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Abstract

This thesis is an edition based on the study of a fifteenth-century Middle English manuscript containing a collection of cookery recipes as well as a miscellany of medical texts. The cookery recipes of the London, British Library’s Sloane 442 manuscript (MS Sloane 442) are the subject of the thesis, and will be presented in a diplomatic edition. The edition encompasses a codicological description of the manuscript and the hands, but also supplies the necessary background information in order to shed light on the historical and linguistic context of these medieval cookery recipes.

The present thesis project investigates the vagueness notion frequently linked to the language of Middle English cookery recipes. The perceived vagueness, however, is coloured by the context of the cookery recipes: the time, the function, and the audience. The study draws upon previous research projects of similar character. In this respect Carroll’s studies of Middle English recipes are of great interest. There is to this day no knowledge of parallel texts containing the exact same contents in the same particular order of appearance as the MS Sloane 442. Consequently the cookery recipes have been studied in their own right without making comparisons with parallel texts.

What concerns Middle English and the specific dialect of the manuscript, the dialect of MS Sloane 442 has been localized in *A Linguistic Atlas of Late Medieval English* as Linguistic Profile (LP) Essex 6021 (thus belonging to the Essex area). An in-depth study of the dialect therefore proved superfluous. Nonetheless, an outline of the history of Middle English and the linguistic variation typical of the period will be provided, thus contextualising the dialect of the manuscript.

The thesis is divided in two parts of which the first includes the background material that will place the manuscript in its historical and linguistic context. Then a general study of cookery recipes as text makes up the theoretical framework, followed by a specific study of the language of the cookery recipes in the Sloane 442 manuscript.

Finally the edition, with the transcribed text and the editorial conventions, makes up the second part of the thesis. The cookery recipes have been transcribed according to the conventions of the diplomatic edition. The intention has been to present a text that represents, as far as feasible, the layout and conventions of the original manuscript. A glossary of culinary terms has been included as an appendix. This was considered useful since the recipes consist of some culinary terms that would most likely be unfamiliar to the modern reader.
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First I would like to say a word about the thesis title, which, as the shrewd reader may have noticed, holds a ‘spelling error’. However tabyle and tabille are spelled differently on purpose – this is how the two words are spelled on folio 3r in the London, British Library’s Sloane 442 Manuscript (see Appendix 1) – thus supplying the first example of Middle English spelling variation.

Writing a Master’s Thesis is like going on a long journey where nothing is settled in advance and pocket money is scarce. You have to figure out the direction of your journey as you go – and with small means you will have to work hard throughout the journey if it is going to get you anywhere at all – it is true that there is no such thing as a free ride.

This thesis project has taken me up and down the narrow and winding paths of the academic world – paths that I never even knew existed. This is perhaps the most cumbersome but at the same time the most interesting journey I have ever made. During this journey I have gained valuable insights in many fields, not only those concerning the topics of this thesis – there are so much wisdom to be harvested from this kind of work – both at the personal and academic levels.

However when doing research there are a few pitfalls that the novice researcher might fall into. Without my two supervisors I would probably have fallen into at least one of them without even knowing it. Professor Merja Riita Stenroos and Associate Professor Aidan Keally Conti – you have each in your turn guided me safely through this journey – I am forever grateful for your support and knowledgable advice, without you my travels would not have been safe. I also owe thanks to my loving husband. Though this ‘academic business’ is not really your ‘thing’, you are one of the wisest persons I know – your down-to-earth and practical approach to any challenge that may come in our way – makes up the kind of wisdom that weighs more than ten theses all together.
1. Introduction

The present thesis offers an edition of some fifteenth century Middle English cookery recipes, more specifically those of the Sloane 442 manuscript (MS Sloane 442), located at the British Library, London. The cookery recipes of this collection were most likely meant for the tables of the upper classes. An indication for this is the list of courses on folio three, with the revealing titles: *For the Knyȝhtys tabyll and for the Kyngges tabyll* (For the knights’ and kings’ tables). However in this respect many of the ingredients necessary for making these dishes are also quite revealing in character (see ch. 4.2 and 4.3).

The cookery recipes make up twenty folios of this manuscript codex, which contains a total of seventy-eight folios. The manuscript includes in addition to the recipe collection, a miscellany of medical writings, such as remedies for common worries like hair loss and ‘corrupt winds of the stomach’ – some of them written in the form of medical recipes or recipe paraphrases, others might be characterized as herbals (see Mäkinen 2006:21-4). The medical section also includes medical treatises known as the ‘Books of Galen, Hippocrates, Socrates, and Æsculapius’ and some surgical texts (Lanfrancus, Mediolnensis) (*British Library Online Archives and Manuscripts*).

This thesis aims at making a contribution within the field of historical linguistics, with particular focus on Middle English cookery recipes. The main focus is thus contextualising these recipes by shedding light on the different historical aspects, and at the same time supplying an in-depth study of their particular linguistic features. But not the least, making an edition of a Middle English manuscript is a means of making the historical text available to a larger audience.

Regarding medieval cookery recipes and their history, linguistic scholars, medievalists and historians, as well as food experts have already made important contributions in the field. A considerable number of publications, originating from both amateurs and scholars, are proof of this growing interest. However in the light of the interest for cookbooks in general, parallel with the rising interest for medieval cooking, it is hoped that this study will constitute a welcome supplement to the existing knowledge of the language and history of medieval cookery recipes. The idea is that the in-depth study of this manuscript will illuminate its historical context. Though this study primarily aims at the scholarly audience, it is hoped that the topic of medieval cookery recipes will attract some readers among the general audience too.
Medieval cookery recipes are frequently described as vague. This study will examine the language of cookery recipes, by looking at some features that might support the prevailing notion of vagueness, such as the omission of information. The study will draw upon previous research in the field of cookery recipes. The theoretical framework that the study is based on concerns both editions of medieval recipes as well as works discussing text and language in general, but most importantly those concerning the language of cookery recipes.

One of the earliest, and certainly most well known editions of medieval cookery recipes, is that of Pegge (1780). His edition of The Forme of Cury contains the transcription of a manuscript roll dating from around 1390, supposedly written or dictated by Richard II’s master chef. The edition is considered an authority in the field, though is has been pointed out that Pegge made some mistakes in his transcription (Hieatt and Butler 1976:21,23). Nonetheless, Pegge’s edition, by virtue of being an authentic source, is frequently cited and used as work of reference.

Of more recent date is the work of Hieatt and Butler (1985) that constitutes valuable sources of information on medieval cookery recipes. Their edition of fourteenth century culinary recipes Curye on Inglysch is worth taking notice of. Moreover Hieatt’s edition of the cookery recipes of the Beinecke 163 manuscript, An Ordinance of Pottage (1988) is highly relevant, as it was found to contain the same recipes as those of the Sloane 442 manuscript, plus fifty or so in addition to these. Furthermore her compilation and translation of The Culinary Recipes of Medieval England provides useful insight into the history of medieval cooking and the cookery recipes of the period (Hieatt 2013).

Also Carroll (2004, 2009, 2010) has made some contributions dealing with the language of recipes, of which ‘Vague language in the medieval recipes of the Forme of Cury’ will be of interest in this context. Görlach’s (2004) studies of text types, and in particular his study of cookery recipes as text, must also be incorporated. Additional insights on recipes as text are found in Mäkinen (2006), though his study deals with herbals, there are many similarities between cooking recipes and herbals – both on the level of layout, content, and particular linguistic features. Also Hoey (2001 [2005]) and Biber and Conrad (2009) provide different approaches to how texts can be analysed and discussed. In addition comes Channell’s (1994) study of vague language, which shed light on factors inducing the vagueness notion.

Today cookery recipes or cookbooks have a large audience – whether one chooses the paper copy or some kind of digital version is of less importance – what matters is that they have in a sense become common property, contrary to what was the case in the Middle Ages. The cooking directions that modern cookery recipes consist of are precise in quantities and
measures, as well as supplying relatively accurate timings and cooking temperatures. Modern recipes are directed mostly at the amateur cooks, which explains the need for explicit and detailed instructions. The medieval cookery recipes are located at the other end of the scale of their modern equivalents inasmuch as they are frequently described as vague.

Undeniably the thesis topic was chosen out of a personal interest in cookery and cookbooks. Combined with the interest for manuscript studies, initiated by the participation in a ‘Scribes and Manuscript’ course at the University of Stavanger, there was no doubt about what to write on when the MS Sloane 442 recipes were presented as a possible strand to follow. The whole project is founded on these Middle English cookery recipes – constituting the platform or ‘point de départ’ from where all research had to begin. The research questions addressed in the research proposal were formulated on the grounds of a somewhat limited knowledge in the field, both in regard to manuscript studies, as well as medieval recipes and cooking. However as the work progressed, it was decided that these research questions were still valid, with some minor adjustments. They have been conferred with in many turns to ensure that the project was heading in the right direction. The following research questions have been addressed:

1. What was the context and use of these cookery recipes and how does this fit into the history of cookbooks?
2. Which dialects are represented in the recipe collection and what can the scribal usage tell us about the origin(s) of the MS Sloane 442?
3. What kinds of recipe structures are present in this collection and how do they relate to what we know of medieval and post-medieval English cookbooks as text type, at the levels of layout, contents, and grammatical structure?

With respect to the specific context and use of these recipes, one can make assumptions based on for instance the descriptions from contemporaries. Parkes refers to the twelfth century author Wace who ‘declared that he wrote for those Ki unt les rentes e le argent Kar pur eus sunt li liure fait’ (who have the incomes and the cash, because for them are books made)’ (Parkes 1973:557). Books were prized belongings in the Middle Ages, thus the audience of cookery books is likely to have been found amongst those who were both literate

\[ ^{1} \text{Though there is hardly any relevance in this context, the excerpt translated into modern French will be } \text{Qui ont les rentes et l’argent Car pour eux sont les livres faits. This is of course a digression, however it is interesting to draw some parallels between English and French, acknowledging that also French has undergone considerable changes since the twelfth century.} \]
and had the economical means to acquire books. As initially underlined, costly ingredients in a sense occlude an audience of limited economical means, inasmuch as owning a collection of recipes for dishes that one cannot afford to cook, makes little sense.

The cookery recipes of MS Sloane 442 are witnesses of the history of food consumption in medieval England as well as provide evidence of the Middle English linguistic variation. The thesis comprises two main parts, in which the first provides a codicological description of the MS Sloane 442, its history as well as a presenting and discussing the hands in chapter two. Then chapter three gives an outline of the historical aspects that may be said to have caused the Middle English linguistic variation. Since the dialect of the manuscript was already localized in the Linguistic Atlas of Late Medieval English, it was found that the need for an in-depth dialectal study was superfluous, thus the dialectal study has been granted less attention than initially planned for.

The history of food and cooking in Late Medieval England will be dealt with in chapter four, thus contextualising the recipes. Finally chapter five includes the theoretical framework upon which the linguistic study of the recipes is based. This chapter discusses whether the language of these cookery recipes is vague or not, and the factors that contribute to this vagueness notion. The edition, with the editorial conventions and the transcribed text, makes up the second part of the thesis.

The diplomatic edition strives at the most truthful representation of the layout and the conventions of the manuscript. However some considerations had to be taken into account, such as the fact that the handwritten medieval text contains some features not easily transmitted to the digital copy within the limits of a regular keybord. In addition some considerations must be taken with respect to the thesis guidelines. The editorial conventions account for all the decisions made in the transcription process, such as the treatment of abbreviations, superscript, curtailments, and other features typical of the medieval manuscript. The edition also includes a glossary of culinary terms as an appendix, in order to provide the readers with a useful tool that might enhance the understanding of the recipes.

This edition is mainly based on a study of a digital facsimile copy. Nonetheless the original was also consulted at one point in order to get an overview of details not easily detected on a copy.
2. The Sloane 442 Manuscript

The following sections offer an introduction to the Sloane 442 manuscript. An account for its history, ownership, contents, physical condition and appearance, as well as the hands/dialect will be rendered.

2.1 Historical Background

The Sloane 442 manuscript is a codex, described as a ‘commonplace book’, located at the British Library’s London St Pancras department, and forms a part of the great Sloane Collection. Based on present evidence, the MS Sloane 442 as a collection, as discussed in this thesis, with this particular composition of items in this order of appearance, is the sole exemplar of its kind. However one is familiar with the existence of other collections of cookery recipes containing many of the same recipes as the MS Sloane 442. Amongst those is the culinary recipe collection of the MS Beineicke 163 (located in Yale University’s Beinecke Library), the one that has perhaps been most approved for its authenticity. The cookery recipes of the MS Beinecke 163 have also been edited and adapted by Hieatt (1988). All the recipes in MS Sloane 442 can be found also in MS Beinecke 163. There is a difference though, as from f.18v in MS Sloane 442 the order of appearance is not the same as in MS Beinecke 163, in addition comes the fact that MS Beinecke 163 includes fifty or so additional recipes that are not present in the Sloane manuscript. Both manuscripts have been localized in *A Linguistic Atlas of Late Medieval English* (LALME), though with two different dialects/linguistic profiles (LP Essex 6021 and LP 5292 (5291)).

The manuscripts of the Sloane collection were once in the posession of Sir Hans Sloane (1660-1753), a renowned physician in his time, but also an eager collector of manuscripts and codices, in particular those concerned with ‘medicine, alchemy, chemistry, botany and horticulture, exploration and travel, mathematics and natural history, magic and religion’ (*British Library Online Archives and Manuscripts*). Besides his devotion to medicine and natural sciences, Sloane frequently invited dinner guests – the meal he probably used as an excuse to invite them into his private museum to study the displayed collections (Hawkins 2010). In this respect the inclusion of cookery recipes in the Sloane 442 manuscript seems like a relevant choice. The *British Library Online Archives and Manuscripts*
Catalogue’s custodial history lists the MS Sloane 442 as an ‘owned manuscript’, the former owner being Colonel Walter Slingsby – from whom Sloane must have purchased this particular manuscript. On f.3r there is a signature that seems to be identical with other signatures, on letters from the same Slingsby, located in the online database of the National Archives. The MS Sloane 442 was one out of many purchases, and it is regarded as rather extraordinary that one individual managed to acquire such an extensive book collection, comprising in the end an estimated 50,000 manuscripts. Sloane’s constant search for ‘a particular remedy for sore eyes’ might to some degree explain his constant craving for and purchases of books – on medicine in particular (Walker 2014:384).

At some point Sloane’s house was filled to the rim due to his constantly growing collections, resulting in the purchase of the neighbouring house, in order to make more room for all these objects. In the end his collections comprised not only around 50,000 manuscripts, but also ‘objects and curiosities, including 5,439 insects and around 23,000 coins and medals, over 12,000 examples of plant material’ (Hawkins 2010).

The Sloane collections ‘include what has been described as the greatest collection of medical manuscripts ever made by a single individual, not just in quantity and variety but in the exceptional quality of individual items’ (British Library Online Search Catalogue. In his will Hans Sloane expressed a wish that his collections were kept as a unity, without being split into smaller units, and furthermore that his tradition of keeping them available to the public be continued. ‘His collections were bought by the nation for the sum of £20,000 and by an Act of Parliament £100,000 (£8,000,000 in today’s currency) was to be raised by lottery for the storage and display of the Sloane collection which was to form, along with several other collections, the foundation of the British Museum’ (Hawkins 2010). Today registered readers of the British Library are still granted access to the manuscripts of the Sloane collection.

2.2 Manuscript Description

The Sloane 442 manuscript is a codex containing a collection of cookery recipes and diverse medical recipes with some illustrations of the human anatomy as well as some chemical and astrological illustrations. The manuscript, rebound by the British Library (BL) in 1972, contains seventy-eight folios – twenty-one of these folios make up the cookery section, upon which the study in this thesis project has been based. Naturally the main focus of the MS description rests on the cookery section on ff.3, 6-25, giving less attention to the remaining
parts of the manuscript. The codicological description of MS Sloane 442 is based on information from the British Library Online Archives and Manuscripts and the Schoenberg Database of Manuscripts, in addition to an in situ study at BL London performed in November 2014. The dialect or origin of the manuscript, localized in LALME as LP Essex 6021, will also be put into a historical and linguistic context, thus forming a part of the codicological description.

The manuscript contains, in addition to the cookery recipes, a miscellany of medicinal treatises, a few tables (on horoscope and how to read urine samples), and recipes for how to make remedies and ointments, bearing titles like ‘how to make hair grow’, against stomach and toothaches’, and ‘against all kinds of evils in the head’. Some of the medical treatises constitute the English version of Gilbertus Anglicus’ ‘Compendium Medicinae A Regimen For Diet And Bloodlettin’ (1450). The medical section includes thirteenth century ‘treatises known the “Books of Galen, Hippocrates, Socrates and Æsculapius’, as well as Lanfrancus’ fifteenth century treatise known as ‘Parva cyrurgia’ (www.bl.uk/reshelp). The section on cookery and confectionery on ff. 3 and 6-25 is, according to the BL Catalogue, fifteenth century. The majority of the manuscript is written in English.

The creation date of the MS is, according to the BL Catalogue, the period between the thirteenth and seventeenth century – slightly self-contradictory though, considering that none of the elements are actually listed as being older than fifteenth century. Since none of the quires/folios are older than fifteenth century, a possible explanation for this discrepancy could be that one has regarded Sloane as the final compiler of the manuscript, thus being the one who ‘concluded’ it in some way, by collating the different quires into one codex – thus the ‘creation period’ would have ended in his time; the seventeenth century. Disregarding this discrepancy, one must conclude that most obviously the codex was created or written between the thirteenth and fifteenth centuries. The medieval codex would often consist of a collection of miscellaneous ‘booklets’, making each book a unique exemplar to suit ‘the requirements of each owner or maker’ – by consequence there is a fair chance that a codex might contain quires of various provenance (Clanchy 1993:117-118).

The material used for the MS Sloane 442 is paper – with the exception of ff. 1, 2 and 78 – these are made of parchment. The size of the seventy-five paper folios is approximately 280 mm (height) x 210 mm (width), whereas the parchment folios are slightly smaller in size (h:272 mm x w:197 mm). The size of the ‘written on’ surface varies – folios that include marginalia naturally have a larger ‘written on’ area. Disregarding marginalia and some rather untidy folios, where almost the whole surface has been written on, the standard pricked and
ruled area measures around 200 mm in height and 130 mm in width – top and inner margins are the narrowest, leaving broader space on the bottom and in the outer margins of the folios. The modern 1972 binding measures 295 mm x 240 mm x 32 mm, and bears the golden lettered inscription ‘Biblioteca Manuscript Sloaneian’ on the front, and ‘Culinary and Medical Tracts – Brit. Mus. Sloane MS 442’ on the spine. The inside of the front cover reads ‘154 f.’ – which ought to be the equivalent to 154 pages (however the MS contains 78 rectos and 78 versos, usually referred to as 78 folios (154 pages), so this must be a slight misunderstanding of the meaning of ‘folio’, because 154 folios are actually 308 pages). Three blank folios in paper are followed by one folio that has a notice glued onto it reading ‘Sloane MS 442 For printed text or notices of this MS. see: - Index to recipes, ff.6-25b in Add. MS 42562, ff. 42-57’ in addition to the information ‘Readers are requested to notify the Superintendent of the Student’s Room of any additions that may be made to the above’.

The manuscript has naturally been exposed to some ‘wear and tear’ over the years, supplying a good reason for the ‘in-house’ rebinding in 1972 – as well as ensuring a continuous preservation of this fragile document. Even though the folios of the codex are the originals, the in situ study reveals features not easily detected on a digital copy – in fact quite a substantial amount of amendments have been performed on the manuscript. The folios have been reinforced – i.e. damaged and rugged edged folios have been repaired – leaving an impression that adjustments have been made in order to standardize the folio size, fitting them perfectly into a codex.

With respect to the physical description of the manuscript, notice should be taken of the fact that distinguishing the different, rather tightly bound quires from one another, was a rather cumbersome task. Though the in situ study of the MS represents the work of a novice in the field, it was carried out with utmost care, in order to supply the most reliable results possible. At this stage, and so far, it represents the only information available as concerns the quires and how they are put together, by consequence is must be taken for what it is – the meticulous toil of an amateur. The in situ study concludes that the codex consists of a total of fourteen different quires.

Medieval codices were made up of quires – pieces of parchment/paper that were folded one or several times, forming units that can be described as booklets. These quires could be bound together, thus forming a codex. The OED definition of a quire is ‘four sheets of paper or parchment folded to make eight leaves (=16 pages)’ – derived from the Latin ‘quaternion’, meaning ‘set of four’ i.e. the so-called ‘quarto’. In reality not all quires are made up of eight folios – some have fewer, others include more, and uneven numbers also occur.
The ‘regular’ quire, however, was made up of an even number of folios, as the parchment or paper was always folded. Besides the quarto, some other ‘standard’ quires are the ‘bifolium’ (one sheet/two folios/four pages), the ‘binion’ (two sheets/four folios/eight pages), and the ‘quinion’ (five sheets/ten folios/twenty pages). In the case of an uneven folio number, this usually indicates the presence of a ‘singleton’ – a single leaf/folio that has been glued onto the quire, either on the outside of the first folio, in the mid-section, or on the last folio.

The MS Sloane 442 has ‘pastedowns’ with their affiliated ‘flyleaves’ both at the beginning and at the end of the codex – these do not count as quires. The first two folios that follow are made out of one piece of yellow-brownish parchment, thus a bifolium making up a quire on its own. Folio 1r is blank, then 1v and f. 2 contain some medical treatises of the sort ‘for swellings & aches’, and as the sole occurrence in the whole MS, on the bottom of folio 1v, a line of quarter notes is displayed – it is neither a particularly catchy tune, nor is it clear what purpose this tiny piece of music serves in the context of medical treatises.

The three parchment folios (ff. 1, 2 and 78) have several features in common, their legibility is rather poor, they are written by the same hand, and all three give an impression of being of an older date that the paper folios, with brownish colour and faded ink. Without written evidence one cannot tell with certainty if this assumption is true, though commonplace books would often contain a collection of preferred miscellany, implicitly quires may have dated from different periods.

Folio 3r contains an index listing three menus with dishes “for the knyghtys tabylle and for the kyngges tabylle”, which was also found to make up a suitable title for the thesis. Folio 3r has a rubbed-off imprint from another folio, and by the looks it cannot be ascribed to any tight bondage with folio 2v, thus one must assume that f.3 most likely is a ‘singleton’, in this case glued on the first folio of the quire. F.3 apparently makes up a quire together with f.4 and f.5 – thus a quire made up of one bifolio and a singleton. Both f.4 and f.5 have suffered loss, so half of the text is missing – by the looks it has probably been torn off at some point. The folios have been amended though, and the missing text has been replaced by blank paper, neatly glued on.

The third quire has six folios; ff.6-11, making up a rather interesting quire, since ff.6r-9r are written in brown ink (however probably originally black at some point) – whereas the ink on ff.9v-11 is black. Furthermore this feature coincides with the marginalia present on exactly the same folio numbers – ff.6v-9r – apart from the first folio in the cookery section.

