader must also look forward, rather than backwards, into the text to find the information required. The only instance of this type is the following:

(18)
For to restore a¥eyn þe wombe whenne
it is solible § Tak an handful of
hennecresses seed anoper of weybrode & gryn
de hem in a mortere penne frye hem wel to
gedre with schepes talwe & frank encens

    & make a plaster & ley to his nauel also hot
    as he may suffre • & *let hym vse pis pat*
    is jtolde next after
    (MS Hunter 185, f. 37v, ll. 2239-2246)

In this case, the string *pat is jtolde next after* compels the reader to go forward in the *receptarium* to find the second part of the treatment for the womb which is presented in the following recipe: "*Also for pe fluxe*" (l. 2246).

6. CONCLUSIONS

The present study illustrates the strategies used by the medieval scribe of MS Hunter 185 to connect medical recipes in a manuscript. Such strategies include the use of specific visual elements, and the use of grammatical devices such as anaphora, substitution, ellipsis, and cross-references. As shown above, one of the aims of linking recipes is to create subgroups of recipes which cover particular information for specific sicknesses. Thus, the scribe employs systematically the expressions *also*, *an other*, *item*, *for pe same* in the titles so as to group recipes with a similar therapeutic function. Also, as seen earlier, by using such expressions in the second and following recipes in a given group, the scribe only needs to write in full the first title of the first recipe in that group; in this way, he avoids the repetition of the entire title in subsequent recipes.

The use of internal cross-references, such as *bifore saide*, also sheds light to the process of compilation of recipes in the Middle Ages. These cross-references show that scribal work in the construction of the medical *receptarium* was far beyond the random compilation of recipes. Quite on the contrary, cross-references constitute an indication that the scribe knew his material well, and hence that he was able to establish connections among the recipes. It should be also noted that the scribe supplies extra-information in strings like *as it is seide be fore* or *before j seid* by adding phrases such as *for pe fluxe* or *for pe hed ache*, which clearly define the recipe he refers to. The inclusion of such phrases depends on the relation of proximity between the recipes involved: the larger the distance between recipes, the longer the cross-reference.

The information included in this paper represents just the starting point towards further research in the field of linking particles in Middle English recipe collections. The use of specific lexical items with linking function among recipes has been ignored here, but constitutes another area of research which might enlighten our understanding of medieval recipe compilations.

<div align="right">

Francisco Alonso Almeida

Universidad de Las Palmas de Gran Canaria

</div>

REFERENCES

Alonso Almeida, F. forthcoming: 'Gyf hyr pis medycyin' Analysing the Middle-English Recipe Medical Discourse. *Revista de lenguas para fines específicos* 5/6.

Brown, G. and G. Yule. 1996 (1983): *Discourse Analysis*. (Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics). Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Norri, J. 1992: *Names of Sicknesses in English, 1400-1550: An Exploration of the Lexical Field*. Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, Helsinki.

Parkes, M. 1973: The Literacy of the Laity. In David Daiches and A. Thorlby (eds.) *The Mediaeval World*. Aldus Book, London. 555-557.

Robbins, R. H. 1970: Medical Manuscripts in Middle English. *Speculum*, 45: 393-415.

Rodríguez Álvarez, A. 1997: *Documentos notariales vernáculos del condado de Durham (Siglo XV): estudio y edición*. Servicio de Publicaciones de la Universidad de Córdoba y Servicio de Publicaciones de la Universidad de Las Palmas de Gran Canaria, Córdoba.

Schmidt, K. A. R. 1994: The Index of Middle English Prose and Late Medieval English Recipes. *English Studies*, 75.5: 423-429.

Taavitsainen, I. 1994: On the Evolution of Scientific Writings from 1375 to 1675: Repertoire of Emotive Features. In F. Fernández et al. (eds.) *Papers from the 7th International Conference of English Historical Linguistics*. John Benjamins Publishing Co, Amsterdam and Philadelphia. 329-342.

Voigts, L. 1982: Editing Middle English Medical Texts: Needs and Issues. In Levere, Trevor *Editing Texts in the History of Science and Medicine*. Garland, New York and London, 39-68.

Voigts, L. 1995: Multitudes of Middle English Medical Manuscripts, or the Englishing of Science and Medicine. In M. Schleissner (ed.) *Manuscript Sources of Medieval Medicine*. *A Book of Essays*. Garland Publishing, New York and London. 183-195.

Young, J. and P. H. Aitken. 1908: *Annotated Catalogue of Manuscripts in the Hunterian Library*. James Maclehose and Sons, Glasgow.

* † *