---

2 One folded sheet makes up a pastedown and a flyleaf, of which the pastedown is glued to either the front or back cover, whereas the flyleaf is ‘loose’ one.
(f.6r), which contains no marginalia. On f.9v the capitals become slightly more elaborate and curled with a different ‘touch’ compared to previous folios (ff.6r-9r), at the same time as the handwriting leans a little more to the right. This may be taken as a sign of yet another hand, however the discrepancy might possibly be caused simply by a variation in one person’s handwriting, bearing in mind that handwriting may vary, as well as the writing equipment may also have a certain impact on the physical appearance of someone’s handwriting.

The next quire, ff.12-14, contains only three folios – a bifolium and a singleton. At the bottom of f.12r are the catchwords ‘or ellys’ – then the two first words on f.12v read ‘or elys’. After this follows a quire of six folios (ff.15-20), succeeded by the sixth and the last quire of the cookery section (ff.21-28). The cookery section ends half way down on f.25v, where another hand takes over. It is worth taking notice of the fact that in this quire three completely different hands are represented.

The seventh quire, written by two different hands, contains six folios (ff.29-34). Then comes an eightfolio quire, containing drawings of glasses of urine samples. On the last three folios red ink has been employed. It should be noted that the more expensive red ink is not found anywhere in the cookery section. Quire eight on ff.35-42 includes eight folios, and is written by the same hand as ff.6-9r. The ninth and tenth quires (on ff.43-49 and ff.50-57) are both made up of eight folios, both are written in the same hand. The eleventh quire (ff.58-68) is made up of nine folios – the one in the middle is a singleton. Regarding the twelfth quire (ff.63-66), these four folios are written in Latin, in both black and red ink. In addition another hand takes over on f.66v. The last two quires (ff.67-74 and ff.75-77) are in the same hand, number thirteen has eight folios, whereas number fourteen consists of the three last paper folios followed by folio 78 – a parchment folio. The last folio consists of two different materials, thus one must assume that it is a bifolium with two singletons.

Though the colour of the ink varies the ink used in the cookery section is thought to have been uniformly black, even though the colour and intensity of it varies. No other colours besides black have been employed in the cookery section, neither for underlining nor for decorating enlarged capitals. Red ink (and invariably also blue and green) was commonly employed for decoration (capitals/initials) and underlining (headings) (Clemens and Graham 2007:25-26). However only in the medical section some red ink has been sparingly employed.
2.3 The Hands and the Script

The British Library Catalogue description of the MS Sloane 442 lists three different hands, none of which are named. A draft of a personal letter, written vertically in the right hand margin of f.26r, refers to ‘yᵉ persone of Stanbryhge’ – however the mention of this Stanbryhge person does not add any information that might help reveal the identity of the scribe who wrote it. While the fact that the Catalogue lists three different hands does not preclude the existence of more hands, this query was judged to be slightly beyond the main scope of the thesis. However the potential existence of a fourth or even fifth hand is intriguing and will be granted at least some attention.

In the following sections the characteristics of the hands will be described, at the same time as images from select folios might support the hypothesis that more than three hands were involved in the production of the MS. The catalogue description does not state the exact ‘whereabouts’ of the three different hands, which is rather unfortunate, as the handwriting varies quite a lot throughout the manuscript – in fact to a such degree that the first impression is that the presence of more than three hands is very likely.

The Schoenberg Database of Manuscripts labels the script of MS Sloane 442 as Gothic Cursive. The script of the present MS includes features of both Anglicana and Secretary, including some headings in the medical section written in a variant of Textualis – implicitly it could be characterized as a mixed script, with a slight predominance of the Anglicana features. As pointed out by Roberts, the distinct features of Anglicana and Secretary scripts were frequently mixed, and consequently ‘it is not easy, and perhaps it is even inadvisable, to distinguish mixed hands as predominantly one or the other’ (Roberts 2005:4).

Roberts describes three main types of script within the Gothic system of scripts (Roberts 2005:140-254). Textualis, with all its minims, compressed and upright form, angular and lozenge shaped letters, was succeeded by Anglicana and Secretary – hands that are, according to Roberts, ‘important for the history of the book in England’ (Roberts 2005:140). Anglicana was, as the name reveals, a script that first developed in Britain, used between the thirteenth and sixteenth centuries as a ‘business hand’, since the linked letters and loops made it a more practical and ‘speedy’ handwriting compared to Textualis. Clemens and Graham point out that ‘the main features that distinguish a cursive script from a formal bookhand are a reduction in the number of pen lifts necessary for the execution of individual letters and the introduction of loops both to facilitate this reduction and to link one letter to another’ (Clemens and Graham 2007:160).
While the cursive scripts Anglicana and Secretary share many of the letterforms, the characters a, e, g, r, s, w, and x are of different shapes, thus these are typically employed to distinguish Anglicana from Secretary (Roberts 2005:161). In the Sloane 442 the different features of Anglicana and Secretary are used interchangeably and apparently inconsistently. This is however not unusual, as most handwritten texts of the period are prone to inconsistencies and errors, as well as irregularities. According to Clemens and Graham the Secretary hand was commonly used from the second half of the fifteenth century, especially for copying ‘the major vernacular authors Chaucer, Gower, and Lydgate’ (Clemens and Graham 2007:168). The Secretary hand was most likely found more efficient to use than its predecessor the Anglicana hand.

The quality and readability of the folios of the MS Sloane 442 vary. The vast majority of the folios are for the most part fully legible, so that after some rounds of careful study of the cookery section (from the facsimile copy and in situ), one is left with only a handful of puzzling readings. Some of the folios have an untidy appearance, as the lines are not straight, margins deviate from the standard, and the hand is executed in an almost sloppy manner – illustrated by the images categorized as hand I (see Appendix 2).

Table I shows the representation of the said three hands listed in the BL Catalogue. The first hand does in reality constitute a miscellany of different handwritings, as a closer study of this hand indicates that as much as three different hands are represented in hand I. It is of course possible that a scribe may have altered his handwriting in such a way that it came to look like a completely different hand, however the different letter shapes represented by hand I might as well be taken as a proof that more hands were involved in the MS production. Table I is thus made in order to place the three listed hands of the BL Catalogue description on the folios they are thought to represent so that they make up three categories of the said three hands.

Table II and III indicate the distribution on the different letter shapes of Anglicana and Secretary present in the MS. A discussion of the hands, supported by ‘visual evidence’ of select MS images however, is supplied in Appendix 2, which provides a more in-depth discussion of the hands of the MS Sloane 442. According to Petti, the 2-shaped ‘r’ occurs in variants of both Secretary and Anglicana. In the MS this 2-shaped ‘r’ is employed by hand I.

---

3 In this context it must be said that the BL Online Archives and Manuscripts Catalogue does not indicate the specific whereabouts of these three hands, thus the three said hands have in this table been divided into three categories according to their style –based on a visual impression. It would have been easier to justify those three different hands if the Catalogue description had included information naming the exact folio number on which they were supposed to occur.
however it only occurs on the most untidy folios, i.e. those represented by the image examples of 1A f.33v, 1D f.28r, and 1F f.66v (see Appendix 2).

Table I The Representation of the Hands in MS Sloane 442

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hand</th>
<th>The hand is present on these folios</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hand I</td>
<td>1, 2, 3v – 4r second half, 4v – 5, 25v second half – 34v, 37v minus the five first lines, 66v minus the three first lines, 78r</td>
<td>On f.29r there is a different hand in the mid-section.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hand II</td>
<td>3r, 4r twelve first lines, 6r – 23r seven first lines, 35r – 77v</td>
<td>On f.66v hand II occurs only on the two and a half first lines. The rest of the folio ‘belongs’ to hand I.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hand III</td>
<td>23r starting from line eight – 25v first half</td>
<td>In this section punctuation is absent, apart from some strokes at the end of recipes, possibly in order to to complete the lines.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table II Distinct letter shapes of Anglicana.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter Shape</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Double-compartment ‘a’</td>
<td>There are few occurrences of this form of the ‘a’. Some of the cases are of such a size that the scribe might have intended they represent capital A. However on ff.23r-25v (hand III) and on ff.28v-32r this appears to be the only ‘a’ used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looped ‘d’</td>
<td>All the ‘d’ characters are performed in some looped variant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pointed ‘e’</td>
<td>No image of this character which is not present in this MS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reverse ‘e’</td>
<td>This is the most commonly employed variant of ‘e’ in the manuscript, by all of the hands involved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-shaped or ‘closed’/‘tight’ ‘g’</td>
<td>This form is present on a very few occasions in the cookery section, however fairly consistently used by hand I (medical section).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-stemmed ‘r’</td>
<td>Though a count has not been performed, it appears to be the most frequently used ‘r’ shape throughout the MS:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-shaped or ‘sigma’ ‘s’ in word final position</td>
<td>This ‘s’ seems to be represented on most of the folios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘113’-shaped ‘w’</td>
<td>This is the form employed by hand II and the use is consistent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two stroke ‘x’, joined in the mid-section (i.e. in the cross)</td>
<td>No occurrences of ‘x’ in the cookery section. This variant is found in the medical section in hand II.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1Jacob Thaisen must be accredited in full for both table II and table III, as they are very much inspired by a schema (of his) distributed to the students of his ‘Scribes and Manuscript’ course at the University of Stavanger in the spring semester of 2012.
### Table III Distinct letter shapes of Secretary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter Shape</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single-compartment ‘a’</td>
<td>This is the most frequently used form throughout the MS, except from the case of ff.23r-25v (hand III) and ff.28v-32r (see the previous table). It should be noted that double and single compartment ‘a’s are used interchangeably.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘e’ formed as two separate strokes</td>
<td>This form is not present in the MS. No image.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open ‘g’</td>
<td>Hand II employs this form, the use is consistent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V-shaped ‘r’</td>
<td>V-shaped ‘r’ is represented on all folios, though the long ‘r’ is the predominant form.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kidney-shaped word-final ‘s’</td>
<td>This form of the ‘s’ is represented, however not as frequently employed as the sigma shaped ‘s’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open form ‘w’. The first type is made up by two strokes, whereas the second is made by a broken, single stroke (no pen lift involved)</td>
<td>The representation of these two is consistent. The variant executed with two strokes is present in ex.1C, E, F while the second variant is present in ex.1A, B, D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-stroke ‘x’, joined at right or at bottom</td>
<td>As the cookery section includes no words spelled with ‘x’, this variant occurs only in the medical section, employed by hand I.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3. Middle English – When Variation is the Norm

The next sections will give a short introduction to the linguistic variation in Middle English in order to shed light on some reasons why written English developed into a multitude of regional dialect variants in the Late Middle Ages. Then follows a brief overview of *A Linguistic Atlas of Late Medieval English* (LALME) and the ‘fit’-technique (the ‘LALME-method’ for localizing the dialects of Late Middle English). Finally a short gloss will account for the dialect of the MS Sloane 442, which is listed as Linguistic Profile (LP) Essex 6021 in the LALME.

#### 3.1 Historical Background

Written Middle English is characterized by a high degree of linguistic variety, i.e. spelling variation, contrary to the more standardized English of Late West-Saxon, the dialect which
makes up the most record form of Old English\(^5\) (OE). The years between 1100-1500 lacked a ‘multinational standard’ written English. It is believed that in the late Middle Ages it was regional dialects that came to represent written language (see eLALME Vol.1: Ch.1.1.2). Not only is it thought that written language reflected the regional dialects of the scribes, Middle English (ME) encompassed a significant variety in spelling also within the regional dialects themselves. Thus one scribe, as the representative of a regional dialect, would employ a variety of different spelling forms. The spelling of late ME thus appears a rather ‘haphazard’ matter, in which variation seems to be the rule.

This spelling variation can be exemplified by the verb ‘take’, which is spelled in three different ways on f.9r in the MS Sloane 442: thake, take and tak. If found in a modern text one would be inclined to judge the person who wrote it a dyslexic. However at a time when variation was the most significant characteristic of written language, ‘spelling errors’ of this kind were most likely not regarded as flaws at all.

Most linguistic changes occur gradually under the influence of several succeeding or simultaneous circumstances, such is also the case for ME. The variation in written ME was caused by the sum of a number of events/circumstances – some of which are considered more important than others. First of all one could say that, roughly speaking, the Norman Conquest (1066) must be regarded as a paradigm shift in the history of written English. As a direct consequence of the Conquest written English ceased to be for more than two centuries.

However between the fall of Rome and the centuries prior to the Norman Conquest England experienced a number of invasions from Germanic peoples (Angles, Saxons), Frisians (Dutch), and Vikings (Danes, Norewegians and Swedes) – and obviously these invaders (many of whom also settled permanently) must have influenced vocabulary as well as contributed to some phonological changes. The linguistic ‘status quo’ in Late Medieval England is thus a rather complex one. Also immigration (from invading peoples/settlers) as well as migration in the late Middle Ages, when people moved to the larger towns (London in particular saw many immigrants) must be taken into consideration, alongside with the emergence of London as the national centre for commerce and seat of government, with its near proximity to the universities of Oxford and Cambridge (Machan 2003:Ch.1). The sum of all these factors must be seen in a larger context in order to understand why written Middle

---

\(^5\) The terminology is slightly confusing, since Old English is referred to as both West Saxon (see Barber, Beal and Shaw 2009 and Rogers 2011 [2005]) and Anglo Saxon (see Millward and Hayes 2012 and Clanchy 1993 [1979]), however there is no doubt that they are referring to the same Old English written variant.
English developed the way it did – into somewhat unsystematic representations of what were probably the spoken dialects of medieval scribes.

This short gloss merely supplies an oversimplified approach to the historical background on the variation in written ME, however a slightly more detailed overview can be gleaned from Appendix 3. This will in addition give an account for some of the phonological changes and lexical influence that might be ascribed to the numerous invasions.

### 3.2 LALME and the ‘Fit’-Technique

LALME is an extensive four-volume piece of work accounting for the great variety of Late Middle English. The Atlas can be used to identify the dialect of nearly any late Middle English text (within England and Wales mainly) of unknown origin, produced between 1350-1450 (though the text material from the south dates from as early as 1325), by means of the so-called ‘Fit’-Technique. In this context it should be emphasized that LALME is concerned with the written dialects and not the spoken dialects of late Middle English, i.e. though it is not unlikely that the written late Middle English texts may represent the spoken dialects, written language should be studied in its own right (eLALME, Vol. 1: Ch.1.4).

LALME encompasses an extensive study partly as a result of the fact that its creators were rather critical to previous studies of Middle English regional dialects, which they regarded as insufficient and over-simplified, insofar as they included relatively few dialectal features to represent the dialects, compared to the far more extensive study of LALME which encompassed a questionnaire of 424 different items (see f.ex. eLALME: ‘Fitting’) in order to make up a dialect continuum (eLALME, Vol.1: Ch.1.1.2). In addition comes the fact that earlier studies (LALME refers to those of Moore, Meech, and Whitehall) have omitted translated texts, which were considered by McIntosh et al. equally interesting as any other texts because even though a transcribed text may corrupt the author’s intention, the scribe who translated it most likely had produced a text that should be considered a genuine exemplar of his dialect.

In LALME a substantial number of dialects of late Middle English have been accurately described – each of the dialects has been given a Linguistic Profile (LP) based on

---

6 The creators of LALME are Angus McIntosh, M.L. Samuels, Michael Benskin, with the assistance of Margaret Laing, and Keith Williamson. The work with LALME was initiated by McIntosh in 1952 and was finished in 1986. The work includes four rather extensive volumes.
the questionnaire. The very fundament of LALME is the corpus of ‘anchor texts’ – texts of known origin, i.e. one can tell with relative certainty from which parts of the country the scribes who wrote them came from. The first step in the making of LALME then was to first locate texts on ‘non-linguistic’ grounds. Next these written exemplars of scribal dialects and their respective dialectal features (those of the questionnaire) make up the ‘templates’ that unknown texts can be compared with by means of the questionnaire. In other words the anchor texts constitute the material that enables dialects to be fitted on ‘dot maps’ (c.f. eLALME: ‘dot maps’ and ‘fitting’). Without these anchor texts it would have been a fairly impossible job to place the regional dialects on the geographical map. Of course dialects are not one hundred per cent unique. Dialects, particularly those within near geographical proximity may share a number of dialectal features, which may cause problems finding the precise localization of a dialect.

The new eLALME has facilitated this fitting process enormously, so that one does not need to copy maps manually (by means of overlays) neither fit in the dialectal features, as this now easily can be plotted in on the items list on the computer, simply by first ticking off those items from the text in question, then choose the specific forms of the items that are present in the text. The questionnaire used for this fitting process contains 424 LP items, all listed with their respective dialectal forms. For instance LP item 50 ‘through’ is listed with more than 300 different forms whereas LP item 5 ‘not’ has 175 different forms. The next step is simply to click the ‘fit forms on map’ button, and the programme will reveal the most likely geographic location of the dialect. The dots on the map vary in colour, so that ‘the darker the marker, the more likely it is that the LP is a fit for that particular location (eLALME: ‘Fitting’).

The ‘Fit’-Technique then is basically a means of localizing varieties of written language or the scribal dialects of the late Middle English literary corpus. The technique involves a negative way of defining a dialect inasmuch as it employs an elimination method in which one establishes to which area a dialect does not belong to – thus narrowing down the possible locations of the dialect, so that ideally one ends up with some strategically placed dots on the map that will be concurrent with the location of the dialect in question (Benskin 1991:9-10). If one chooses to employ the eLALME for localizing a dialect, one may actually end up with several possible fits – as a computer will never judge the available options as more or less likely – it will only give the exact information based on the existing data on the linguistic features in its database.
3.3 Essex 6021 – The Dialect of MS Sloane 442

The linguistic profile of the Sloane 442 manuscript is LP Essex 6021, which has in the LALME been localized on the grounds of eighty-four different items of the 424 possible choices on the questionnaire. As Benskin underlines, for a start one only needs ‘a dozen or so well-chosen forms’ in order to localize a dialect. There is a slight discrepancy in the LALME LP description of MS Sloane 442, as it is based on sixty-six folios, however the MS that does actually contain seventy-eight folios. This might possibly represent an omission of some Latin folios, however it is believed that it has not affected the fitting of the Essex 6021 in any way.

On the other hand some of the dialects of the LALME have been revised at a later stage. Such is the case for LP 5291, which has been changed to LP 5292 due to the fact that one recognized the presence of more hands than the original description listed and some dialectal features that had been neglected (c.f. eLALME LP number 5291/5292). This revised LP is the MS Beinecke 163, which includes a collection of cookery recipes, the subject of Hieatt’s edition *An Ordinance of Pottage* (1988).

The listed hands of the MS Sloane 442 might be more than three, as discussed in 2.3, however the presence of one or more hands is by no means synonymous with a discrepancy of the LALME LP. The folios have been subject to a rather thorough study, and though there are a few diverging spellings (in particular for forms of ‘do’) and ways in which for instance macrons are employed (hand 3) among the hands, they are of such a character that it would not be substantial enough as proof of a misinterpretation of the dialect on behalf of the LALME. Strictly speaking the scope of this study merely encompasses the cookery section of MS Sloane 442, by consequence it is too time-consuming to include dialectal evidence from the medical section (as that would initiate yet another, even longer transcription than that of the cookery section). The typical Essex features as described in LALME (see eLALME LP 6021) are on the whole concurrent with the cookery recipes of the MS Sloane 442, thus it was decided that the Essex dialect needs not be subject to further scrutiny.

4. The History of Food and Cooking in Late Medieval England

The next sections will set the historical context in which the cookery recipes of MS Sloane 442 were written; what foodstuffs were available in late medieval England, who had access to them, and the factors that were decisive for people’s diet. First of all one must establish the
various sources of evidence that information about the medieval diet is based on. Moreover food consumption in late medieval England depended on a wide range of factors that need to be addressed, such as variation in availability due to location (and season) and the importance of one’s social status. The social dimension would influence not only what foodstuffs were accessible, but also mattered when it came to how food was prepared. Furthermore religion and church regulations had a rather strong impact on the medieval diet as well along with the prevailing beliefs regarding the links between food and medicine.

4.1 Sources of Evidence

The prevailing understanding of the English medieval diet is on the whole based on written sources, the most important of which are surviving cookery recipes from the late fourteenth and fifteenth centuries (Henisch 1976:99, Müldner and Richards 2004:39). In addition conclusions can be drawn about food consumption by studying the surviving account books and expense registers of institutions and private households. Also ‘accounts of the foodstuffs that were cried by street-peddlers’ (Scully 1995:12) can give a fairly exact picture of what was sold in the streets, and consequently used in the everyday cooking. Les Crieries de Paris\textsuperscript{7} lists 79 articles of raw foodstuffs and prepared food that were all sold on the streets by these street-peddlers (Scully 1995:13). English vernacular literary texts also give glimpses of the use of the foodstuffs and various dishes of both rich and poor in medieval England, like those presented in the different tales of Geoffrey Chaucer’s The Canterbury Tales\textsuperscript{8} and also William Langland’s Prologue to The Vision Concerning Piers Plowman.

While much information can be gleaned from these sources, they all have limitations. As the purpose of account books is to record expenses, one needs to bear in mind that foodstuffs acquired ‘for free’ would constitute a supplement to the household diet normally not accounted for in the bookkeeping (Scully 1995:10-11). For instance in towns it was quite common to keep an orchard or kitchen garden in which fruits, vegetables, and herbs were cultivated. Also pigs and hens were bred in towns, as well as in the countryside. These were animals in need of few resources because they could be fed on scraps from the household

\textsuperscript{7} This is a poem by the French Guillaume de la Villeneuve, online here: http://grande-boucherie.chez-alice.fr/Cris-Paris.htm. The poem is a good source of evidence of what kind of food was sold in the streets of Paris, however lots of the foodstuffs listed in here are thought to be representative of foodstuffs sold in the streets of other big towns all over Europe as well.

\textsuperscript{8} The Canterbury Tales and Piers Plowman referred to here are both online.
waste. Hunting, hawking, and falconry also supplied people with game and various fowls. After the Norman Conquest savage or forest laws were put into effect, so that hunting was only for landowners or those who were granted permission to hunt by the King or a lord. In addition training dogs, falcons, and hawks for hunting was a costly affair that was reserved for the nobility only (Elliott 2004:26-7). However there were no restrictions on fishing in the same way as with hunting for game, which meant that people who lived close to water could have access to a substantial source of free food.

According to Scully (1995:71) one should not put too much weight on the written evidence of cookery recipes as a source of information about medieval diet because they are most probably misleading. As an example he stresses the fact that cookery recipes reflect a rather modest consumption of fresh fruits and vegetables, quite the opposite of what evidence from various ‘tacuinum sanitatis’9 (Scully 1995:71) reveal about all the fresh foodstuffs that were sold in the streets every day. Moreover Müldner and Richards (2004:39) state that these ‘documentary sources are biased towards the upper ranks of society […]’. They argue that in order to reconstruct the diet of common people in later medieval England, one should also look to stable isotope analysis from several archaeological sites. Primarily this means that measuring the ratios of carbon and nitrogen (which are the stable isotopes) in human bones enables archeologists to reconstruct people’s diet on an individual level, irrespective of their social status and the fact that documentary evidence cannot tell the whole story. It is a means to elaborate on and perhaps give a fuller picture of the medieval diet of all social layers, not only the elites.

To illustrate this, uncommonly high nitrogen isotope ratios for instance indicate a high intake of marine foods, whereas a diet based on mainly terrestrial resources is revealed by high carbon values (Müldner & Richards 2011[2006]:231). Yet another method of finding evidence of medieval diets is by studying plant remains like pollen and seeds/grains that have survived due to special conditions (charring, waterlogging) on medieval sites (Moffett 2011[2006]: 43). These studies may identify more plants than the written historical sources are able to, however they will not say much about the quantities consumed (Moffett 2011[2006]:43). Also animal bones from a vast number of wild and domestic birds, game and domestic animals found on several sites tell more about who ate what kinds of meat/fowl as well as giving a vague idea of the quantities consumed. Fish bone remains on the other hand

---

9 A tacuinum sanitatis was a medieval health handbook dealing with all aspects of health and well-being, like food, drink, exercise, the psyche, the humours etc. Usually these handbooks contained ‘illustrations of the most commonly consumed foodstuffs’ as well as illuminations of how the foodstuffs were produced and distributed (Scully, 1995:21-22), thus making them particularly interesting for the study of the history of food and cookery.
are scarse and thus not particularly reliable as evidence of fish consumption because they, according to Serjeantson and Woolgar (2011[2006]:105-107), decompose more easily than animal and bird bones.

All these pieces information deduced from isotope analysis of the remains from historical sites are hardly substantial enough to rewrite history, however they constitute a valuable addition to the extant written information. Consequently, when these new types of research are combined with the variety of historical documentation, they can together shed considerable light on the history of medieval food and cooking.

4.2 The Social Dimension of Food Consumption and Cooking Procedures

In the Middle Ages socioeconomic factors would be decisive with regard to the kinds of foodstuffs that were found on the tables of English homes. What might have been on the menus of the privileged classes is well attested in the extant cookery books from the medieval period and other historical sources like the account books. However little evidence of ordinary people’s menus are traceable in the cookery books, since they are mainly concerned with food served at the upper classes’ tables, and the account books are for the most part those of the aristocratic and monastic households. The audience of cookery books may have been the chefs working for the royalty and aristocracy as well as the aristocrats who wanted to be able to select a tasty menu that would first of all provide them with healthy dishes for their own sake, but also delicate dishes serving the purpose of impressing their guests (Redon et al. 1991:4).

The cookery recipes in MS Sloane 442 are labelled For the knyghtys and for the kynggys tabylle, which is a clear give-away that this is a collection of upper-class dishes. Lots of the ingredients in these recipes are costly foodstuffs that were unavailable to the lower classes either because they had no access to the resources or lacked the money with which to buy them. Socioeconomic status would have an impact on more than just the variety of ingredients available to people, it also had great influence on how food was prepared. The methods of making food in the Middle Ages cannot be compared with modern ways of cooking, as most processes in medieval society were more time-consuming and demanded a lot more manual labour. However preparation methods would vary enormously all depending on the resources available to the cook, both in terms of what kind of kitchen utensils and facilities s/he had at disposal, as well as the choice of ingredients, and not the least time at
hand. According to Brears (2012 [2008]:173-174) many of the largest households had rectangular shaped kitchens that could measure as much as 80 feet or more on the longest sides, including several hearths allowing the kitchen staff to perform different cooking procedures simultaneously. The greatest households might have several units connected to the kitchen either on the inside or outside of the main building such as: the bakehouse, the pastry, the boiling house, the saucery, the confectionary and waferie, the separate brewhouse, and the ewery (Brears 2012 [2008]). A whole line of employees were involved in preparing the food and serving the guests. The carver cut the meat, wine and ale were served by the butler and his assistants, the steward made sure that the serving staff did their jobs, and the royal feasts called for a variety of different meats, fish, exotic spices, sweets, imported wines, and subtleties\(^{10}\) along with entertainment from musicians.

In medieval society the upper classes had a certain responsibility concerning charity to the poorest and the sick (Brears 2012[2008]:483). This was practiced by alms giving. After a banquet the leftovers were usually collected by a cleric who distributed the food to the sick and poor. Brears (2012 [2008]:483) states that the tradition of alms giving probably ensured that only fresh food was served at the nobleman’s table. However leftovers were sometimes sold to the various cook shops where particularly meats were used as filling for pies.

The circumstances around the cooking and the meals were a lot more modest at the opposite end of the scale, in the small rural and urban houses with one fireplace in a sparingly equipped ‘all-purpose’ room serving the function of both kitchen and living room (Brears 2012 [2008]:173). The cook in the humble household – that is the housewife, had to settle with modest cooking facilities and a modest range of foodstuffs at hand. Small means was a challenge to her inventiveness. She often had to manage without the luxury of sugar and spices, and at times even salt could be scarce. The alternatives were found in the herbs from the kitchen garden, an apple, a taste of honey, an onion, a meatbone, or some nuts that would turn a bland everyday meal into ‘a relished treat’ (Henisch 2009:46, 56). The simplest way to prepare a meal was to put everything into one pot and let it simmer until done. As a housewife had a number of other duties to tend to besides cooking, this was also the most practical way of preparing food, and in addition the method reduced the risk of spoiling the meal by burning

\(^{10}\) The subtleties or ‘sotelties’ as they were called were dishes served in between courses for the guests to ‘nibble’ at, painstakingly arranged by the cook with much care, in bright colours and with a strong element of surprise. These dishes, meant for pleasing primarily the eye but also the stomach, could be for instance a cooked peacock served with its plumage to look alive, or a tower or castle made out of dough (Weiss Admson, 2004:37,74).
it. When cooking over an open flame one had to pay attention constantly so that the food did not get burned or the fire went out.

Many town-dwellers lived in cottages that did not even have a fireplace. These people had to go outside their homes in order to obtain a hot meal (Henisch 2009:74-76). However in towns they were provided with plenty of opportunities to buy ready-made food from the cookshops situated on the ground floor of many town homes. Here one could get ‘prepared foods, such as roasted meats, mincemeat pies, stewed chicken, puddings, and tarts filled with soft cheeses or eggs’ (Elliott 2004:19). ‘Eating out’ in the medieval society cannot be compared to the modern way of dining in a restaurant, because even poor people could afford it (Henisch 2009:76). Cookshops had something for everybody: ranging from the cheapest pie with leftover filling to the most luxurious roasts. The fast food business was much disliked by the authorities because of the strong association with ‘fast women’ and flirting, as well as the undesired consequences of these actions (Henisch 2009:76). However, the ready-made meals on the streets were also enjoyed by travellers, students, businessmen far away from home, or those who lived in crammed, cold and simple lodgings without cooking facilities (Henisch 2009:75).

4.3 Foodstuffs in Late Medieval England

According to Moffett ‘cereals are the most common food plant remains found in archaeological deposits of all periods’ (Moffett 2011[2006]:44), which is a fairly good indication that cereals might also have been a foodstuff consumed in large quantities. ‘Wheat, rye, barley, and oats were the main cereals grown in medieval Britain’ (Moffett 2011[2006]:45). Archaeobotanical evidence has proven two different species of both wheat and oats, and at least two different kinds of barley (Moffett 2011[2006]:45). Cereals had a lot of different uses in medieval England. First of all the grains were the most important ingredient of bread, pottage, ale, and beer. In addition the rest of the plant was equally important due to the cereal straw’s vast number of application areas. This ‘was used for animal fodder, bedding (both human and animal), building materials (daub, flooring, thatch, and insulation), and temper for ceramics, as well as for fuel or tinder’ (Moffett 2011[2006]:45).

As much as 80% of the calorie-intake of the lowest ranking groups in society may have come from cereals and pulses (peas and beans) (Dyer 2011[2006]:213). Grain was a
particularly convenient foodstuff that, if stored properly in a dry place, would keep through the whole year. ‘Bread probably formed the most substantial part of the medieval diet, being served at every meal’ (Brears 2012 [2008]:109). Even though the high consumption of cereals indicates that bread, being fairly cheap as well as nourishing, was probably one of the foodstuffs especially people of little economical means ate in large quantities, despite the fact that there are hardly any recipes for breadmaking to be traced in any of the recipe collections from the period. The MS Sloane 442 has none. Peasants mainly ate dark bread made of barley and oats. Nonetheless bread was important for everyone since for centuries it served as an edible trencher during the meal. In wealthy households people would usually not eat the trenchers at the end of a meal, instead they would be given to the poor or as serve the function of animal fodder. It was a common practice that leftovers from big dinners were given as alms to the poor, or sold to smaller establishments like bakeries and cookshops where the scraps from the lord’s roast were turned into pies and sold on street stalls (Henisch 2009:72).

Beef, pig, and mutton were the meats consumed by peasants – if at all they had any meat to spare for their own use. Pigs were ‘the most promising source of meat’ (Henisch 2009:53). Fed on scraps they were easy to breed, and the sow gave birth to as many as 8-12 piglets. Every single part of the animal was eaten, and even the blood was appreciated as an important ingredient of black pudding, together with liver, oatmeal, and flavourings. The meat kept well when it was smoked and cured as bacon and ham.

All the parts of the animal were useful, but not necessarily as food for humans. For instance animal carcasses consist of lots of by-products, such as candles from mutton fat, all fats for ointments for both people and animals, fat for frying in, and tripes (from the stomach walls) that would make cheap everyday food.

The table (Table IV) that follows roughly represents the selection of foodstuffs available to people in late medieval England. Though these foodstuffs were available, table IV does not reveal anything about who had access to them. Obviously quite a large proportion of these foodstuffs would be out of reach of ‘common people’, mostly because they were too expensive. For instance imported spices were a luxury and a token of wealth in the Middle Ages, a foodstuff that might on occasions even be used as a means of payment. Game also represented foodstuffs difficult to get hold of, since hunting would usually be restricted to those few privileged people who owned the forests.

The main sources for this table are Scully’s The Art of Cookery in the Middle Ages (1995), Brear’s Cooking and Dining in Medieval England (2012 [2008]) and the MS Sloane 442. The table is read as follows: All foodstuffs could be eaten on ‘meat days’. On ‘fish days’
(i.e. fast days), those written in **bold** were banned. The foodstuffs written in *italics* were frequently consumed on fish days albeit they are actually meats and not fish. However the medieval understanding was that these were categorized as sea/water creatures, and consequently could be eaten as fish. For some mysterious reason rabbit foetus and newborn rabbits were not categorized as meat either, thus allowed on meatless days (though it would be really interesting to learn how it happened that this fasting rule became practice).

As table IV quite clearly shows, the number of foodstuffs available to people in medieval England was rather substantial. The difference between medieval and modern cooking rests not so much in the choice of foodstuffs, but rather in ways of preparing and combining the different ingredients. Today most people in the western world have modern cooking facilities regardless of economical means, however economy probably still matters to a certain extent in relation to the choice of ingredients.

Table IV reveals that some of the foodstuffs were of the kind that one would not voluntarily eat today, such as swan, peacock, plover, badger, rabbit foetus, porpoise, and the tail of beaver. Some of these peculiar foodstuffs were probably not served because of their particular tastiness and delicacy, but rather because they were exotic and expensive. At grand feasts it was common to treat the guests with an *entremet* or *sotelty* (subtlely) as an extra element of surprise during the dinner, which would also ‘show off’ the skills of the cook. Such ‘soteltries’ could be the head of a boar, a swan or a peacock, all beautifully arranged, to look both lifelike and extravagant – birds with ‘gilded beaks and tusks and bodies striped and slashed with brilliant color’ – all presented with a momento of drama, frequently accompanied by music (Henisch 1978:228-9). Though sotelties were edible foods, they were primarily made for the show, paying less attention to taste and texture, as the main purpose of these dishes were ‘to make guests gasp with delight and hosts beam with satisfaction by creating spectacular table decorations […]’ (Henisch 1978:230).

The list of common ‘modern’ foodstuffs unknown to the medieval cook is short. Ingredients such as tomatoes, peppers (red, green, yellow), potatoes, green peas, bananas, kiwis, pineapple, peanuts, vanilla bean, allspice, coffee, tea, cocoa, and turkey are all high-frequency foodstuffs in the modern kitchen, however they were not part of the diet in medieval England (Scully 2009:67).
Table IV: Foodstuffs in Late Medieval England

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vegetables</td>
<td>Garlic, onions, leeks, cabbage, lettuce, turnips, parsnips, beets, radishes, spinach, and sorrel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legumes</td>
<td>Beans, peas, and chickpeas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fruits &amp; berries</td>
<td>Pears, plums, peaches (from the 13&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; c.), quinces, apples, cherries, strawberries, raspberries, blackberries, pomegranates, lemon, raisins, dried figs, and dried dates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuts</td>
<td>Almonds, acorns, chestnuts, walnuts, hazelnuts, pine nuts (rare), and pistachios (rare).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grains</td>
<td>Wheat, barley, oats, rye, millet, and rice (not until the 13&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; c.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herbs</td>
<td>Parsley, anise, alkanet root, avens, betony, borage, sage, dill, fennel, mint, caraway, mustard, elderflowers, hawthorn-flowers, roses, and violets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spices</td>
<td>Saffron, pepper, long pepper, cubeb, grains of Paradise, galangal root, ginger, cinnamon, cassia, cloves, nutmeg, and mace.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condiments</td>
<td>Salt, sugar, honey, vinegar, verjuice, rose water, olives, and olive oils.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drinks</td>
<td>Ale, beer, mead, wine, hippocras, claret, cider, perry, aqua vitae (pure spirit), and distilled alcohols.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish/shellfish</td>
<td>Herring, cod, stockfish, salmon, sturgeon, bream, carp, perch, pike, trout, crayfish, eel, conger, tench, thornback, haddock, lamprey, mackerel, plaice, sole, plaice, turbot, oyster, mussels, cockles, and scallops.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sea/water animals</td>
<td>Porpoise, whale, seal, beaver (only the tail was used).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poultry/wildfowl</td>
<td>Chicken, capon, duck, goose, peacock (peafowl), partridge, pheasant, pigeon, dove, quail, crane, heron, bittern, plover, rees, egret, curlew, swan, woodcock, and barnacle goose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic/wild animals (game)</td>
<td>Beef, veal, mutton, lamb, pig, suckling pig, goat, kid, venison (roe deer, fallow deer, and red deer), wild boar, hare, badger, and rabbit. Unborn and newly born rabbits (Weiss Adamson, 2004:36).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dairy products/egg</td>
<td>Milk, butter, cheese, eggs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4 Variation Due to Location and Demographic Changes

There were certainly differences in food consumption according to which socioeconomical group one belonged to, nevertheless also location would have an impact. Those who lived in the proximity of a river would naturally be able to supply themselves with freshwater fish. People living in the bigger towns and villages had easy access from the markets and shops to
all the foodstuffs and other merchandises that they needed for their cooking, while people living in the countryside usually had to travel a fair distance to get supplies. One might think that the peasant household would be self-sufficient if they had a strip of land for growing cereals, a garden with fruits, herbs, and vegetables, and domestic animals for a steady supply of milk, eggs, and meat. This was most probably not the case as most peasants, when the time came for slaughtering, sold the meat to the butcher in return for money that could be spent on other ‘more pressing needs’ (Henisch 2009:52). As hunting was the nobleman’s activity, the only way the poor peasant would have access to game and wildfowls would be by being involved in poaching, either directly or indirectly.

The late medieval period in England saw some notable changes both in climate and demography, changes prone to exercise some effect on food supply. Around 1300 climatic changes, causing colder winters and wetter summers, resulted in severe famine all over Europe between 1315-1322 – millions died. In particular the plague known as the Black Death that came to England in 1348-9 wiped out more than a third of the population, but also other plagues contributed to a marked decrease in population. Fewer people in general meant more food – meat and dairy products – for those who survived famine, the Black Death and succeeding plagues. When there is a new growth in population, like the period after the Black Death, the situation reverses – with greater availability of meat and dairy products (Woolgar, Serjeantson, and Waldron 2011 [2006]:268).

In the two centuries following the Black Death, people in England experienced failing crops, the pressure on resources was acute, probably one major reason that might explain the increase in bird consumption (Stone 2011 [2006]:161). Indeed farmers who dealt with bird rearing would be able to improve their economic welfare. Also fish consumption increased drastically from the eleventh century, though this increase had started already in pagan communities in northern Europe, the impact of Church and its fasting rules must be seen as an important reason for the increase in fish consumption (Woolgar, Serjeantson, and Waldron 2011 [2006]:269).

4.5 The Medieval World View

In medieval England religious matters affected people’s diet, in the sense that the numerous fasting days imposed by the Catholic Church ought to be taken into consideration when planning a meal. Quite a few of the cookery recipes in MS Sloane 442 are specific as to
whether a dish is meant for a ‘fish day’ or a ‘flesh day’ – or sometimes both, in the cases where alternative ingredients are listed. Fish days were the fasting days when one had to abstain from meats, dairy products and eggs – in addition one should of course strive at a more frugal food consumption, i.e. having supper in the evening was regarded as sufficient, or at least one should reduce the daily meals from three to two. On flesh days, obviously, all foodstuffs were allowed – gluttony should be avoided, though.

In medieval society the position of the Church was strong and incontestable. All year round there were three regular fasting days a week – Wednesday (the day Judas took money for betraying Jesus), Friday (memorizing the crucifixion of Jesus), and Saturday (consecrated to Mary and the celebration of her virginity) (Henisch 1976:29-30). In addition came two long periods of continuous fasting – Advent, the four weeks of fasting before Christmas, and Lent – six weeks of fasting before Easter. Though for most people fasting was paid most attention to four times a year, during the so-called Ember days, initially a Roman practice, adopted and adapted by the Church to match with the farm cycle (sowing, reaping, and harvesting), making them a practical mix of heathen and religious rituals (Henisch 1976:30-31)

Fish was allowed on fasting days because it was seen as holy, having escaped from God’s curse on earth by living in the water (Henisch 1976:33). ‘In medieval thinking fish was associated with repentance: this cold and wet creature from the deep protected human flesh from excess’ (Klemettilä 2012:77). Though fish consumption was associated with being a good Christian, meat was nonetheless a favourite foodstuff in medieval England (Klemettilä 2012:63). Long periods with fish on the menu, and long hours of waiting every day before one was allowed that one meal in the evening, were certainly not always welcome. In a schoolboy’s private notebook dating from the fifteenth century the following words are proof of the physical strain that periods of fasting encompassed (Henisch 1976:40):

Thou wyll not beleve how wery I am off fysshe, and how moch I desir that flesch wer cum in ageyn. For I have ete none other but salt fysh this Lent, and it hathe engendyrde so moch flewme [phlegm] within me that it stoppith my pypys that I can unneth [scarcely] speke nother brethe.

People who resent fish strongly are inclined to claim that ‘fish is fish and meat is food’, and would probably have expressed the same worries as this boy if the strict fasting rules of medieval England were still prevalent. It is known that herring especially was consumed in large quantities in the Middle Ages (Serjeantsone and Woolgar 2011 [2006]:116). Of course if
the dried and salted herring was on the menu a little too frequently, one might understand the resentment of the boy and his contemporaries. Traces of these ‘fishy’ fasting rituals can be seen even today, as some Catholics have retained Friday as their fish day, thus commemorating the sufferings of Jesus by their own bodily sacrifice the abstination from meat represents.

There were ways, however, of omitting Church regulations – ‘bending the rules’ sometimes resulted in some rather creative definitions of what might be eaten as ‘fish’. For instance creatures such as porpoises and waterfowls were occasionally eaten on fish days, in addition to rabbit foetuses and newly born rabbits (cf. table IV). In addition pubs would serve small snacks along with the drinks during fasting periods, a practice that was silently accepted by the authorities, perhaps because one realized that drinking on an empty stomach might induce more unpleasantness than the bending of rules (Henisch 1976:41-42).

Being a good Christian in the Middle Ages implied more than just paying attention to the fasting regulations, caring for those of lesser means than oneself was also important. ‘The idea of hospitality was woven into the texture of medieval society, and generosity as a host was one of the defining characteristics of a great man’ (Henisch 2009:3). It was a Christian obligation to feed the poor, thus when banquets and other festive occasions were finished, leftovers were given to the poor as alms (Brears 2012:483). The job of collecting and distributing these leftovers was usually taken care of by an almoner. Most likely this tradition meant that very little food was wasted, in addition to the fact that only fresh food was served each day, thus avoiding food poisoning (Brears 2012:483). According to Bishop Grosseteste’s regulations of the 1240’s leftovers should always:

…be kepyd, & not sende not to boys and knafis, nother in halle nothe of the halle, ne be wasted in soperys ne dyners of gromys, bur wysely, temperatly, with-oute bate or betyng [reduction], be hit distribute and deportyd to poure men, beggars, syke-folke and feballe.

Brears 2012:482

As food and religion were close companions in the medieval society, also food and medicine were linked together. The masterchefs of Richard II compiled the recipe collection known as *The Forme of Cury* in accordance, of course, with the ‘assent avysement of Maisters [of] phisik and of philosophie that dwellid in his court’ (Henisch 2009:148-149). There were many considerations to be made, because the diet should be balanced according to the
theories of the four elements with four different characteristics: fire (hot and dry), earth (cold and dry), air (hot and moist) and water (cold and moist). The idea of the so-called ‘humoral theory’ was that these four elements and their properties could be combined in numerous ways in order to match the four humors or temperament of the body (i.e. the four bodily fluids) – choler (yellow bile), melancholy (black bile), blood and phlegm (Henisch 2009:149). All these things would need to be balanced, and food was a means of getting the balance right – since foodstuffs also had their individual characteristics that could be used to create the perfectly balanced diet. These theories were those of Antiquity – the medieval period was perhaps not the time for great medical discoveries.

People, or rather the privileged classes, were preoccupied with their health, and as long as medicine was not yet established as a profession, 11 one could seek healing from medical practitioners of all social ranks, who operated in late medieval England with more or less fortunate outcome. In the period between 750-1450, medicine embraced a much larger field than today, as a practitioner of medicine might be dealing with spiritual, legal and philosophical matters in addition to the concern for the body. (Henisch 2009:149).

A blacksmith could work as a surgeon ‘on the side’ – which would be a very practical combination too, as he would be able to make his own surgical instruments. According to Getz (1998:4-5) the medical practitioner almost always had functions beyond just medicine. The most prominent feature of medieval English medicine is the great diversity of groups practicing it – rich and poor, men and women, serfs and free people, ignorant and educated, Christians and non-Christians – so many different groups involved in medicine (Getz 1998:5). Whereas the cleric worked for free (he was employed by the Church), the other practitioners could receive payment for their duties, however most of them worked as ‘part-time doctors’.

Medicine in the Middle Ages encompasses a large field that this short gloss has barely scratched the surface of. One has to acknowledge that the combination of cookery and medical text in the MS Sloane 442 is perhaps not accidental. Food – religion – medicine – these things all hang together in medieval society. Though religion and medicine were important matters, however food was an indispensable for everyone – one could say that it also supplied the Church with a handy tool with which it could exercise some control over people.

11 In England there were no established medical universities in the Middle Ages, contrary to what was going on on the continent (Italy, France). The institutions of Cambridge and Oxford Universities were more interested in educating priests and jurists (Getz 1998).
4.6 Conclusion

In medieval England an impressive variety of foodstuffs was available for the upper classes. The dishes prepared in grand kitchens by cooks and servants often reflected the noblemen’s economical situation, particularly if their houses were filled with prominent guests to impress. Dishes served at the big occasions were neither simple nor bland. Expensive spices flavoured, as well as gave fancy colours to the dishes, and the methods used for preparing them could be both complicated and numerous. Just as much as rich people’s food was extravagant and tasty, poor people’s food might be characterized by blandness and little variation, unless the common stew or gruel were spiced up with the pungent flavour of onions or given a meaty flavour by means of a meat bone (Henisch 2009:56). Food also had to be consumed in accordance with both religious and medical beliefs. Moreover food was linked to charity, as good Christians were obliged to share their meals – usually in the shape of leftovers.

5. Medieval Cookery Recipes

In the following sections linguistic aspects of cookery recipes will be scrutinized and discussed. Prior to the study of the language of cookery recipes some introductory chapters will shed light on the history of cookery books as well as setting the theoretical framework concerning cookery recipes as text.

5.1 Historical background

Though cookery recipes, as treated in this thesis, are those represented by the written word, cookery recipes have a long history that can be traced back to a time when cooking directions were painted on walls. In Egypt some 4000 years old well-preserved paintings on tombstones represent important historical evidence, as they describe in great detail the activities of everyday life, like ‘hunting, fishing, the harvesting of crops and grapes, feasting and general rural life’ (Sitwell 2012:11). Everyday life, of course, includes cooking – and pictures of people preparing food are numerous – tombstones are intermediaries of activities such as
grain grinding, roasting of chickens, slaughtering of oxens, and preparation of meals in big cauldrons.

Of particular interest in this context are the colourful paintings depicting in great detail bread making, found in Luxor, on the tomb of Senet – the only known ‘female grave’ dating from the Egyptian Middle Kingdom (2055-1650) (Sitwell 2012:11-12). These meticulous descriptions are unique and rare, bearing in mind that recipes for breadmaking are absolutely absent in medieval recipe collections (Hieatt, Hosington and Butler 1996:xix). In addition, these pictures represent some of the oldest descriptions of cooking – and are thus some of the oldest cookery ‘recipes’ – if paintings qualify for the recipe label. Other pictures depicting cooking are for instance those found on the Bayeux tapestry in Normady, France. Apart from describing the Norman Conquest, this nearly 1000 year old tapestry includes vivid descriptions of meals being served as well as the preparation of them – though recipes are represented in words, the pictures are at least very detailed on methods – and roughly on what is being served. Moreover traces of the earliest written recipes dating from around 1700 BC are found in the Babylonian Collection where the recipe for Kanasu broth has been carved on clay tablets (Sitwell 2012: 15).

Then there is Apicius’ ‘De re coquinaria’ (On the subject of cooking), a Collection of Roman cookery recipes dating most probably from the late fourth or early fifth century AD, also form a part of the history of cookery books. This collection consists of ten books, each book covering a particular field in cookery (the careful experienced cook, minces, the gardener, miscellanea, legumes, fowl, sumptuous dishes, quadrupeds, seafood, and the fisherman).

The first written cookery recipes in the English vernacular, of which the MS Sloane 442 and The Forme of Cury are good examples, are different from modern cookery recipes on the level of layout as well as content. At the same time one could also argue that the cookery recipe as text type has stayed relatively stable in form and content – that the changes recipes have undergone, would merely be the result of some natural changes, caused by a shift in their use and audience, adding that also the processes, utensils, and ingredients may have changed (Görlach 2004:123).

Six centuries ago, the cooking recipe was first of all visually different from its modern counterpart, as it consisted of only two parts: the heading and the recipe ‘body’. The heading named the dish, whereas the recipe body, made up of one paragraph only, named the different ingredients, and on a very basic level gave some instructions on how to prepare the dish. The length of the one-paragraph recipe body would vary from two to thirty-five lines, making an
average of seven and a half line per recipe.\textsuperscript{12} For several centuries this two-part structure (heading + body) was the norm – where the heading named the dish, and the one paragraph body included ingredients as well as cooking procedures, as in the MS Sloane 442.

A pronounced change in the recipe structure was not seen until the nineteenth century with Elizabeth Acton’s \textit{Modern Cookery, For Private Families}.\textsuperscript{13} This book of 643 pages containing 1021 recipes, all of which had been thoroughly tested to ensure their applicability, in many ways revolutionized cookery recipes. Acton’s 1845 publication contained some ‘novel features’, as she states in the introduction, like the inclusion of a ‘summary’ in the form of an ‘appendix’ to each recipe, which names all the ingredients needed, their quantities, and the precise preparation time. Her summary represents in a sense the forerunner to the separate ingredients list, as her book represents ‘the first English recipe book to include a list of ingredients and their quantities separately from the directions paragraph’ – though Acton’s summary constitutes a whole paragraph of continuous prose, and not a list as such (Carroll 2010:67).

It is more than just the new structure and the more specific directions that make Acton’s cookery book different from her predecessors’; her pen is witty,\textsuperscript{14} she elaborates more than strictly necessary without being tedious – on the contrary her recipes are at times quite narrative and entertaining. Her book is also systematically divided into chapters\textsuperscript{15} according to types of dishes/foods (soups, fish, dishes of shell-fish, gravies, sauces, forcemeats, pork, poultry, curries etc.), each chapter including an elaborate and very detailed introduction comprising practical advice prior to the recipes proper. Acton leaves nothing to chance, every operation is explicitly explained, giving full attention even to the smallest

\textsuperscript{12} These figures are based on a count performed on the MS Sloane 442 only, other variations are not accounted for, implicitly this must be taken for what it is, a rough estimate meant to illustrate the fact that variation in line numbers had no effect on the division of a recipe – one recipe body irrespective of the length. However it is assumed that this would be very close to the truth also for other comparable recipe collections from the period.

\textsuperscript{13} The full title of Acton’s book was \textit{Modern Cookery, For Private Families, Reduced to a System of Easy Practice, in a Series of Carefully Tested Receipts, in which the principles of Baron Liebig and Other Eminent Writers have been as much as possible applied and explained} – a rather lengthy title for a book, none the less a descriptive one.

\textsuperscript{14} She discretely, but with a certain ‘sting’, hints at the inequalities in the publishing business by naming recipes ‘Publisher’s pudding’, ‘Printer’s pudding’, and ‘Poor author’s pudding’. These three puddings reflect the social order and economical status in the publishing industry, by their respective composition of ingredients. The first one rich in ingredients and definitely the most costly to cook, as Acton indicates quite wryly comments ‘which can scarcely be made too rich’. The printer’s pudding is also rich, though not as lavish as the publisher’s, whereas the poor author’s pudding is the frugal variant (but still tasty, according to Acton), prepared with the fewest and cheapest ingredients. Acton also frequently criticizes bad cooking and the use of procedures that are apt to spoil otherwise good foodstuffs, all of which she believes are the result of ignorance. Clearly one of her main goals is to enlighten ‘the young housekeepers’ with useful tips on how to succeed with cooking – this book is both educational in many respects and very thorough.

\textsuperscript{15} However the grouping of similar recipes is also seen to a certain extent in some of the medieval collections of cookery recipes.
detail, when is the foodstuff in season, how to look for the best meats/fish, how to store them, which utensils to use, how to economize, and in general all the advice a novice in the kitchen might be in need of. And the audience Acton had in mind is clearly stated in the introduction: ‘Dedicated to the Young Housekeepers of England’.

For a cookbook, this was a lengthy project that took ten years to complete. She claimed that all her recipes had been tested, which seems likely – her recipes appear to be applicable even today. Acton is considered one of the first modern cookery authors, her cookery book in fact sold more than 60 000 copies in her own lifetime, supplying her with an income of 900£ (around 70 000£ in today’s money).

The modern recipe includes several parts, at the minimum consisting of the heading/title, a separate ingredients list, and the ‘mode d’emploi’ – how to prepare the dish. Quite often recipes are illustrated with photos, in addition to supplying the reader with information on how many servings a recipe yields. A time estimate for the preparation of the dish is usually also included. A change has taken place in recipe structure as well as content. The modern cookery recipes are not vague – the vagueness, typical of medieval recipes, has been replaced by a more precise language, in regard to ingredients quantities, cooking procedures as well as timings, as discussed in 5.4. An impression of the development in layout and content of recipes can be gleaned from the recipe examples in Appendix 3.

Cookery recipes are still subject to change. There will probably always be room for improvements with respect to content and layout, however lately the most prominent changes are those concerning the ways in which cookery recipes are conveyed. The printed copy of cookery recipes is now in competition with the modern e-books, blogs, websites for ‘foodies’, and television shows – and it may be interesting to see how the ‘old-fashioned’ paper copies are going to cope faced with this universe of online resources.

5.2 Defining Cookery Recipes – Theoretical Framework

‘It is obvious that not all texts are of the same type’ (Trosborg 1997:3). It is likely that most people probably have a relatively straightforward and clear perception of cookery recipes as text – their contents, use, and purpose, which one could describe as the ‘everyday notion’. However, within an academic framework, various and sometimes overlapping definitions are used. By consequence cookery recipes may be referred to as belonging to a specific genre, a certain text type, a text colony as well as being labelled Cinderella texts. Textual linguistics
embraces a vast academic field, in which the scholarly use of different terms for the same thing appears as slightly confusing. Some scholars discuss cookery recipes as text on an internal level concerning the formal structural elements, whereas others are more preoccupied with the external features – thus being concerned with people’s general perception of cookery recipes, the ‘everyday notion’. The next few pages will shed light on some of the theoretical framework and discuss whether cookery recipes belong within the genre or text type category.

5.2.1 Genre, Register and Style

A genre is characterised by the Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary as ‘a particular type or style of literature, art, film or music that you can recognize because of its special features’. The immediate association with the genre term is perhaps linked to literature. Some of the literary genre categories of today date back to the classical critics like Aristotle and Plato. The three main classes in their time were epic/narrative, lyric, and drama – however they also identified some more specific genres too, like tragedy, comedy, and satire (Abrams and Harpham 2005:148). Trosborg supplies a slightly different genre definition:

Genres are the text categories readily distinguished by mature speakers of a language, and we may even talk about a “folk typology” of genres. Texts used in a particular situation for a particular purpose may be classified using everyday labels such as a guidebook, a nursery rhyme, a poem, a business letter, a newspaper article, a radio play, an advertisement, etc. Such categories are referred to as genres.

Trosborg 1997:6

Her definition of genre is based on the external criteria, and is thus not concerned with the language itself, but rather the use or topic to which the reader/audience can relate. Trosborg acknowledges though, that identifying, classifying and describing the different genres might be problematic, as some scholars will use external criteria only, while others will also stress the importance of ‘communicative purpose and/or linguistic content and form’ (Trosborg 1997:9). Trosborg claims that the genre term is only valid in completed texts, because the genre ‘specifies conditions for beginning, structuring and ending a text (Trosborg 1997:11).

Biber and Conrad employ yet another framework for text analysis as they refer to three different perspectives on/approaches to text varieties – register, style, and genre.
According to them ‘the same texts can be analyzed from register, genre, and style perspectives’ (Biber and Conrad 2009: Ch.1.4.1).

Registers are described for their typical lexical and grammatical characteristics: their linguistic features. But registers are also described for their situational contexts, for example whether they are produced in speech or writing, whether they are interactive, and what their primary communicative purposes are. […] linguistic features are always functional when considered from a register perspective.

Biber and Conrad 2009: Ch.1.3.1

According to Biber and Conrad also the genre term, similar to register, includes ‘description of the purposes and situational context of a text variety’ – however an important difference is that ‘its linguistic analysis contrasts with the register perspective by focusing on the conventional structures used to construct a complete text within the variety, for example, the conventional way in which a letter begins and ends’ (Biber and Conrad, 2009: Ch.1.1).

Style features on the other hand differ from the register perspective in that the use of core linguistic features16 ‘is not functionally motivated by the situational context; rather, style features reflect aesthetic preferences, associated with particular authors or historical periods’ (Biber and Conrad, 2009: Ch.1.1). Biber and Conrad’s treatment of text varieties thus implies that genre can be seen as the ‘umbrella’ term, as it may comprise in fact both different registers and styles.

Furthermore one should in this context add that there seems to be no clear boundary between the terms register and style. Style would usually relate to the grade of formality17 of a text (or speech/discourse), whereas register might be more recognisable as language adapted to suit the situation in which it is used – however the OED definition of register only intensifies this confusion as it states that register concerns ‘the level and style18 of a piece of writing or speech, that is usually appropriate to the situation that it is used in: The essay suddenly switches from a formal to an informal register’. And here, obviously, instead of ‘informal register’ one could have employed ‘informal style’ instead.

16 By core linguistic features are meant the linguistic features like the grammatical and lexical choices one makes in the text variety.
17 Style encompasses a wide range of formality levels, such as frozen, formal, informal, colloquial, and intimate – however these are just suggestive, there may be other levels of formality, moreover each of these levels may involve other sub-levels (Lee 2001:45).
18 Italics added by the candidate, ‘level’ and ‘style’ are not italicised in the original text.
Lee actually does point out that when discussing literary texts, the register term is never used – instead one would refer to style (Lee 2001:45). This may illustrate to a certain degree why terms like register and style are employed interchangeably. According to Lee one should refer to style when talking about an individual’s use of language. For instance a master’s thesis may be said to belong within an academic genre – but the style will refer to the language employed by the individual thesis candidate, which may in theory vary from colloquial to very formal, though one would obviously expect the style to be formal.

According to Lee, text typology constitutes a quagmire of different points of view for looking at language, thus the terms register and genre, he suggests, simply represent ‘two different ways of looking at the same object’ (Lee 2001:46). The register term is employed when talking about ‘lexico-grammatical and discoursal-semantic patterns associated with situations (i.e., linguistic patterns)’, whereas the genre term is being used when ‘talking about memberships of culturally-recognisable categories’ (Lee 2001:46). However, Lee also emphasises that the use of one particular register within a genre, does not mean that other registers are excluded (in that very same genre).

Much of the confusion concerning terminology must then be ascribed to the fact that the same terms are used for describing both language (as in register or style), and category (i.e. the genre). Lee points out that ‘genres are about whole texts, whereas registers are about more abstract, internal/linguistic patterns, and, as such, exist independently of any text-level structures’ (Lee 2001:47). In Lee’s view the genre definition is suitable for describing larger groups of texts, like one would use for corpus-based studies.

5.2.2 The Text Type

Görlach defines text type as ‘a specific linguistic pattern in which formal/structural characteristics have been conventionalized in a specific culture for certain well-defined and standardized uses of language’ (Görlach, 2004:105). This is a general description embracing just about any variety of text, constituting a sort of ‘all-purpose’ definition. His text type study includes the hypothesis ‘that the distinctive features defining text types can be made explicit by a semasiological analysis of designations’ (Görlach, 2004:121).

In connection with his linguistic research Görlach has in fact made an alphabetical list of English text types, which proves the enormous variety the label ‘text type’ encompasses.
(Görlach, 2004:23-87). The list consists of more than sixty pages of text type items – thus including a rather substantial number of text types.

In order to find all the items in this alphabetical list, Görlach mainly scoured the *Shorter Oxford English Dictionary*. His list contains numerous text types that one would perhaps not immediately consider as a text type proper, such as specimens of oral language like *war-cry*, *toast*, *talkathon*, *street cries*, *sermon*, *quarrel*, *lullaby*, *gaffe*, and *jingle* to mention but a few. Nevertheless the majority of the items on the list are examples of written text types, some of which may also seem slightly intriguing at first, like these examples – *superscript*, *marginalia*, *heading*, *hint*, *formula*, *footnote*, and *direction*.

However intriguing, Görlach’s definition proves to fit surprisingly well with the items in his alphabetical list, they do follow specific patterns, easily recognizable, typical for each of their individual text type. A quarrel, for instance, contains some specific elements that make this text type easily recognizable. The two (or more) parties in a quarrel must have a disagreement about something, i.e. they have diverging opinions that cause dispute – if not it is not a quarrel but rather a conversation – so the element of disagreement is obligatory for being labelled a quarrel. Likewise the sermon must contain various elements of religious worship, such as a priest reading from the holy scripts prayer and rituals like prayers – if these were absent it would be but an ordinary meeting.

When the text types Görlach lists are well-defined this means that they have been in use long enough to have been formalised within some specific text type characteristics that distinguish them from one another. Each category thus follows a specific ‘formula’ or ‘template’, so when familiar with its characteristics one immediately recognizes the text type.

Görlach has studied cookery recipes in particular – research motivated by the interest in finding the features that can define the cookery recipe in relation to its function and language (Görlach 2004:124). There are several factors that make up the list of features Görlach describes as constituting the nature of cookery recipes as text type.

Cookery recipes, he claims, are found in collections (or codices) containing similar types of text – which is true in the case of the medieval cookery recipe (the MS Sloane 442 contains a variety of recipes (organized in discrete sections however), of which approximately twenty-five percent are cookery recipes and the rest mostly medical recipes). The name has remained the same for centuries – receipt/recipe. Its vernacular tradition in England goes back to the Middle Ages.
The next feature is cookery of course – the most important topic of recipes. Cookery recipes are ‘well-defined as far as function is concerned’ inasmuch as they comprise ‘instructions on how to prepare a dish’ (Görlach, 2004:123).

What concerns the linguistic features, there is the particular use of the imperative mood for verbs, as well as the fact that in eighty per cent of the recipes Görlach studied a pronoun was absent (‘take a hare’ is the dominant form, whereas ‘take thy hare/take your hare’ are minority forms) (Görlach, 2004:129). Also he points out that other typical features of those early recipes in particular, are the use of relatively simple sentence structures and the outspoken scarcity of specific quantifications, apart from just a few specific ones, the ‘rule’ is ‘lack of explicitness or absence of quantifications’ (Görlach, 2004:130). The structure of the recipe has changed through times, starting with only heading and ‘recipe body’, it has become more elaborate both in content and layout – including both more information, more sections as well as a more specific language referring to measures/quantities and timings.

When Trosborg discusses text types, she refers to them as the texts that ‘cut across registers and genres’ (Trosborg 1997:12). She states that the different text types, whether they are of a descriptive, narrative, expository, argumentative, or instrumental character – or encompass some other property – are functional categories classified according to purpose (Trosborg 1997:12).

5.2.3 Cinderella Texts and Text Colonies

Hoey is preoccupied with texts he refers to as ‘Cinderella’ texts, such as shopping lists, TV listing magazines, bibliographies, Bibles, and criminal statutes (Hoey 2001: 72-73). They represent, according to Hoey, texts that have been much neglected by text analysts and grammarians, despite the fact that Cinderella texts constitute a variety of texts most people are in daily contact with, contrary to the ‘mainstream’ texts (literary/fictional) texts that have traditionally been used for the purpose of linguistic analysis.

Cinderella texts are characterised by their lack of cohesion, a feature that distinguishes them from mainstream texts. The characteristic hierarchical cohesive organisation of mainstream texts he describes as static, in the sense that each of the different elements the text is made up of, has a fixed place within the text, and cannot be moved around or removed without disturbing the text as a working unit – i.e. if the cohesion is disturbed, the text will be dysfunctional. The crime novel is not the same if one removes the concluding
chapter where the murderer is exposed, nor will it be a particularly good read if the order of the chapters was jumbled – then it would probably make little sense to the reader. A shopping list on the other hand is incohesive, but it still ‘functions as a unity with respect to its environment’ (Hoey 2001: 72). Despite the lack of full sentences or cohesive language, the shopping list works perfectly well as a memory aid for the intended audience (not necessarily identical with the author), it needs no cohesion – the different elements on the list may even be jumbled around, and the list is still functional, doing exactly the same job. Even if an item is removed from the list, one can still go shopping for the remaining items.

According to Hoey the variety of Cinderella texts can be classified into different text colonies. In the metaphorical sense a text colony works in the same way as the beehive and the anthill (Hoey 2001: 74-76). He exemplifies this by describing how the numerous small creatures of these colonies work together as individual units in a complex organisation – where the loss of one or more of these creatures does not really endanger the viability of the colony – like the example of the shopping list that stays functional even with one or two of the listed items removed.

5.2.4 Discussion

How, then, do these theories of text categorization match with the cookery recipe? According to Biber and Conrad ‘…almost any kind of text has its own characteristic linguistic features’ (Biber and Conrad, 2009: Ch.1.1). The cookery recipe includes the same linguistic features irrespective of the text category one chooses to place it in. The cookery recipe apparently fits all of the above categories. Admittedly deciding what category cookery recipes belongs to proved a less straightforward task than initially assumed. One is left with a variety of categories concerning the same kinds of texts, though studied from somewhat different angles. Within this rather complex theoretical framework it will be for the best that terms are kept as simple and unambiguous as possible.

19 Obviously a shopping list is an example of incohesive ‘non-continuous’ prose, however those who organize their shopping lists according to the ‘order of appearance’ of the groceries in the particular store they plan to go shopping in, would strongly disagree. The shopping list would not be as functional with a jumbled word order – that would in fact turn the execution of the shopping into a complete chaos, as one would have to go back and forth a number of times to find groceries – instead of picking them up in the right ‘order of appearance’. One might assume that the organized shopping list is a quite common procedure, by consequence one cannot immediately claim that a ‘jumbled’ shopping list will do the same job as an organized list would.
It is clear that the language of cookery recipes encompasses a specialized register or a particular culinary vocabulary and structures in order to optimize the message of the recipes. Certainly, cookery recipes are easily recognized, due to some very characteristic features – both in content and layout, and though the audience and function may have varied through time, they have at each stage in history constituted a discrete category. In the most basic sense cookery recipes could be defined as belonging to a specific genre\(^{20}\) – both Trosborg’s genre definition, based on the everyday notion, but also Lee’s description of genres as memberships of culturally-recognisable categories suits the cookery recipe.

Authors of cookery recipes do not always have the same audience in mind (though they represent the same period, historically speaking) – thus two cookery books might apply different registers/styles when aiming at different audiences. An example that might illustrate this is Beeton’s style in *The Book of Household Management* (1861), which is characterized by ‘explicitness, genteel diction, a quasi-scientific approach’ – her audience most likely the household mistresses and their housekeepers – quite contrary to Francatelli’s *A Plain Cookery Book for the Working Classes* (1851) in which the author clearly aims to accommodate his language to a style suitable to the intended audience, the working classes (Görlach, 2004:132-135).

Görlach suggests that Francatelli deliberately varies the form, ‘as if he were intentionally flouting the conventions firmly entrenched in the culinary handbook of the time’ (Görlach, 2004:134). The language of the example of Francatelli that Görlach (2004:135) uses is perhaps best described as colloquial/conversational in style. However style is not a category of text that one can fit the cookery recipe into – it only refers to the way the author employs his/her language. Görlach here describes one text type (cookery recipe) encompassing two different styles – which is in fact the case for many of the different text varieties. Also a particular genre, like the novel, will encompass different styles, as well as different registers – it all depends on what kind of novel one refers to.

According to Görlach’s definitions the cooking recipe clearly belongs within the concept of text type – there are some ‘distinctive features’ that can define this text type through a ‘semasiological analysis of designations’ (c.f. Ch.5.2.2). Most importantly he states that the cookery recipe is ‘well-defined as far as function is concerned’ – its function being to

---

\(^{20}\) Though Carroll argues that the two part structured medieval cookery recipe does not really belong within the genre category – the recipe ‘is more recognizable as belonging to a specific genre’ at a later stage, with the inclusion of an ingredients list separated from the methods section (Carroll 2010:67). In the history of cookery recipes, she claims, including the ingredients list is what makes the recipe stand out from other short texts with the same structure. It is not immediately obvious though, why a more comprehensive cookery recipe should be more qualified for being labelled within the genre category than the simpler medieval variant.
supply the reader with instructions on how to prepare a dish (Görlach, 2004:123). Second, he argues that throughout the centuries its function has also proved stable – any changes that have taken place are mainly those that concern the people (cooks, audience), the utensils, and the ingredients. However cookery recipes also suit the Cinderella text description supplied by Hoey. Cookbooks are text colonies consisting of recipes that have the property of functioning equally well on their own just as much as their function within the unit (text colony/cookbook).

Perhaps it is more correct to look at what level the linguistic analysis is concerned with – is it the external characteristics that are described, or are the internal features the topic? Is it a matter of terms being mixed up because one cannot distinguish apples from pears – because some call them fruits, the umbrella term, while others prefer to call them by their proper name. Asking for a fruit is not quite the same as asking for an apple or a pear, however it is very close.

There seems to be no simple solution as to what terms to employ when analysing and discussing language – linguistic terminologies offer a variety of diverging explanations, which invite to further discussions and interpretations. Some critique of the inconsistent treatment of terms states that this field is confusing (c.f. Lee 2001).

Genre, text type or Cinderella text within a discourse colony – numerous terms, all suitable for describing cookery recipes, however, aiming for a tidy terminology, the choice was made to use text type for labelling cookery recipes. By choosing text type, the focus will be on specific linguistic features such as grammar and lexicon, features that will be further analyzed in 5.3 and 5.4. Text type thus stands out as the most versatile and neutral term in the context of describing and discussing the linguistic features of cookery recipes. This is also the most general term, and it is hoped that it will constitute a broad and neutral fundament for an unbiased linguistic analysis/discussion. It is not the terms in themselves that are troublesome in the context of text analysis – it is rather the seemingly inconsistent use that becomes problematic. This, anyone who wants to discuss texts must deal with when conferring with and interpreting the different theories that are offered. Thus, in this context, it seemed appropriate that this chapter ends with the words of Lee (2001:40-41), who pertinently states:

At the risk of rocking the boat, I would also like to say that, personally, I am not convinced that there is a pressing need to determine “all the text types in the English language” or to balance corpora on the basis of these types.
5.3 The Grammar of Cookery Recipes

The cookery recipe is a text type of instructional character with its own grammatical peculiarities, vague language (see 5.4) and particular layout – so what is the nature of cookery recipes? Most importantly, at the grammatical level, the cookery recipe stands out from ‘ordinary’ prose in the sense that the verb form is always in the imperative mood – the mood used for giving advice/instructions, or for putting forth a request or a command of some sort. The period or exclamation mark normally ends an imperative sentence, however this is rarely so in Middle English, as punctuation marks in general are scarce. Sentences in the imperative mood usually omit the clause subject (thou/you): *Take cawlys strepe hem fro þe stalkys* (f.6r) and *take rybbys of bacon’ boyle it* (f.6v) – the real clause subject is implied.

Also modern cookery recipes employ the imperative mood: *Deseed the pepper and peel the onion* (Oliver, 2013:168) and *Drain the sweetcorn and put into a food processor* (Lawson, 2009:235). The use of the imperative mood can thus be said to constitute one of the most prominent grammatical features of cookery recipes, in its most basic form. In addition recipes generally omit the real clause subject. The recipes address some second person singular you/thou – the real clause subject, which is more often than not implicit (i.e. omitted). It might be worth noticing that for modern recipes there is a tendency of employing a more jovial and personalized style, exemplified by Oliver (2013:118) who gives his readers smart tips on how to use leftovers: *If you’re not going to use all the leftover brisket within 2 or 3 days, simply portion it up and freeze for making meals in future weeks.* Here Oliver chooses to address his audience you when giving a personal advice – but in the recipe itself, including the instructions are written in the imperative mood, he omits the real clause subject (you).

With respect to punctuation the modern recipe does, contrary to the medieval recipe, include full stops and commas more generously – however the exclamation mark is obviously not used – recipes do not give orders, they give directions. As most modern recipes include a list of ingredients where only one ingredient is displayed on each line (often in two columns, though), the use of commas and full stops is naturally not necessary for those sections. Nevertheless the ‘body’ of the recipe, in which the preparation of the dish is explained, follows regular punctuation rules – thus employing full stops, commas – and perhaps dashes – like ‘ordinary’ prose.

On the grammatical level cookery recipes are identical to a set of for instance prison regulations: *Do not exceed the ration. Do not waste food. Do not carry food from the dining
room. (Regulation#33 Dining Room Rules)\textsuperscript{21} – or the text of the odd instructional booklet: *Press the shutter button lightly. Press the movie button to start shooting, and press it again to stop.*\textsuperscript{22} Prison regulations, instructional booklets and recipes are all examples of text-types written in the imperative mood, what makes the one category different from the other is decided by the content and the use. These texts are directed at different audiences and their functions are not the same – nevertheless all three give instructions of some sort and are grammatically speaking identical.

The imperative mood is in short what distinguishes recipes and its likes from for instance narrative or academic prose, which are usually written in the indicative mood. It would be considered both strange and inappropriate if for instance a newspaper article was written in the imperative mood. The imperative mood, though, is not a text type – it is merely the particular verb mood that can in theory be employed for a variety of different texts with different functions serving different audiences, just as much as the indicative, subjunctive and infinitive verb moods can.

\textbf{5.4 The Language of Cookery Recipes}

The following sections are concerned with the said vagueness notion of medieval recipes. First the vagueness notion will be discussed, after that the cookery recipes of the MS Sloane 442 will be scrutinized in regard to this said vagueness.

\textit{5.4.1 The Notion of Vagueness}

Medieval cookery recipes are described as vague with respect to procedures, weights and measurements, thus a substantial amount of familiarity with cooking is required in order to succeed with the kind of instruction they give. A close look at the recipes of the MS Sloane 442 reveals that any preparation of these dishes would involve, to the novice cook, undertaking a rather difficult, if not impossible task. Even a skilled cook would most likely find quite a few of these recipes challenging – the biggest challenge consisting of the fact that specific measurements and weights are scarce, and lacking even, in addition to the vagueness of those

\textsuperscript{21} This is an excerpt of Regulation #33 as found in the original 1954 ‘Alcatraz Prisoners Rules & Regulations’ online facsimile copy on http://www.alcatrazhistory.com/ebook.htm.

\textsuperscript{22} From the instructional booklet ‘Canon Power Shot SX700 HS’.
that are present. Furthermore the time lapse of more than five centuries between medieval and present-day recipes, certainly adds another element to consider – the social context, which obviously has changed a great deal, both in terms of audience as well as function – (these two aspects however are further discussed in 5.4.3).

How is it possible then to get the different ingredients proportioned correctly with directions such as ‘Take thynne mylke of almonds..., Boyle fresch brawn..., Take hennys or porke..., Choppe veell..., Boyle datys..., put þer-to powdur of gynger & canell...’(MS Sloane 442: ff.16v, 17v, 13r, 13r, 14v, 14v)? The quantity of almond milk is not given, how much meat of boar, hen or pork is meant, how much veal is to be chopped, how many dates do the indefinite plural form ‘dattys’ actually involve, and how much spice is needed? Then there is the uncertainty of timing, illustrated by a lytyll, but a whyle, not to longe, lange, Inogʒh, adverbs and expressions about time, all found in MS Sloane 442 in combination with ‘boyle’, indicating how long something is supposed to boil. Such indications are relatively vague, at least compared to the norm of modern cooking instructions – one would expect at least an approximated timing, given in minutes or hours. Unless the cook is well versed in the looks, taste and texture of medieval dishes, the preparation of them involves some rather random choices when it comes to the above-mentioned directions, where vague timings are the rule and quantities are in many cases completely omitted.

Before studying this particular feature of omission, one needs to establish what this notion of ‘vagueness’ implies. Gleaning the established general understandings of medieval recipes among linguists and medievalists (Carroll, Görlach, Henisch, Hieatt and Butler, Scully) may shed light on the reasons why the notion of ‘vagueness’ seems to be the most prevailing one in this field. Even though Channell’s studies of vagueness in the English language are not concerned with medieval recipes as such, her studies are considered important because they supply reasonable input in this field, constituting a platform in which the vagueness notion can be understood.

Henisch argues that medieval recipes appear ‘disconcertingly unfamiliar’, due to the way ‘directions on quantities and timing’ are dealt with (Henisch, 1976:142). What this means is that much interpretation of the directions is left to the cook. Two examples that can illustrate this are; put þer-to sugur a gret dell and temper it vp with wit sum of the mylke & þer-to sugur Inogh (MS Sloane 442:16v and 14v). Obviously the implication of these instructions is that the cook must know already the dishes and their respective cooking procedures, unless ‘a great deal’, ‘some’ and ‘enough’ proved to have been fixed entities in the Middle Ages.
Henisch’s arguments are further confirmed by Scully, who states that ‘What is frequently lacking in these early recipes is a precise indication of quantities, times and heats’ (Scully, 1995:24). However, he also emphasizes that in the Middle Ages, the position of cookery books was quite different, the audience was a very restricted one – their use was not intended as ‘popular books’ for the general audience, quite contrary to the present situation. Görlach too claims that English medieval recipes generally are ‘imprecise and variable in form’ and ‘the lack of explicitness and absence of of proper quantifications are obviously the rule’, using ‘hony, nowt to moche’, ‘take ynow powder of canel’, and ‘a good quantyte/and a lytil of Rys’ as examples (Görlach, 2004:125, 130).

Hieatt and Butler are very pertinent in this matter by claiming that ‘The earliest English recipes, then, are terse, leaving a great deal up to the cook’s basic knowledge, but nevertheless precise and discriminating in directions for seasoning and colouring’ (Hieatt & Butler, 1985:8). They underline the need for basic knowledge in order to cook from medieval recipes, which can be said to be almost an undisputable fact after having gone through a vast number of medieval recipes. However, their argument about being ‘precise and discriminating in directions for seasoning and colouring’ is more intriguing, because whether colour it wiþ alkenet yfoundyt, Do þerto ayr, raisouns corauns, sugur and powdour of gynger, powdour douce, Do þerto butter, safroun & salt, & raisouns corauns, & a litel sugur with powdour douce are precise directions or not, clearly depends on the reader’s knowledge of and experience in cooking.

Quite confusingly, Görlach claims to be on the same terms as Hieatt and Butler, although his arguments completely contradict Hieatt and Butler’s statement – their ‘precise and discriminating in directions for seasoning and colouring’ is rather the opposite of his ‘lack of explicitness’ and ‘imprecise and variable in form’ – as Carroll (2009:57) timely points out. According to Channell ‘vague language is not bad or wrong, but nor is it inherently good. Its use needs to be considered with reference to contexts and situations, when it will be appropriate, or inappropriate’ (Channell, 1994:197). Channell’s studies are concerned with modern language considered to represent Standard British English. However some parallels can be drawn between her theories and findings on what she defines as ‘approximated quantifiers with non-numerical vague quantifiers’ and the linguistic reality of medieval recipes. Both written and spoken modern English make use of a wide range of vague

\[\text{Channell’s study is wellknown, and her typology has since been adopted by other reserachers’ (Carroll, 2009:61).}\]
linguistic features which all have in common the need to understand an utterance or written text within a certain context.

Carroll states that Channell’s ‘approximated quantities’ ‘are likely to be rare in medieval recipes, since quantification of any kind is rare. For example, a typical recipe contains no numbers and no measurements’ (Carroll, 2009:61). She uses the following recipe to illustrate her argument about missing numbers and measurements.

*Malaches of pork. Hewe pork al to pecys and medle it with ayren & chese igrated. Do þerto powdour fort, safrou & pynes with salt. Make a crust in a trap; bake it wel þerinne, and serue it forth.*

The above recipe gives no quantities – however it does give one vague measure: ‘bake it well’. Carroll’s study includes several different witnesses of *The Forme of Cury*, and she states that ‘Each manuscript of FC contains at least one recipe which uses recognizable units of measure’. These few indications such as *ounces, viii galones, a potell, ii pounde* are used to quantify ingredients (Carroll, 2009:62). Then she names a few quantifiers used to indicate size; *as grete as apples, as pin as paper, of be length of a litel fyngur*, and a couple of others to indicate measurements; *2 yncch deep, a foot brode* (Carroll, 2009:64). According to Carroll the most frequent of the existing quantifiers are nevertheless the non-numericals. These are for instance vague quantifiers often signalling small amounts like *a lytel*, and *a fewe* (Carroll, 2009: 65). Then some quantifiers are categorizes as vague because they are seen as neither small nor large – which also leaves great room for interpretation; *a porcioun, a quantite, sum, somdel, ynowh of something* (Carroll, 2009:66).

Carroll’s study of *The Forme of Cury* reveals that quantifiers and measures are present in small quantities, but the vast majority of them supply the reader with only vague indications. Perhaps most importantly however, her study concludes that much of the reason why medieval recipes are thought of as vague, may be explained by ‘the omission of information, particularly of specification of ingredient quantities, temperatures, and timings. This omission, unfortunately the feature hardest to quantify, must be the feature which most contributes to the modern reader finding medieval recipes alien’ (Carroll, 2009:78). Carroll actually argues that recipes are not as vague as the majority of scholars seem to think, as the

---

24 Translation of this recipe: "Malachis of pork”. Cut pork all to pieces and mix it with eggs and cheese grated. Add thereto *poudre fort* [seasoning], saffron & pine nuts with salt. Make a crust in a cooking vessel; bake well therein and serve forth.
notion of vagueness largely depends on the context and the reader, an aspect put forth also by Hieatt and Butler. Carroll claims that in regard to the perception of medieval recipes, several factors must be taken into consideration – ‘…cultural familiarity is an issue. The different role of the cook in society, the vastly different literacy rates, the lack of timepieces, and many other factors contribute to distance their world from ours, and to leave very different expectations for recipe texts’ (Carroll 2009: 77). Her research in the field of medieval cookery recipes and vague language is in many respects concurrent with Channell’s study of vagueness in the English language in general. They both agree on the fact that whether language is vague or not all depends on context.

One conclusion that one may draw from these studies is that medieval recipes are vague, or rather, perceived as vague. However, there is also an element of vagueness in modern recipes. A glimpse from a couple of modern cookery books reveals this; *then season to perfection [...] serve with seasonal greens* and *then season to perfection, going heavy on the black pepper* (Oliver, 2013:188, 204). Oliver25 takes for granted that the reader is able to ‘season to perfection’ – he gives no indication of quantities or what kind of seasoning he has in mind, except that one should ‘go heavy on the black pepper’. Neither does he give any quantities nor examples of ‘seasonal greens’ – readers must figure out for themselves, which greens are in season (perhaps not obvious to everyone, because these days most greens are available all year round in the shops). Also Lawson26 instructs her readers to *salt and pepper to taste*, confident that the audience knows exactly how much salt and pepper this potato and mushroom gratin needs (Lawson, 2009:39). This ‘modern vagueness’ is without doubt rather insignificant compared to ‘medieval vagueness’ – adding the right amount of spices is perhaps not the most intriguing task in the field of cooking – acknowledging that ‘the right amount’ very much depends on the individual palate. In regard to quantities of spices, modern recipes are usually generously equipped with precise amounts (except from the ‘salt and pepper to taste’ measure), whereas medieval recipes hardly give any measures for spices, making *seson it vp wit powdur & salt* another typical feature. Other examples of expressions used in connection with spices are *do/put per-to salt powdur of peper and opur powdur of canell and temper it vp wit wyn & powdur of gynger canel & wit galentyne*. Omission of

---

25 Jamie (James Trevor) Oliver (born 1975) is a British cook and chef. Once discovered by BBC in 1997, after making an unscripted appearance in a documentary about the restaurant, “Christmas at the River Café”, his career escalated.

26 Nigella Lucy Lawson (born 1960) is a passionate amateur cook (self-taught) with an MA in medieval and modern languages from Oxford. Her career as a food writer and amateur cook has literally brought her both fame and fortune. She has enjoyed great success with her cookery series on television, particularly the award-winning *Nigella Bites* and *Nigella’s Christmas Kitchen*. She has also had great successful with her ten cookery books, many of them huge best-sellers, of which three brought her credit in the form of book awards. (wikipedia).
quantities proves to be a common feature in medieval recipes, it concerns all kinds of ingredients, also spices.

_Seson it up with_ is comparable with today’s _salt and pepper to taste_, or Oliver’s _season to perfection_ (however the latter is not quite representative of the majority of cookery books). In modern cookery books, the _season to taste_ principle is employed mostly for salt and pepper, whereas more specific quantities (table-spoon, teaspoon etc.) are given for other spices. Using a modern cookery book classic, Costa’s _Four Seasons Cookery Book_ as an example, a search in the new Kindle edition reveals that the treatment of salt is actually much the same as that of medieval recipes. As much as forty-three recipes call for salt, without giving a precise indication of quantity, the reader must ‘salt to taste’. Six other recipes call for ‘a pinch’ of salt, eight more give a precise quantity measured in teaspoons/millilitres, and finally two recipes give an exact amount of salt to be added in ounces/grams. In the medieval recipes, ‘seson it vp’ occurs in combination with all spices/flavourings, including salt, suger, and herbs – the general rule appears to be an omission of quantities, and those few indications mentioned are of a vague character (a little, some, a great deal etc.). However in modern cookery books ‘season to taste’ is used only for salt and pepper – when the recipes call for spices, precise quantities are employed.

Why do modern cookery books treat salt in such a ‘careless’ manner? The answer may partly be the fact that salt is, in the case of British cuisine (and Norwegian, for that matter), probably the most frequently used flavouring, and its basic or common nature then, makes the mention of any specific quantity superfluous – salt is a flavour that people are familiar with and thus know approximately how much to add in order to get the wanted ‘effect’. Modern cookery books treat spices and herbs more carefully, compared to salt – using mostly precise quantities. Though both spices and herbs are frequent ingredients in cookery recipes, and have been so ever since the Middle Ages (i.e. that is how far back documentation in the form of recipes goes, obviously herbs and spices were in use also before this period), there has been a change in how they are referred to. Medieval recipes refer to all ingredients in the same way (general vagueness and omission), modern recipes have continued the tradition of omitted/vague specifications only for salt (and pepper) – at some point specific quantities for spices and herbs became more common. The treatment of salt vs spices is as a rather puzzling feature. Salt is probably the ingredient that has the highest potential of ruining a dish if used too generously, so including a precise measure could be very useful, particularly to the novice cook.
5.4.2 Vague Language in MS Sloane 442

How are cooking directions and quantities dealt with in the MS Sloane 442? Is there a concordance with previous, comparable studies regarding vagueness? In order to verify to what extent the recipes of MS Sloane 442 follow the same pattern as in Carroll’s study of the *Forme of Cury*, some of the characteristic features of cookery recipes have been studied in detail and systematized in the tables below. A close study of these aspects concerning vagueness shows that there is a general agreement with the results from Carroll’s study.

First of all, as a means to give an indication of a potential vagueness of cooking directions (i.e. specification of preparation methods), tables V and VI indicate the uses of the word ‘boyle’ (boil) and its synonyms (i.e. those involving the same kind of cooking procedure). To boil something is a very basic cooking procedure, present in a vast number of the recipes, thus it appears as a natural feature by which to start. Next, by virtue of being frequently used, the verb ‘take’ is subject of scrutiny (*take cawlys, take coloppe of porke*...etc). Finally, a category of miscellany, here named ‘modifiers’ is studied as well – all in the search for signs of the vagueness in question. In sum a study of the following fours tables should constitute the material needed in order to draw some conclusions regarding the said vagueness of ‘cookery language’.

The first four items in table V are all cooking directions that give no further details other than to boil/parboil/boil up – timings, and what heat to use are not mentioned. ‘Boyle’, ‘parboyle’, and ‘seepe’ must be seen as vague cooking directions in this context. They make up 75 tokens of omission of information, as they reveal but the cooking method itself (boyle, parboyle, seepe) and not one word about how long to boil the ingredients or what kind of temperature to opt for, apart from ‘seepe’ which obviously implies cooking at a low heat. The last two items in the table have modifiers, thus cooking directions have been expanded on to some extent, as shown in table V.

Table VI shows the distribution of boyle/parboyle in combination with modifying attributives. Spelling variation has not been of any concern in the table, neither variation in word order – consequently there are some hidden variations of the tokens listed. All the tokens in the table are verbatim examples from the transcription, however in the case of several tokens of one kind, the table represents the spelling of the first folio listed, whereas the rest may be slightly different (contentwise all of them are equal, though). There is a slight chance that personal judgement may potentially have coloured the results, in the sense that the level of knowledge of cooking procedures and ‘cookery language’ are seen as ‘colouring
agents’ in the judgement process. Nonetheless, all tables are based on physical findings, so
the results represent reliable data.

Table V The use of ‘boyle’ and its synonyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Usage</th>
<th>Occurrences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boyle as sole indicator</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parboyle as sole indicator</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seepe as sole indicator</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boyle it/him vp</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seepe + modifiers*</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seepe + modifiers</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* All the cases where the verb ‘boyle’ occurs in combination with ‘modifiers’ are displayed in the next table. Modifiers in this sense involve both whole sentences as well as single words. (ex: lange or as b² seisth b² good ys)

Though none of the cooking directions listed as precise indicate any specific timings, they are
all the same precise – the only ‘catch’ is that one must pay close attention to pots and pans,
keeping it all under surveillance – wait until they come to the boil before adding more
ingredients – or cook until tender, or keep an eye on the mussels so that they can be pulled off
the fire the minute they open. ‘Cook until tender’, however, is an example of individual
judgement and a case of doubt. On the one hand one could argue that it is easy to verify when
vegetables are tender, and end the cooking process before they turn into mash, likewise to
cook meats until they are no longer tough. On the other hand these processes may not be
obvious at all, because they depend on the context – is the cook experienced, is he an amateur,
or is it someone who has never cooked anything in his whole life? ‘Boil until tender’ might as
well be replaced by ‘boil enough’, ‘boil for a long time’ or even ‘boil a little’ – to the novice
they may all seem like confusingly vague directions, whereas the expert, familiar with both
the dish in question as well as cooking procedures, has no trouble at all following such
instructions. The nature of cooking directions found in medieval recipes clearly allows for a
great deal of individual judgement. Direct indications of timing are simply non-existent. A
general lack of timepieces implies that specific timings were not needed – the wristwatch and
the clock on the mantelpiece were not yet a part of the history.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>boyle/parboile + modifier</th>
<th>Occurs on the following folios of MS.S.442</th>
<th>Vague cooking direction</th>
<th>Precise cooking direction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>boyle hem tyl dey opyn</td>
<td>6r</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>boyle hem tyl þey be Inowʒg</td>
<td>11r, 6r, 8v, 10r, 13r, 24r, 21r, 22r, 10v</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>whenne they boyle do in þe whythe of lekys</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>boyle hym a good whyle</td>
<td>7r</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parboyle/boyle hem/hym/it well</td>
<td>7r, 9v (2x), 22r, 24r</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parboyle þe qwythe of lekys tendyr</td>
<td>7v</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ʒif þe poke be noʒt tendyr) boyle it bettyr</td>
<td>8r, 21r</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lat it no mor’ boyle</td>
<td>8r 2x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ster it wen it boylyd</td>
<td>8r, 9v</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>boyle it tyl hit be resenabill thykke &amp; tyl þy</td>
<td>8v</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>whethe be tendur</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lat it boyle as þe seist þ good ys</td>
<td>8v</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ster hem wel for brennyng in the boylyng</td>
<td>9r</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>boyle it þe it be ryʒt tenþur</td>
<td>9v</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>when it boylit ster it</td>
<td>9v, 11r</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>when it boylit cast in þe pelettes</td>
<td>12v</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>boyle it as mortrewys</td>
<td>14r</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parboyle hem in good lycour tyl dey ben Inogh</td>
<td>11v</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>when it ys boylid do þer-yn</td>
<td>15v</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>when it boylid</td>
<td>15v</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>boyle it a lytyll</td>
<td>17v, 19v</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lat it noʒt boyle</td>
<td>17v</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>boyle fresch brawn in fay water tyl it be tendur</td>
<td>17v</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parboyle hym þe day be steff thorwʒ</td>
<td>18v</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parboyle hem a lytyl</td>
<td>18v</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>when it be-gynnyt to boyle scome it clene/when it boylit scome it clene</td>
<td>20v, 22v, 23r, 21v, 22r</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>boyle but a lytyll</td>
<td>22v</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>boyle but a whyle</td>
<td>23r</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lat it boyle lange</td>
<td>23r</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lat yt not boyle to longe for brennyng of almonds</td>
<td>23r</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>boyle þour fyssche always tyl þe seson it</td>
<td>24v</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As Carroll argues, it is probably not so much the vagueness of the existing quantifiers and measurements in themselves that contributes to the vagueness label of medieval recipes, but more all those incidents where these have been completely omitted. Another method of finding examples of this omission of quantities and measurements, is by counting how many times the verb ‘take’ followed by ingredient(s) occurs without further specification, compared to the number of times take + ingredient + modifier occurs – modifiers meaning ‘quantities’ in this context. Furthermore it is of course also interesting to see if the modifying tag is of a vague or specific nature. This way of making statistics however needs ‘handling with care’, as a straightforward computerised linguistic count very impractical, if not impossible. First one has to discard all tokens of ‘take’ where these do not represent examples of ‘take + ingredient’, i.e. those cases where the modifiers are omitted, and thus perform a count by studying every single occurrence of ‘take’ one by one. Then there is the additional challenge of spelling variation – which all studies of authentic Middle English language need to take into consideration.

Verbs like *grynde, frye,* and *draw* also occur with ingredients (+ modifiers), and could have been studied as well, however the reason for choosing to look at the use of ‘take’, is the very nature of recipes in a linguistic sense. The language of recipes has a quite simple structure, and some characteristics are very outspoken, like that of ‘take + ingredient (+ modifier)’ – a feature represented by 146 tokens in MS Sloane 442. The extensive use of ‘take’ is literally quite eye-catching. In fact 79 of 140 recipes have ‘Take + ingredient(s)’ as the initial words in the body of the recipe, exemplified by *Take fresch porke or moton soden tendur, take brede drawyn wit red wyne, Take conynes, take melke of almondes, take swete creme of cow mylke, Take gode wyte wyne* (MS Sloane 442:ff. 8v, 10r, 10v, 11r, 15v, 25r). Eleven of these have modifiers attached to them. For 130 of these 146 tokens, the ingredients stand on their own, without any further specification of quantities (modifier). Then on as little as nine occasions, the modifiers leave no doubt about how much is meant of something (i.e. a quantity easily understood by readers today – regardless of the degree of familiarity with cooking). Finally seven tokens give some indication of quantity, however of a rather vague nature (to the present-day readers).

The study of ‘take’ in MS Sloane 442 clearly shows that omissions are by far in the majority, compared to the use of ‘take + ingredient + specific modifiers/modifiers’. Undoubtedly these figures strengthen Carroll’s theory of omission as the largest contributor of the vagueness label. Quantifiers are rare but not totally absent, the precise ones are compatible
**Table VII The representation of the verb ‘take’**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>take + ingredient</th>
<th>take + ingredient + specific modifier</th>
<th>take + ingredient + vague modifier</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘Take + ingredient’ is present on as much as 130 occasions. Here follows a handful of examples; take cawlys (6r)</td>
<td>take a gooss (7r)</td>
<td>take sum of þe melke (14v)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>take chekenys sodyn tendur (12v)</td>
<td>Take þe nombel of a der (9r)</td>
<td>take sum of þe melke (16v)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>take fat off moton or beeff (13v)</td>
<td>Take an hare (10v)</td>
<td>take some of þe elys (18v)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take blanchyd almondes (18r)</td>
<td>Take þe bowelys of a calff (11v)</td>
<td>take som of þe same brawn (18v)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>take gode wyte wyne (25r)</td>
<td>Take flesche of a Roo (12r)</td>
<td>take powder of canell a gret del</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>take brawn of capon (15v)</td>
<td>Take a kydde (13v)</td>
<td>take sum of þe same wyne (24r)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>take blanchyd almondes (18r)</td>
<td>take þe bar’ fylkys of a bor’ (14r)</td>
<td>take mor’ fysshe (24v)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>take gode wyte wyne (25r)</td>
<td>Take a crabbe or a lobster (20v)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With modern standards, though the vague ones call for haphazard choices – as some of, a great deal, and more of an ingredient are intriguing measures. So at least judged by modern linguistic standards the figures from this table do signal a high degree of uncertainty regarding quantities. It is nevertheless by far the vast number of missing modifiers that really contributes to the notion of vagueness – at least when one tries to study these recipes for the purpose of potentially using them as proper cooking directions. Again the need for exceptional cooking skills manifests itself in particular through the omissions – one normally expects more accurate directions than ‘take meat of lamb and boil it’ and ‘take a great deal of cinnamon’ in order to make a recipe functional.

Table VIII includes a selection of modifiers present in the manuscript. Modifiers as they appear here must be seen as a group of ‘miscellaneous’ because they do not belong to a fixed entity or word class, however the majority are adjectives and adverbs. The modifiers include instructions that indicate quantities, timing, mode etc. ‘All kinds of, a little, some, not much, enough, a taste of, a part of, a great deal, small, big’ are all vague indications. ‘Two days, as big as hazelnuts, the size of plums, the size of an eggyolk, a cupful, half a dozen’ on the other hand, are surprisingly precise, though these are in this context the exceptions to the rule, with just a very few occurrences, most of them occur only once. ‘A portion’ of something may be both precise and vague, depending on the context. It is at times found also in modern recipes, the size and cooking directions for this portion is then given somewhere else in the cookery book. This is not the case for medieval recipes – they do not elaborate on what this said portion implies.
Table VIII Modifiers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modifiers used in combination with ingredients /cooking procedures found in MS.S.442</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>hew/kut/grynþ it gret/smal, cut almondes in lengche, cut it in smale leschis no morþ pen þy fyngur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a keuþ milk, a cupfulle of swethe wyn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>almaner of good herbys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>make ʒour stuff as gret as heselnoytys, make it in pelettes as gret as a plomme, make smale rownþ ball</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reysens fryd a lytyll, hew hem but a lytyll</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a gret quantyte of al powdur gynger, good quantite of vergeous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a porcon of clene larþ, a good porcon of sugur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a good whyle/ a whyle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>some of, a party of, a grett dell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nowʒt moche of þþ broth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>too days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inowgh/almost Inowgh/ as þþ seisth þ good ys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a talage of powdur, a dragge clowys maces, a lyour of crustes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leches iij or iiiij in a dysche</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>when he is somdeþ cold, so þþ it be somdel dowcet, þþ it be somdel brownþ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loke dy fyer be not to hastyff, set hem on an hesy fyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>put a quarte &amp; a pynthe of þþ best wynþ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>make peletys of þþ gretmesse of þþ solke of an eye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>half a docenþ fyggis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.5 Conclusion – Context: Function and Audience

The conclusion that can be drawn from the study of these medieval cookery recipes is that in regard to the vagueness question, one should first of all acknowledge that the notion of vagueness is relative. It is very much dependent on the audience and the context – one will have to look at the function of the cookery recipes before judging whether they are vague or not. Clearly the modern reader finds these recipes vague inasmuch as they ommit precise measurements and timings. The intended audience of MS Sloane 442 was of course the fifteenth century reader – these recipes were not adressed to readers of the twenty-first century.

Who, then, was this fifteenth century reader? One can of course only assume who s/he was – maybe the cook or the head of a large household, or the wealthy nobleman/woman.
However what is obvious is that neither of them would actually be in need of more precise recipes than those already offered by the MS Sloane 442. First of all, the cook would be skilled, thus s/he knew how to make all the dishes – and if ever s/he did make use of the recipes, it would be as a memory aid. In addition, the preciseness of modern recipes, concerning issues such as timings and temperatures, would be superfluous in the medieval setting as most people had no precise timekeeping devices such as a timepiece – however in the late Middle Ages some households may have had an hour-glass to keep track of time. In addition the cooking facilities offered few opportunities to regulate the temperature. Moreover if the recipes were intended for the head of the house, s/he would not need to worry about vagueness – since the recipes were in his/her case probably meant as a proof/token of wealth, a means to keep record of all the dishes served at the big occasions, or simply a handy selection of recipes to choose from in order to vary the menu. In any case s/he would not be in charge of cooking. Also if one takes into consideration that literacy rates in medieval times were not particularly high among the lower classes (where most cooks would be situated), it is perhaps unlikely that there would be a particularly large audience for cookery recipes among the cooks.

Any text must be understood within the context it was meant to be read, which means that one cannot label medieval cookery recipes as vague, since they are only vague to the modern reader – for whom they were not initially intended. Carroll (2009:80) states that:

Modern readers do expect quantities and specifications in their recipes. This is partly because recipes are expected to instruct a wider audience today than they did in the medieval period, and may be used to instruct new ideas and tastes, rather than provide crib sheets of the necessary for familiar favourites. However, when a writer assumes familiarity and experience on the part of the reader, it is possible to omit a great deal of specification, even to the extreme…

As an example of ‘omission to the extreme’, Carroll uses Hieatt’s recipe for venison pie (Hieatt 1988:197): just skin a chunk [of venison], sprinkle it with pepper and perhaps cinnamon, wrap in pastry, and bake. Though this medieval recipe forms part of an adapted recipe collection, Hieatt has in this case chosen to omit a quite substantial amount of information, as she assumes that her audience are those eager amateur cooks who know all too well how to make a pie.
The vagueness of the cookery recipes in the MS Sloane 442, from the point of view of the modern audience, is a typical feature of medieval cookery recipes. The medieval cookery recipe is not vague if the audience is the medieval cook or the nobleman/woman, whereas for the amateur cook of today, medieval recipes are considered too vague for practical use. Modern readers of cookery recipes are not a uniform group, they are readers of all social layers and skills – some of them are professional cooks, but the vast majority will be amateur cooks – which is, as Carroll underlines, likely to be the reason why the majority of modern cookbooks employ a precise language that is easily understood by their audience.

However cookery recipes may be characterized as a text type that, regardless of context and audience, has remained relatively stable through time – in the sense that the recipe has always included the same elements – ingredients, cooking direction, and some typical grammatical features – the imperative mood and the rather consistent omission of clause subject. These elements have stayed the same for centuries, so the changes that have taken place in regard to layout and content. Recipes have most likely changed in order adapt to its audience and the practical use. What can be stated for a fact is that modern recipes are clearly meant to be cooking directions, whereas the purpose of medieval cookery recipes is more uncertain – it may actually be the case that they were never intended to be cooking instructions at all.

Furthermore these recipes are also good examples of the spelling variation in ME, they are consistently inconsistent in spelling. The ‘worst’ example from the MS Sloane 442 in this respect is perhaps the spelling of *through*, which has been listed with twelve different forms in LALME (*porwʒ, porwʒ, thorowght, thorow, throwʒ, þerew, thorwe, dorwʒ, durwe, durghe, drowʒ, b’rew*). However there are actually eleven more forms that have not been listed in the LALME description of LP Essex 6021 (*dorwe, d’rwʒ, dorwʒte, þorwʒ, trowʒt, trowʒ, throw, þorwʒgh, thorwʒh, þorwʒg, drowʒg*). When there was no national standard of written English to guide the scribes, they would probably either imitate the language of the manuscripts they were copying (if they were copying), or they would write the way they spoke – or a mixture of the two.

On the one hand spelling variation is of course one of those elements that makes the reading of ME cumbersome. On the other hand spelling variation is also what makes the study of ME so fascinating. Though the online MED is a gift for those who want to look up

---

27 This of course only refers to the cookery section of the MS Sloane 442, as the medical section has not been part of the study. There could be other forms in the medical sections, though these are in that case not accounted for in this study.
medieval words, the spelling variation sometimes makes it difficult to find the right words despite this valuable tool – because the spelling may be very distant from what one would expect it to be. For instance when <d> and <þ> are used interchangeably in the MS Sloane 442 it is not immediately obvious that the word *þyschys* means *dishes*. Neither is it easy to figure out what *turwsake* means, when there is no modern word that looks anything like it – one could guess that perhaps it was a herb (which it is) – but when the word for it in MED is *turn(e)sole* (a herb in the spurge family), it is not evident (and here knowledge of French does not help much either, because the French *tournesole* means *sunflower*, which is not the same). What may help is when the one of the forms listed in MED also occurs in the MS (*turnesole*), so that one can compare (however in this case Hieatt 1988 was of great help). Adding the fact that there is a certain French influence in the cooking vocabulary, one has to admit that reading medieval recipes is perhaps just as intriguing and challenging as reading academic articles on unfamiliar subjects. Moreover one has to know some French in order to understand that *chawff* probably means *heat* because it reminds much of the French verb *chauffer* (which means *to heat*).

By force of being a master’s thesis the immediate purpose of this edition is obvious. However the intention is also to make the recipe collection of the MS Sloane 442 available for a larger audience – for the purpose of studying both the language as well as the recipes of this particular collection. The modern audience will then be able to judge for themselves whether these recipes are functional units, as presented in this edition, without being adapted. With some knowledge in medieval food, combined with exceptional cooking skills, one might be able to treat guests with medieval dishes such as stewed lobster, venison pie and subtleties.

Finally the study of the hands in the MS Sloane 442 uncovers the fact that the LP Essex 6021 might be in need of a revision – that is when raising the question whether there ought to be more than three hands listed in the LALME description. This query then may be said to constitute the starting point for yet another study in Middle English.

**PART II: The Edition**
6. Editorial conventions

6.1 A Diplomatic Edition

This edition, being a diplomatic one, aims to represent the layout and conventions of the manuscript as closely as possible. Ideally the transcription constitutes a verbatim representation of the manuscript, in addition to supplying a relatively similar layout compared to the original. Nonetheless, in the process of converting handwriting into typed characters, some editorial choices have been made.

First of all attention should be drawn to some of the features in a handwritten text, which are particularly challenging to convert into characters offered by a regular computer keyboard. To represent certain letters, medieval manuscripts usually employ space saving abbreviations in the form of various strokes, curtailments or squiggles. These are not easily represented by the signs and characters offered by a standard writing programme on the computer. Some adjustments are therefore necessary, due to the obvious differences between handwriting and typed/digitised characters.

Secondly the formal requirements of a thesis are to some extent a hindrance in the making of a diplomatic transcription in what concerns margins and line spacing. Though the size of the original MS Sloane 442 is no bigger than an A4 sheet, the medieval manuscript is very crammed, which in turn allows the inclusion of more lines. The A4 sheet allows thirty two lines within the formal thesis requirements – however the MS Sloane 442, taking f.13v as an example, includes thirty two lines and approximately seven more blank lines. Obviously this discrepancy is slightly problematic if one strives for a diplomatic edition. Standard margins and line spacing simply do not leave enough physical space on the page in order to represent every single line on some of the folios. Thus with respect to margins, there are a few discrepancies from the formal guidelines in order to obtain the best possible diplomatic transcription, though the vast majority of the folios are made in accordance with the norm.

The decision to disregard the norm on a few occasions has enabled both marginalia as well as an increased number of lines to perfectly fit in on one page – otherwise this would have been an impossible act within the allowed standard margins. In practice this means that on some of the pages in the transcription, the margins have been shrunk for the purpose of fitting a complete folio onto one single page of the thesis. The original MS has also been
consulted to ensure that the transcription here presented is as diplomatic as intended. The editorial choices are all accounted for in the following sections.

It must be added that the cookery recipes of the Sloane 442 manuscript are not destined to form a part of any particular corpus, consequently the editorial conventions are not in concordance with one specific set of guidelines, rather their fundament is based on an eclectic choice regarded as the best suited for this particular manuscript edition. However editorial choices have not risen like a phoenix from the ashes, the guidelines of the MEST Project as well as Petti’s have been gleaned at for advice during the whole process.

6.2 Layout: Margins and Line Spacing

Attention must be drawn towards the layout of the manuscript, as the making of a transcribed version of ‘diplomatc standard’ is not as straightforward as it may seem. Admittedly technical issues have to some extent made the prosess of turning this handwritten document into a digitised diplomatic copy more difficult. A disproportionate amount of time has been spent in the cumbersome making of the desired transcription layout. However the time spent was worthwhile, as the finished product has been given a ‘satisfactory appearance’, furthermore the process proved to be both interesting as well as instructive.

First of all the standard thesis margins do not enable an accurate representation of all the folios in the manuscript. In medieval manuscripts the margins employed for rectos and versos have different measures – a feature found also in the layout of modern books. The left hand margin is wider on the verso while the left hand margin on the recto is narrower, the opposite for right hand margins (verso: narrow margin and recto: wide margin).

On the first folios of the cookery section marginalia have been added. This feature is present on ff. 6v-9v, whereas from folio 10r onwards marginalia are completely absent. The marginalia consist of a repetition of the recipe headings found in mid-position on top of each recipe. Marginalia occur in the right hand margins on the rectos and in the left hand margins on the versos. In the transcription the marginalia have been placed in more or less the same positions as in the MS, even though this means a breach with the regular norms for thesis layout. The purpose of marginalia on these few folios is a bit unclear, as they only repeat the headings, thus carrying no particular meaning. Nonetheless it was concidered important enough to be represented in a dipomatic manner in the transcription, as this scribal variation may indicate the presence of one more hand.
In particular due to the presence of marginalia, the layout of the MS Sloane 442 does not conform to thesis requirements, the standard margins are simply too wide. To amend this situation, margins have been ‘tampered’ with to a certain degree, so that the ‘written on’ surface has in fact been enlarged both in width and height on all four sides on some folios. However this has been done with utmost care and in the smallest scale possible. From f.10r onwards marginalia are completely absent, by which at least the right and left hand margin dilemma is eliminated.

Making a three column table with invisible lines, has enabled a correct placement of left and right hand marginalia. In addition this three column system also enabled the marking of each page with folio number (left column) and line number (right column) in the margins. Placing folio numbers in the margins, ‘saved’ one line on each folio.

Another challenge concerning layout was hidden in the blank lines in between the recipes. The number of recipes on each folio in fact varies from one to five recipes. Adding the blank lines in between recipes, the variation in number of lines becomes quite significant. This is problematic if the goal is to represent a completely diplomatic copy of the manuscript that includes all blank lines, because there will be too many lines. To compensate for the lack of physical space, the original extra spacing in between recipes has been eliminated, for the sake of keeping within the norm when possible. The aim is of course to stick with the formal thesis requirements in regard to layout and only break the rules when it is absolutely necessary. Still on some folios it was inevitable that also the top/bottom margins had to be reduced some millimetres.

Line spacing in the MS is not in accordance with modern standards, thus constituting a slight problem as it also affects the layout. For instance single spacing or no space at all is frequently used between the last line of a recipe and the heading of the succeeding one, whereas double spacing is used between the heading and its recipe body – which is rather contrary to modern standards. It has been regarded as less important to represent a fully diplomatic line spacing, whereupon line spacing in the transcription has been adapted to suit the formal requirements (margins), thus a compromise was reached so that formalities and diplomacy are united.

In addition to the irregular line spacing (compared to present standards), there is the presence of the extra large capitals that may descend more than one line. The large capitals occur mostly in the initial word of a heading as well as in the first word of the recipe body. A diplomatic representation of this feature would corrupt the line spacing, so in this respect the actual letter size cannot be employed. Particularly large, embellished capitals are nevertheless
represented by a change of script and the use of bold writing (all letters in the transcription then follow the ‘one size fits all principle’), so that these capitals differ from the others without disturbing the regular line spacing (see also 5.1.5). Transferring the original layout to the transcribed text in the most accurate manner is thus as good as accomplished. The transcription has, as far as possible, been produced with the same layout as the original MS.

6.3 Abbreviations, Curtailments, Superscript, Macrons, and Otiose Strokes

Medieval scribes made use of various strokes or signs – the MS Sloane 442 also contains these features, all of them are represented in the transcription in some way, and the following sections will explain and give account for the editorial conventions. Compared to Latin manuscripts, English vernacular manuscripts are ‘nicer’ to the reader in the sense that the scribes made use of fewer abbreviations and curtailments. The MS Sloane 442 only includes a handful, making the decoding process less cumbersome. The abbreviations and curtailments are relatively easily distinguished, leaving relatively little doubt about the scribal intention, by consequence they have all been expanded, thus taking the advice of Petti (1977: 35). The different abbreviations are accounted for, and illustrated with examples from the MS Sloane 442. However the superscript has been retained, as the making of a diplomatic edition justifies the keeping of superscript as it appears in the MS.

Letters written in superscript in the MS are transcribed as such without any expansions. Abbreviations like wí (with), þe (the), þat (that), and þu (thou) have a high frequency in the MS. A common feature like this is easily understood by the present day reader, with some knowledge of Middle English, thus an expansion of these seems unnecessary. Invariably ‘þo’ occurs instead of ‘do’, however this was common in the late medieval period, consequently also this feature is retained in the transcription. (see LALME LP Essex 6021).

1: (7r) 2: (10v) 3: (21v) 4: 21(v) 5: (21v) 6: (19v) 7: (24r)

The frequently used Tironian nota represents the Latin et i.e. the conjunction and (Petti 1977:23). These images show that the execution of the sign varies, in which the third and last examples are actually the only ones that are found in Petti’s description (or Graham and Clemens for that matter). The other variants are not depicted – however there is no doubt that they are just as much Tironian signs as number three and seven. These are represented in the
transcription by their modern equivalent ‘&’, which prevents any confusion with the cases where the scribe has spelled out ‘and’ in full – moreover it is regarded as the most diplomatic representation.

The function of curtailments is ‘to shorten the end of a word by one or more letters’ (Petti 1977: 22). According to Petti these word-final curtailments of ‘spic’, ‘almond’, and ‘wort’ represent es in most English manuscripts after the fifteenth century, ‘though very occasionally signifies simply s’ (Petti 1977: 23). Also in the MEST Project’s list for ‘Transcription of suspension and contraction marks’ this sign is expanded with es. The scribal intention of this sign in the MS is without doubt to indicate a plural ending, thus this curtailment (always in word-final position) is represented by ‘es’ written in italics (es), as in the three examples cited; spices, almonds, and wortes.

A horizontal bar across the desender of the letter p represents an abbreviation of er/re or ar – depending on which word it appears in. The transcription employs the expansion, so that the two examples read ‘tempery’t and ‘parboyle’.

This abbreviation or breviograph always represents –ur, and is consistently expanded as ur in the transcription (sugur and colour) thus following the guidelines of both MEST and Petti. Despite consistency in editorial actions, the scribal actions are not as consistent, which the next brevigaph is an example of. Obviously there is a slight confusion between the –ur and the –er breviographs/abbreviations. The transcription consistently accounts for all original spellings, thus avoiding amendments and normalisations.

These are examples of the –er/re/ri breviograph, also consistently expanded by er and re (ri) in the transcription. ‘Suger’ and ‘presse it þer-in’ are typical examples of the use. The third example of ri as in primerole (6r), however this is not a very common feature in English according to Petti (1977: 24), in fact this is the only example of its kind in MS Sloane 442. The example of suger also shows the scribal variation or the er/ur confusion, as ‘suger’ occurs with two different breviographs. However this does not represent anything unique in the sense that it merely reflects the fact that written English in this period was not yet standardised, and (Norman) scribes ‘spelt the
language as they heard it’ (Barber et al. 2009: 161). When to use *er* or *re* is understood from the context. Any scribal inconsistencies in abbreviations are retained in the transcription.

(7r) A slant descending stroke from top of the ‘s’ crossing over to the left ending i a curl to the right represents an abbreviation of *er*, like the example of ‘serve’ – found in a majority of the recipes in which they ‘round off’ by some variation of ‘serve them/him/it forth’.

(16v) Frequently ‘r’ in word-final position has an upwards curl towards the left ending in a downwards curl, like the example of f.16v shows. Visually it is at times very similar to the *er/re* breviograph, however the editorial decision is not to treat them in the same way, obviously there is a significant difference between the two. According to Petti (1977:24) this ‘curled r’ represents *re*. Though there is a clear difference (visually) between the regular long r and the long r with an extra backwards curl attached to it, this feature is signalled in the transcription by the apostrophe (’) only. Despite Petti’s suggestion to retain this feature, it is regarded as more adequate to transcribe the curl with the apostrophe – as there is some doubt connected to the scribal intention of the squiggle. The example of f.16v shows the long r with a curl, which could mean ‘fye re’ – however the same word occurs on many other occasions with absolutely no curl on the r – fyer, consequently the apostrophe is used because it will not corrupt the scribal intention. On the other hand, there are examples that adds to the confusion about scribal intention, such as these two examples taken from the same recipe on f.7v.

The heading reads *Blaunche porre* and the marginalia reads *Blaunche porr’* – one could easily argue that the latter was most probably meant to be porre with a final ‘e’ as in the heading (see Petti 1977:24). Also those who are familiar with the Norwegian language would immediately see the resemblance with the Norwegian word for leeks *purre* and the *porre* in the manuscript (‘porrum’, however is the Latin form, which is more likely the origin of ‘porre’). In the manuscript *porre* and *lekys* (from the Germanic ‘leek’) are used interchangeably, with the same etymological meaning. The recipe on f.7v actually names porre/porr in the heading and marginalia, whereas the body of the recipe refers to the ‘qwythe of lekys’. This might seem a bit confusing, however in regard to the potentially missing ‘e’, the apostrophe has been employed to mark this, thus following the same procedure as for the other final strokes/otiose strokes (as in the above example).
These two supralinear signs/suspension marks shaped like an open ‘a’ are identical. However the first is an abbreviation of –ua whereas the second represents –re. Slightly confusing, but according to the MEST transcription guidelines and Petti (1977: this sign or suspension always represents –ua after q, and –ra in other combinations. The two examples thus read qualyng and gratyd in the transcription, both representing a consistent use (see also Clemens and Graham 2007:89-93).

A macron above the word can be a contraction that refers to an omitted letter in the middle of the word (Honkapoja 2013:2.2). Macrons may at a first glance seem somewhat confusing, as the use appears slightly haphazard. However a meticulous study of the same words with or without macrons (those that are spelled out) shows that the use of them is rather consistent – the inconsistency lies more in the frequency – sometimes the word is spelled out, sometimes a macron is used instead, a fact that actually facilitates the interpretation of them. Macrons represent ‘n’ (n), ‘m’ (m), or ‘ne’ (ne). The above examples (pyne, thanne, temperyt, and Swymme) are all represented in the manuscript both with macrons and without them – thus the use of the macron can be verified against the words that are spelled out in full. Whether to use ‘m’ or ‘n’ should be understood from the contexts.

A macron represents a nasal (m/n/ne), however there are lots of instances of macron-looking strokes with no obvious function – these are called otiose strokes. In the transcription they are represented by the apostrophe ’ (ažen’). This example shows an otiose stroke detached from the word-final letter, which obviously carries no lexical meaning.

A curl or otiose stroke is frequently attached to word final letters, as shown in the example – also marked with the apostrophe (moton’) in the transcription. Though otiose strokes and macrons are look-alikes, the context usually reveals whether it is a stroke of embellishment or if it is meant to represent an abbreviation. By consequence the editorial choice is to mark final curls of this kind with the ’ (apostrophe) in the transcription. There is no doubt that the word ‘moton’ needs no extra letter, nor does ‘ažen’. Most word-final strokes, as shown in these two examples, are marked with the apostrophe because they have no lexical function.
Here is one example of how the scribe solves the ‘minim problem’, by making a curl at the beginning of a letter. This stroke looks like an inverted macron – the word reads ‘ín’ in the transcription (i.e. the stroke represents the dot over the i), and can be compared to the next example.

Here the macron probably represents the dot over the ‘i’, and appears as ‘ín’ in the transcription. Macrons were frequently employed to reduce the ‘minim problem’. However as a rule all extra curls attached to letters, carrying no lexical meaning, whether in mid- or final position, are marked with the apostrophe. It appears on occasions in the MS that ‘in’ is spelled ‘inne’ – so strictly speaking this macron might represent –ne, however to avoid any confusion the transcription will have to do with ‘ín’.

Petti (1977: 27) refers to the ‘diacritic’ – the ‘oblique hairline resembling a short virgule which was placed over i to distinguish it from other minims’ thus serving the same function as some of the macrons above. The hand on ff.23r-25v employs this sign also above the ‘y’ for some reason. This feature is however not retained in any way in the transcription for the ‘y’, as the word programme was not very cooperative on the part of this letter in combination with the accent (’). The diacritic above the ‘i’ is marked in the same way as above ‘i’.

6.4 Punctuation and Special Signs

Punctuation carried less importance in the medieval text compared to the significance of punctuation in modern texts. The most commonly used punctuation mark in the MS Sloane 442 is the punctus (.) – however this punctuation mark is not fully comparable to its modern equivalent the ‘full stop’. Punctus is employed on the occasions where ingredients are listed – signalling a pause, but it is also to signal a full stop. Whether the punctus occurs on the baseline, in mid-position, or in elevated position appears to be rather inconsistent, also the size of the dot varies, whether this apparently inconsistent use is intentional or not is hard to tell. One can understand why Petti (1977: 25) finds medieval punctuation confusing at times. The fact that punctus (.) occurs in various positions, rather haphazardly distributed, makes the job of defining its position vis à vis the baseline rather cumbersome. By consequence the editorial decision stranded on disregarding its position and placing all variants of the punctus on the baseline.
The punctus occurs with larger spacing in the MS – i.e. not immediately after the preceeding letter, but with a blank space in between. This particular feature however has been retained in the transcription. Also the virgule (/) occurs with larger spacing in the manuscript, by consequence both punctus and virgule appear with spacing on both sides, in concord with their respective representations in the manuscript, contrary to modern punctuation, which leaves no space between the punctuation mark and the preceding word/letter. The punctus is also used to ‘enclose numerals’ as in . ììj . (Petti 1977: 26)

The manuscript contains some special signs that probably carry no particular meaning other than being embellishments. These are represented by symbols regarded as relatively close look-alikes found in the list of advanced symbols in the Word programme. The following three symbols are employed in the transcription: ‘ζ’, ‘∼’, and ‘ς’.

6.5 Capitals, Headings, and Underlining

Medieval manuscripts are often embellished in some way, most commonly by means of enlarged, embellished capitals. Extra large capitals with lots of curlicues, typically marked the beginning of a new section. These looked like beautiful ornaments in some manuscripts, very often embellished with ink in different colours (blue and red were a lot more expensive to produce) as well as highlighting made from gold leaves. Usually the scribe would leave open spaces in the manuscript so that the illuminator or rubricator to do this job (Clemens and Graham 2007: 25). Typically the scribe would leave enough space at the beginning of the chapter, section or a new page for the illuminator/rubricator to make the beautiful large capital that stood out from the rest of the text.

The capitals in this recipe collection are both enlarged and embellished to a certain extent, however they are all produced by the scribes themselves, without the assistance of any illuminator/rubricator. The fact that some capitals are larger than the other letters, and consist of some extra curls and swirls, makes the job of representing them in modern typeface more challenging. Enlarged capitals will corrupt the line spacing since they often both dip below the baseline as well as stretch above the top of a standard line. As one has to be economical with space, no spacious lines can be allowed for the sake of representing this feature. Nevertheless the capitals that are typically ’embroidered’ and enlarged, are discreetly marked in bold with Lucida Blackletter typeface to signal this feature, thus maintaining the regular line spacing. Lucida Blackletter represents a typeface that to a certain degree imitates the image of the curled enlarged capitals. This particular typeface has been used only for the
capitals that are extra large, dipping below the baseline.

There is also the noteworthy use of the double ‘ff’ in the MS instead of a capital F. Thus ‘ff’ functions as a capital, and the use is regarded as consistent – other variants of this ‘capital’ is absent. Petti argues for keeping this feature in a diplomatic transcription, thus all cases of ‘ff’ are retained, represented in the transcription by \textit{ff} in the same Lucida Blackletter. On one occasion (f.9v) double f occurs in the middle of a sentence, clearly not a capital, however the first of them is weak in colour, and the whole incident could be seen as a scribal error. Another feature is the capital I/J that Petti advises to transcribe uniformly as I (Petti 1977: 35), which has been done in this transcription.

Most recipe headings are underlined, thus facilitating a quick scan for a particular recipe. Why some are not underlined could perhaps be explained by the deterioration of the MS and the fact that some lines may have faded away with ageing. Otherwise the scribe(s) may have forgotten to underline some of the headings, though it is most likely a result of fading. Underlining is represented in the transcription in concordance with the manuscript (thus inconsistent) in order to stick to the diplomatic conventions.

6.6 Variation in Letter Shape

Some letters are represented in more than one way in the MS. The transcription will make no distinction between the most frequently used single-compartment ‘a’ and the more sparingly used double-compartment ‘a’. The latter is the one used for capitals and invariably in word-initial position, otherwise hardly ever seen in mid-position. The ‘s’ comes in three different shapes. The long\textsuperscript{28} ‘s’ usually occurs in front and mid-position, leaving the round ‘s’, usually referred to as 6-shaped or sigma ‘s’ (may be confused with ‘o’), and the kidney shaped ‘s’ to word-final positions, though variation may occur. It is too complicated to signal the variation in letter shapes, by consequence the transcription does not treat the variations of ‘s’ and ‘g’ any differently either. For the most part the ‘g’ is of the closed type, whereas the occurrences of the 8-shaped or closed ‘g’ are very rare.

V-shaped ‘r’ and long ‘r’ both occur in the MS. The long ‘r’ is by far the most frequently used. There is no obvious system as to which position the scribe would use these two variants. For instance the word ‘creme’ appears with both v-shaped and long ‘r. By consequence the transcription employs the standard keyboard ‘r’, making no distinction

\textsuperscript{28} The term ‘long’ indicates that the desender dips below the baseline as in ‘g’ and ‘p’.
between the two variant letter shapes. It is regarded as appropriate that these four letters ‘a’, ‘s’, ‘g’, and ‘r’ thus be represented by only one character each, without interrupting with the scribal intentions – if there were any. In this context it is most likely that a letter shape in itself does not carry any meaning.

Other letter shapes may also vary, however not in the distinct manner as these examples. Nevertheless, it is worth noticing the rather consistent u/v-feature, with the use of ‘u’ in mid-position and ‘v’ in front-position, which affects the transcription. In medieval manuscripts the letters ‘u’ and ‘v’ are used interchangeably. The transcription retains the feature as it appears in the manuscript. By consequence words like never, serve, up, and put are true to the MS, thus the transcription reads neuer, serue, vp, and put.

An equally interesting feature is the way the thorn character and ‘d’ are used interchangeably. There may seem to be some confusion around the use of these two. The scribe uses thorn where one would expect ‘d’ and vice versa. Examples from the MS are words like þo (do), þyschs (dishes), and to-gedur (together). This feature is, however on terms with the LALME description of the LP 6021 Essex, which denotes the use of etymological þ and þ/þ for etymological d (eLALME).

6.7 Crossed-out Words and Final  לעולם

Handwritten documents are not flawless, and the MS Sloane 442 is not unique – naturally some scribal errors occur here and there, some the scribe discovered and corrected himself – others are left for eternity. The scribe who made an error, would probably have the means to erase it by using pumice or in some other way scraping off mistakes/faulty bits, however the simplest method would be to cross out, which is the method used in the Sloane 442. Scribal errors appear in the transcription with a horizontal bar across the mid-section, thus copying the original. Incidents of ink clutter or illegible readings are commented on in footnotes.

Final double  לעולם frequently appears with a horizontal bar across the mid-section of the letters (eworld). This feature has been retained in the transcription. The bar most likely represents the omission of a final letter, most commonly -e, but possibly also -m or -n (Petti 1977: 22-23). However, the uncertainty of its function made this an easy editorial decision, whereby this appears in the transcription as eworld in bold, thus not to be confused with any other crossed-out letters (scribal errors). Interestingly on one occasion eworld is found in mid-position (on f.23r), but most likely this represents a scribal error, thus the incident has not been marked in bold.
6.8 Numerals, Symbols, and Special Characters

(16v) This is an example of numerals, it reads ‘two or three’ – transcribed as ‘íj . or . iij’. All numerals with the letter i are represented in the same manner (i), the last however always written as a j. Every folio in the recipe collection has been numbered on the recto in the upper right hand corner, however this feature is not represented in the transcription, it is regarded as a feature that might have been added at a later stage. However, on folio 3r the Arabic numeral ‘2’ occurs three times in the mention of ‘þ² 2e cowrs’ (the 2nd course). This folio has not been included in the transcription as does not contain recipes – however it has been included in Appendix 1, because it lists three different menus.

Both the yogh <ʒ> and the thorn <þ> characters have been retained in the transcription, securing the most diplomatic representation and not obscuring the scribal intentions, as shown above in the four examples of ažen’, zolkys, þ’, per-in. <þ> would normally represent the modern ‘th’, but is invariably used in the MS in places where one would expect to find ‘d’ (see 6.3), constituting an adequate reason for retaining it. The use of <ʒ> varies too, as ažen’ (again) and zolkys (yolks) show.

6.9 Word Division

Some words are divided into two (or even three) parts in the MS, though they are thought of as one word, at least in modern English. Examples of these are ‘to geþur’ and ‘a way. These are hyphenated in the transcription (to-geþur, a-way), thus indicating that they are considered as one word, though written as two (or three) in the MS. Moreover some word divisions in the MS that are due to line shifts, the scribes have left without any hyphenation. This feature is represented by a regular word-division in the transcription (with a simple hyphen (-)), as in modern English. In some of the cases of word-divisions occuring on two lines, the scribe has actually put in a hyphen – which looks like a slanted equal sign, which is retained as an equal sign (=) in the transcription, signalling that it is an original word division and not an editorial one. Nevertheless on the last ff. of the recipe collection scribal word divisions occur with only a single slanted line – however this is marked in the transcription by the same word division mark (=) as the other scribal ones.
Take cawlys strepe hem fro þe stalkys and Bettes Borage
Auence, violete, Malowes, parcely, beteyne primerole
pacyens, wythe of leksys, cropyps of nettlys par boyle hem. And
ley hem on a bord, presse owt þe watur of hem. heu hem smale
And do þer-to otemele. then thake broth of congur, turbuth or
halybut, or Samon’. or other fressche fysche. do it in a potthe
wit þe forsaye herbys. whenne þe brothe ys at þe boylyng’
casth in þe herbys. boyle hem, vpp loke dey ben salt the
3yff þe lacke brothe / boyle elys. take hem vpp’ strypp’ þem fro
þe bonys. grynде it temperyt vp wit þe ssselff broth’. do all
to-geþur in a potthe. And make vp þe wortys a-for-say þe
Also þe may 3yff þe willt. whessche moskelys. set hem ar on’
þe fyyr’. do to hem as Moche watur as dey may Swymme ynne.
boyle hem tyl dey opyn’, then powr owt þe broth trow þa
stray’nowur. pyke owt þe moskyl. grynде hem tempere hem wit
þe selff broth’. set þe herbys ouyr þe fyyr’. boyle hem, when
dey ben boylyd ynowe. put to hem þe drawyn’ moskelys & salt
þe mayst if þe wilt. drawe pesyn’ throw’ a streynour. and make vp
dy wortys wit fryar’ watur. put þer-to clene oyle þat be fryyd
ynne be-forr’. and in þe boylyng’ alye hem vp wit pesen drawen’
be-foryn’. but lat noon’ otemele come þer-ynne. þe mayst 3yff
þe wilthe par boyle wythe of leksys. presse owt þe watur heu hem
smalle. then take canabens1 and fayre watur. set hem on þe
fyyr’. whenne they boyle do yn þe whythe of leksys. lat noon’–
othemele come þer-ynne salt hem and serve hem forth’

Or To make canabens.

Take fayre withe benys lay hem in reynyg’ watur too days
chawnge þe water. take hem vp lay hem drye. thanne

1 The fourth character (which is illegible) is crossed out and replaced by a supercript ‘a’.
Canabens.  
Take canabens, whessche hem, or ʒyff þu wilt strepe hem a littył and make hem vp' wit melke of almondes and put þer-to sugyr and salt. And owt of lentyn' do þer-to kow melke & buttur claryfyed & sugyr and salt & serue hem forth'.

Canabens wit bacon'
Do swethe broth in a pothe. & wassche þe canabens clene & do þer-to. boyle it vp do no oþur lycour der-tho loke þey be salt and serue hem forthe. And take rybbys of bacon' boyle it do a-way de skynne ley hem in a other dysche. & serue it fort as þu seruyst venyson' wit formente.

Buttyrd wortys.
*Take almaner of good herbys þ1 þu mayst gethe. pyke hem. swessche hem. parboyle hem. hew. hem. boyle hem vp in fayr' water. put þerto fayr' buttur claryfyd a gret quantyte. when dey ben boyled 1-nowg' salt hem. lat noon' othemele come þer-in. myce bred in smaII gobettes do it' in a dysche powr' wortes a-bouyn'.

Kaboches.
Take withe kaboches. kutthe hem fro þe stalkys. wessche hem clene. parboyle hem presse owt þe watur hew hem but a lytyl & in flessche tyme do broth of beeff in a potth or of caponyes. or of other good flesche. whenne it boyled do in þe kaboches

1 MS: ‘doit’ without word division
lentyn' foyles

Take þe same maner of herbis, as þe doyst to lowt' & oynownys clene paryd parboyle hem presse owt þe water do hem in a pott’. frye reysens in clere oyle þe hath be fryed inne befor’ & do þer-to. wit a party of the oyle. boyle hem vp w’ mylke of almond’. putt þer-to sugur & salt. & serue it forth'

Longe wortys.

Take þe same maner of herbis & boyle pesyn take hem fro þe fyer’. take owt þe clerysth & make hem vp þe same maner. saue þe sugur. & serue hem forth’.

Blanche porre.

Take thykke mylke of almond’ do hit in a potth’. parboyle þe qwythe of lekys tendyr’. presse owt þe water. hew hem grynde hem. tempyr hem wit þe same melke & do to-gedur wit sugur & salt. boyle it vp. ʒif þu wilt þe may hit wit payndemayn’. or wit crommys of qwythe brede drawn’ w’ þe same mylke. serue it forth wit salt ele ʒif þu haue hit.

Pome porr’

Boyle qwithe pesyn’. hole hem take hem’ fro þe fyer’. when’ þey haue rostleyd a whyle. take owt þe cleryst in-to a-nobur potthe. haue melke of almond’ I-drawn’ vp w’ whithe wyn’ fyges of al amalek sugyr’ & salt. & reysens fyrd a lyty ʒif þu wilt do to-gedur. boylit & seruyt forth’.

Gyngandr’.

Take þe hedys of hak fyssche a-lone ędzi þe sown’ dys
And þe luyer. do it in a pott’ to-gedur. make clene þe poke do it der-to. seed it in fyssche broth’. or fayr’ water tyl hit be tendyr’. thanne take it vp. lay it on’ a bord’ take a-way þe bonys. saue de fyssch’. dyse de luyer & þe sown’ ʒif þe

---

1 This is the only incident of the kind in these cookery recipes where forth is abbreviated with a stroke through the mid-section of the double ß. Otherwise it is spelled out.
& marybonys al to brokyn' boyle it vp . do þer-to safferan' & salt when' it1 ys boyled l-nowʒ . a-lye it vp wit gratyd breþe. lok þay chargeaunt of kaboches somdeþl & serue hem forthe

hare or powderyd goos in worteres

Do good broth of beeff . or of other good flessche & mary bonys in a pot seþe hit on’ þe fyr’ . choppe an har’ in pecys & put þer-to . ʒiff þu wilt whesche hym’ in þe same broth þu wilt boyle hym’ inne . & draw þe broth throwʒ a straynowur wit al þe bloþe. thenne take cawl’ and þe withe of lekys & other herbys & otemele . hew hem smalle to-

gehur. ʒif he ben an holde har’ boyle hym’. a good whyle ar þu castehe in þy worthys/. ʒyff it be a ʒong har’. castehe hym and þe wortys //im//to-gerät. or elys taka a gooss of a vyʒtys powderyngr’ choppe hym’ putt hym in þe wortes in þe same maner. & serue hym’ forthe .

Iowtys on flessche days/

Take parcellye and oþer good herbys parboyle hem’ well’ in water presse owt þe water. hew hem ryʒt smalle or grynde hem2 ʒif þu wilt . & þu may hew a lytyl fat porke & grynþ þer-w1 temper it vp w1 swethe broth. and hit þa be somdell’ chargeaunt of the herbys . do it in a pott . boyle it . And lie it vp þer-wit . And ʒif þu wilt þu myʒt draw breþe w’ som of the broth . & a-lie it vp a lityl þer-w1. salt hit & serue it forʒth’ w’ rybbys of bacon’ . or of fatt’ flessche ʒif þu wiltyth . And fyssche days . þu myʒt parboyle herbys And make hem’ vp in þe same maner wit broth of fresche fyssche or w’ elys w’ a dysch melke of almondes & sugur and salt & lat noon’ oþer licowur come þer-ynne . ~

1 MS: illegible
2 MS: ‘hym’ has been corrected to ‘hem’
3 A part of the word is missing.
pok be no3th tendur boyle it bettyr & do it to-gedur. Cut whithe bredb. tempere it wit þe same broth’ & wyn’. drawe a pyn lecour
putt it in a pothe. putth þer-to powdur of peper. gyngeuer & galynge & canell & a good colour of safferan’
set it on þe fyer. ster’ it wen’ it boylid. put in þe fyssch’
ster’ it soffth for brekyng’ þe fysch. seson it vp wit
powdur of gyngeuer. & a lityl venegur salt & lat it no mor’
boyle. / þe maysthy & þe wilt take þe sown’d. þe lyuer & þe poke
of þe coddlyng’ and makyd in þe same maner. ζ

ELYs in seroppe’.

ffle elys. choppe hem in colponys. do hem in a pot. þe þerto
oynown’ys & herbis hewen’-to-geþur. hole clowys & maceʒ
Inybyl & powdur of peper. powdur canelle a grett dell &
fayr’ water. draw a lyour of bred wit wyn’. do it to-gedur
sett it on’ þe fyer. steryt wen’ it ys colourd wit sawn’der’
seson’ it vp wit powdur of gyngeuer venegur and salt & lat
hit no more boyle. serue it ζ

PYkes & Elys in ballok broth’

Splat pikes schalþ hem sclyue hem. & culpn’ hem in a pot
put gret oynown’ys þe mynsyd & herbys þer-to. sesee¹ it vp
wit a liour’ of bred. put þer-to maceʒ and clowys. & powdur
of canell l-nowʒgh. & a lytyl safferan. put to hem stokkefisch
as moche as is þer-in of þe elys. lat þy pikes boyle in an esy
sawce. & serue hole pike for lordes. & quarterys of an oul pomys for
other men. lok þey ben sesownþ in keuþ. & put þy broth’
& þy stuffe a-boue vp-on’ þy pykes. and serue hem forth.

¹ This probably ought to have been spelt ‘seson’.
Take whete clene pylyd in a mortyr, & clene fannyd, & seed hit tyl it be brokyn'. Thanna grynþ blanchid almondyd in a morter, & drawe þer-of a melke & boyle it tyl hit be resenabili thykke & tyl þy whethe be tendur, colour it wþ saffran' & lesche þy porpays whan' it is sodyn', and lay it in dischis be it-selff & serue it fort wit formynte'

Peletes' in sarcene.

Take fresch porke or moton' soden', tendur' pike owt þþ bonis' hew it. grynþ hit smalle in a morter. Tempere it vp wit eyryn' yn þþ gryndyng' & put þer-yyn peper an'ð saffran and salt. take fresch broth, clene tryed, sett it to þþ fyer in a large vesce hit boyle. & seson' it vp wit þþ same colour. thanne make smale rowuþ bað, put hem in þþ boylyng' broth'. & lete hem boyle þer tyl dey ben I-nowg. thanne take hem vp & lete hem þrye', & lat þy broth kele. blow of þþ fathe. tak almond' wesche hem temper hem wit þþ same broth'. & draw þer-of a keup melke. put þy mylke in a swete potth. set hit vp on' þþ fyer', put þer-in powdur of peper & cane & a por=cyowun of sawnþper. to make a sarcene colour, loke þþ most of þþ colour be of þþ owyn' keup. putt in clowys mace þ resens of corans. lat it boyle as þþ seisth þþ good ys. 3if hit be to thykk. a-lay it wit swete wyn'. put in sugur wan' þy spyces ben tendur. put in þy pelettes in þþ same bruet 3if hym' a talage of powdur gyngueuer and vergeous. And serue forth þþ pelett' wit þþ brueth.iiij. or .iiiij. in a dysch' as a potage for þþ secund cowurs

Tho make lussalle.
9r  Chake swethe broth of capons And elys. oþer broth of the besth’
þþ þþ may haue . sett hit vp on’ þþ fyer’ in a brodþþ vesceþþ. colour
it wit safferan’ . put sawge þþ-per-to . kuth it gret’ and salthe
brek eyryn’ . þraw hem throw a straynowur . temper gratyd bred w’ þyn’
eyryn’. loke thy broth’ be boyling’. putinne þyn’ eryn’ & thyn’ herbys
ben’ meddelyd to-gedur . when hit be-gynnyt to stewe . take
owt þy stykke and turne þyn’ crudþþ a-bowthe w’ a scomer . loke
dy fyer be not to hastyff’. when’ hit is throwþþ kuët take
it of the fyer’. and tunyr hyt a swyle . & serue it fort þ

Chho make lesche lardes of .iiij. colouris

Tak clene cow mylke . And puttyt in the yn .iiij. pottes and breke
to eyche a quantyte of eyren’. as þþ seith it ys to don’. colour on reþe
wit sawnderis . and a-nother wit safferan’ . And þþ thrydþþ w’
grene herbis. And put to eche of hem a porcon’ of clene lardþþ. loke
it be þþ fatthe of bacon’ wel l-soden . dyse hit small’. parte hit
in .iiij. potter . put to salth’. boyle hem wel alle .iiij. at onys
stere hem wel for brennyg’ in þþ boyling’. and in þþ boyling’
take hem down’. casthe hem in a cloth . eche of hem a-boue óþur
and wynþþ thy cloth to-gedur. and presse owt all þe lus . thenne
take hem owt all hole . take hem owt al hole . make leches
.iij. or .iiiij. in a dysch’ & serue hem forth

Chho make nombel of a der’

Chake þþ nombel of a der’. and þþ be blodþþ þþ-wit parboyle hem
in fresche broth’. thenne take hem vp . scaldþþ brown’ crustys
of breþþ in þþ same broth . thanne kutthe þyn’ nombel smal
And putthe hem in a potthe to þþ same broth’ tryed trowþþ
a straynowur . lathe hem boyle well . draw þy colour . seson’ it vp
þþ-wit þþ it be ken-þþly rennyg’. do þþ-per peper kaneþþ & óþur powdur
and tempere hit wit whythe wyn’. & put to dy nombel . loke þy colour
stonh be þy canell. sesoon it wit salt and serve it forth'

Gruell enforsyd

Chake marybonys and freshe b'eff’. And make a good grue þ. than’
draw it þorwʒ a straynour. þen take fayr’ porke tendur soden. þo
a-way þe skynne. And pyke owthe þe bonys. And synuys. grynþ
it smal in a morter. And temper it wit þe same gruel þ is þrawe
make it smoth. lat it stonþ resenably by þe flesche. seson
it vp wit safferon’ and salt. þanne set it be þe fyyr’ and lathe it
boyle & serve it forthe

Chaudrown’ of Sawmon’.

Take þe drawþe of þe sawmon. make it as clene as þu may. do it
yn a pot and al þe blood of þe sawmon1 þer-wþ boyle it þi it be ryʒt
tenbur soden in broth of þe same fysche. take it vp & hewe it small
3if it be a femal grynþ þe spawne. do it togedur to þe brothe. draw
a lyour of whythe breðþ. wit whynne. do þer-to powþur of peper canel
And set it on þe fyer’. when it boylyt ster’ it. seson’ it vp wit powður
of gyngeuer. vynegur. salt & saffron’. þu may serve it fort in-stþe of
potage. or ell sauce for sawaw sawmon.

Cokkys of kyllyng /

Chake cokkes of kyllyng. kut hem smalle. do hem in a broth of
ff rysche sawmon. boyle hem wel. do to hem melke of almþ’. And
bredþ drawyn. colour it wit safferon’ sawnderys and suger powður of
peper and serve it forth And oþur fysche a mong as turbut pyke or
sawmon chopping and hewyn’. And seson it vp wit wyn’ vynegur
and salt

Lesche puen’/

Chake mylke of almondy temper it wit whythe wyn’ & water. take
parci þ and oynyons. cut it. & þo þer-to eles chopping and boylyd. and
þe wyn’ safferon’ and hole peper & hole clawys. & seson’ it vp wit
powderys & salt/ ffyleʒ in galentyne.

1 Ink cluttering in the MS obscures the legibility slightly, the most obvious reading is however ‘sawmon’.
Take þe brestys of Rybbys of porke fle of þe scykne. þo þe flesche on’ a broche. rest it tyll it it be al-mosth Inowȝgn. take it of choppe it on’ pecis do it in a potthe wit oynownys cut gret. hole clowys maces quibibs do to-gedur and a quantite of swethe broȝth. draw a liowur of paryng of crustes of whythe bredþe wit good wyng wyn’ & a litil blodþe a-ley it a lytly. and þo þer-to powdur of peper a litil. & canel a good quantite sette it on þe fyrr’ ster’ it. when’ it is boyled I-nowȝg’ loke it be nowȝth chargeant. seson’ it vp wit powdur of gynger vynegur and salt/ & Nombeles of porpays or of oþur fysch’ Parboyle nombeles of porpays. & ʒif þu whilth some of þe fisch cut it smal put it in a pot. draw alyour of crustes. wit þe same broth & a quantite of þe blood & red wyn’. do it to gedur in a pot wit1 powdur of peper clowys2 & canel boyle it vp. ster’ it. seson’ it vp wit powdur gynger vyneger and salt/ Make nombeles of venyson’ in þe same maner. and make nombeles of congyr codlyng & oþur good fysch in þe same maner. . Porpays in galentyne/. Take porpays þo away þe skynne. cut it in smale leschis. no mor’ þen þy fyngur or lasse take bred drawyn’ wit red wyn’ & put þer-to powdur of canell. & powdur of peper. boyle it. seson’ it vp wit powdur of gynger vyneger and salt. & ʒeue it a colour of safferon’ Porpays or venyson’ in broȝth’. Take þe skyn’ of porpays. & mor’ of þe fisch. ʒif þu wilt chopp’ it in peces. wit oynownys and herbis cut gret. hole clowys maces powdur of peper & of canell. þe it in a pot to-gedur wit fayr’ watur or wit broth of fisch. and a party of wyn’. boyle it vp. ʒif þe fysch be good. it wil a lye it self. or ellys drwe’ a lyour of crustes. & powdur of gynger and salt. Make venyson’ in broth in þe same maner.

hare yn Cyueς.

Smythe an hare in sm’le peces parboyle hym’ in swete broth wit þowyn’ blood. cast hym’ in cold’ water pyke hym’ vp clene. do hym’

1 MS: ‘wtt’ with a macron above the middle t, indicates a correction to ‘wit’.
2 Partly illegible, though ‘clowys’ seems to be the right word judging from the context.
in a pot. clarifye þe broþth. do þer to oynownys & herbis mysyd

take hole clawys maces & powderis. and drawe a dyn’ lyour of crustes
wþ red wyn’ do to-gedur. boyle it þe it be I-now3gh. seson it vp
wit powdur of gynger. vynegur and salt. lathe it haue a colour
of þe blood

. þare yn paapelade./

Take an hare hew hym’ in pecis. parboyle hym in water. clarifye
þe brothe. put it to þe flesch. boyle it. seson’ it vppe wþ dowce
powdur & salt. take lecssyng’ of past frydþe or wafferys cowche
hem in þychys. & dresse þe sewe a-boue

. þare in talbot/

Þew an hare in peces. parboyle hem in good broth wþ his blood
trye þe flesch in-to a pott grynþe almondes vn-blanchyd. temper
hem vpp’ wit þe same broth. drawe þe mylke. & þo þer-to oynown’ys
parboylid. & hole spyces & powdur fort seson’ it vp wit powdur & salt
& a quantithe of wyn’ & a lytil sugur

. Conynes’ in graue ./

Þarboyle conynes’ in good broth. take hem vppe. smythe hem
in peces. kepe hem clene. do hem in a potte. & hole clawys
maces. & oynownys cut sumdel gret. & powdur. & blanchyd almonþe
grynde hem drawe hem wit þe same broth. & þykke mylke
& þo to-gedur & whythe sugur. boyle it. loke it be salt. messe it
forth. cast þer-on a dragge clawys maces & myncyd gynger &
blanche powþur & serue it forth

. Conynes in cyve.

Take conynes choppe hem in peces þo hem in a pott take oynownys
& good herbis. chopp þe to-gedur boyle hem vp in swethe broth
þe þer-to powdur of peper. make a lyour of paryng of crustes of whithe
bred drawn wit wyn’. and lytyl þe-blood. a-lye it vp butt
a lytil. do þer-to powdur of canel a gret del. seson’ it vp witþ’
powdur of gynger vynegur & salt/
Conynes ynne clere Broth

Choppe’ conynes in peces . washe hem clene . þo hem in a potthe . do þer to clene broth and wyn’ . boyle hem tyl þey be Inowȝg . loke þi it haue nowȝt moche of þe broth . seson’ it vp wit powdur of gynger a gret quantite and veriows drawe it drowȝg a straynour . salt it & servue it forth

./ Oystris in grave . /

Schele oystrys in-to a pot wit þe sewe þ[..]1 put þer-to fayre water parboyle hem take hem vp . þo hem in fayr’ water . pyke hem clene blanche almondes grynþ hem temper hem vp wit þe same broth draw vp a good mylke . do it in a pott wit oynowns & hothe spices al hole . & a lytyll powdur & sugyr . boyle it vp to Gedur . do þe oystris þer-to . & servue hem forth . & cast þer-to ȝowur drage. and hole spyces a-bovyn . and blanchyd powdur .

./ Oystris in ceue .


Boyle chekenes in good broth’ . reyse þe þyes & þe wyngys & þe broth’ . take melke of almondes vnblanchyd . drawyn vp wþ þe same broth’ . & powdur of canell drawyn’ wyt a party of wyn’ . do þer to sugur saffron’ & salt / do alle in a pott . set it on þe fyer . ster’ it when it boyled seson’ it vp wit powdur of gynger and vergeous . lay þe chekenys hoot in a dische . haue ȝolkes of eyryn’ Isodyn’ hardes & fryde a’ lytiill & cowche on a-bouyn’ þe wynges and þe þyes .

Cretney

Tchake brawn’ of caponyss & of oþur good fowlys parboyle it dyse it cast it in a poot wit cow mylke . boyle it þer-wyt /take payn’ demayen . draw it wit sowr’ of þe mylke . & put to-Gedur . take sodyn’ eyryn’ . hew þe whyte cast þer-to . seson’ it vp wit powdur . sugur . saffron’ & salt And a-lye it vpp’ wit þolks of eyryn’ sodyn’ hard . frye hem a lytyll lay hem in dischys powwr’ þe sewe a bouyn’ & florysche it wit anneys in confyyt Capownys’ in concceys

1 Illegible, probably an attempt to write put since this word follows directly after.
Take capons halff rostyd do hem in a pot put þer-to swete broth'
And a party of red wyn’ . steu it vp to-gedur þ it be I-nowgh trye
þ broth . 3yff þ wyth þ may draw þer-to a lytyl lyour of paynemayn’
And dyryn sodyn’ hard . hew þ whyte þo þer-to . wit sugur saffron’ &
salt . set it on þe fyer . when it boyl yt vp wit 3olkys
of eyryn’ . loke þ it be rennyng/ seson’ it vp wit powdur of gynger
a gret dël And vergeous . reyse þe þes And þe wyngys & þe
brestys þhay hang by bay hem hot in dischys plante hem wit
hard 3olkys of eyryn’ & powdur a-bouyn’ /

. Chekenys in cawde

Chake chenys1 parboyle hem in good lycour tyl dey ben Inogh’. colour þ
broth’ with saffron’ . take vp de chekenys . ryeþe þe þyes . þ wynges and
þe brestys . a-lay þ broth wit 3olkys of eyryn’ in maner of cawdel seson’
it vp wit sugur & salt . chowche þ chekenys in dyschis & dresse þ
sew a-bouyn’ & strowe on powdur of gynger & serue it forth’ .

. Soupes

Take mary & do it in a pot . wt hony powdur of peper gynger and cane
And a lytyl ale with bred cut in scheues tost hem . cowche hem in dischis
loke þ syryp’ be salt . & haue a colour of saffron’ & powdur a bouyn’

Chaudon’ of veel .

Take þ bowelys of a calff make hem clene seþ hem in fresch’
broth’ cut hem smal . take powdur And wyn’ or vynegur’ . or ale . a lye
it wit bredþ . take past of flour of whete make peletes þer-of’ . frye
hem in grecce & put to gedur . . Chaudon’ of pygges feyth’

Chake swynys feyt elene scaldyd . And þ groyn’ & þ eerys
boylyd in fresch’ broth’ take hem vp cut2 hem smal do hem
in a pot trye þ broth’ drawe a dynne lyowur of whythe bred &
wyn’ . & put to-gedur & make a þyn’ foyle of pasth cut in smal peletes
frye hem . seson hem vp’ wit powdur of peper & salth . colour it wit saffron’
do þ peletys hot in dyschis & presse þ sew a-bouyn’

. Dowse . desyr’.

Blanche almondes grynde hem . drawe hem vp wit swete wyn’ . &
þiff þ w[...] wilt wit a party of swete broth’ þo it in a pot . do-þer to

---

1 Probably ought to have read ‘chekenys’.
2 The MS reads ‘cut’ twice.
a quantite of swete sugur þ is ryȝt whýthe. take porke or veel sodyn’ gynde it small. meddyll hit wit ȝolkes of eyryn’ powdye & salt / And make peletys of þe gretmesse of þ ȝolke of an ey. haue a batour of ȝolkes of eyryn’ & paryd floure. turne þe peletys þer-yne’. take hem’ vp frye hem. rolle hem in þe panne þey may be rownþ. layd hem hothe in dischis dresse þe sew a-bouyn’ loke þ it be ëyn rennyng’. And on fysche days þ make it in þe same manur wit pike haddoke or codlyng. & loke þy sew be wel colorwryd wit saffron’.

.Bruet of lombardye.

Chake hennys chekenys conynges. or òur good flesch’ soden & tryed do it in a pot do. þer-to mylke of almondes & peper a-lay it wit bred. & þo þer-to ȝolkys of eyryn’ harde growndyn’ & drawyn’ vp wit lus of parcellæ. þo þer-to a lytyl greece or a lytyl bottur clowfyed. or þe fatte of porke & seson it vp wit powdye salt & vynegur & make red as blod wit alkenet

.Bruet of almayne.

Take veel or porke choppyd in peces cast it in a pot. grynde almondes draw hem vp wit swete broth & put it to þe flesch’ boyle it. put þer-to powdye of peper & sugur. when it is boylyd þer-honde (nearhand), meaning ‘near in time’. The occasional mixing of ‘d’ and ‘þ’ made this difficult to interpret.

.Bruet of spayne.

. Chake flesche of a Roo. choppe it. parboyle it do it in a pot. take þe same broth & òur swethe broth drawyn’ durghe a straunour put it to þe flesche wit oynownys & erbis hol clowys macæ. boyle al to-gedur. seson’ it vp wit powdye & vynegur. 380

.Bruet Roo.

Cut venyson’ in longe lechis & frye hem or rost hem w þ powdye. whesc he hem wit wyn’. take sugur & melke of almondes clowes maces & quybylys boyle al to-gedur. seson’ it vp wit powdye & vynegur. 385

. This word should probably be nerhonde (nearhand), meaning ‘near in time’. The occasional mixing of ‘d’ and ‘þ’ made this difficult to interpret.

. Some illegible superscript scribbles has been added above the crossed out ‘wit’.
or elys wit whythe bred, drawyn’ w’ a lytyl of þe same broth’
& of þe same blod, colour it wit safferon’ do þer-to salt. powdur of peper
And oþur powdr’ of caneã þe mosthe del & serue it fort. & make
all oþur sewys in þe same maner al saue þe ostemen / boyle it
& serue it fort for pernpal
Chekenys’ in bruet/
Thake chekenys sodyn’ tendur & þe broth’ coldes & tryd do it
in a pot. drawe a lytyl lyour wit wyn’ & sugur & þe þer-to seson’
it vp w’ powdur of gynger verg’ous & canel þ is drawyn’ durwe
a straynour. & colour it wit safferon’.
Stewed lombard.
Thake porke rostyd & choppyd do it in a pot. do þer-to wyn’
sugur’ hole oynowunys clawys gynger saffron’ sawndrys & almondes
fryd. temper it vp wit wyn’ & powdur of gynger canel & wit
galentyne & colour it wit saffron’ & sawnderes cheff
An oþur stowyd lombard.
Grynde almondes drawe hem vp w’ swethe broth’ take veel
& porke. par’ it fro þe skynne. hewe it grynh’ it small
do þer-to mynsed datys. reysonys of corans & good powdur
make it in pelettes as grett as a plomme. sett þe melke on
þe fyuer’. ster’ it wel. when’ it boylyd cast in þe pelettes
lete it stewe vpp’ in fyr’ put þer to powder’ & salt. & serue
it forth’ in þe same maner.
Stewed coloppes.
Take coloppes of venson’. rost hem þo hem’ in a pott’
do wyn’ þer-to. hole spices & powdur of peper & canel. boyle it
vp wit powdur of gynger & powdur of peper & canel. boyle it
vp wit powdur of gynger & venegyr’ & serue it forth’
Bruet Tuskyne.
Take broh’ of & of mary-bonys’ & of oþur good flesch þo it
in a pot choppe’ chekenys in peces & erbis hole’ clowys
maces & powdur ’of peper. & þo to gedur & set it on’ þe fyuer. grynde
porke & veel rawe wit 30lkys of eyryn’ put þer to reysonys
of coran’s powdres & salt saffron’ meddyl it to gedur. And
when 3our pot boylyd make 3our stuff in peletes as grett heselnotys

1 Partly smudged MS: the most obvious reading is ‘hole’.
& cast hem in a-nouyn’ . in ḱe boylyng colour it wit ḱe ɪus of
saffron: parcely & opur good erbis boylyd vpp’ . put ḱer-to a lytyl wyn’
seson it vpp wit powdur of gynger & veneger & serue it forth’

Bruel¹ Sarçenes .
Thake venyson boyle it trye it po it in a pot . take almonḍe
mylke . drawyn’ vp wit ḱe same broth’ cast in oynownyns . alye
it vp wit flour of rys . & cast on clowys aftur’ ḱe boylyng take
it down’ . seson’ it vp wit powdrys & wyn’ & sugar & colour it w¹
alkenet/

Bruet of kyddes .
Take kyddes or veel . choppyd parboyle it & trie it do it in
a pot take melke of almondys . drawyn’ vp w¹ fresche broth’
do ḱer-to hole clowys . & a-lye it vp’ wit flour of ryys & ḱo g’te
/lists/bold
ṣer-in . And afftur ḱe boylyng seson it vp’ w¹ vynegyr & powdur
of peper . gynger & canel sugar & salt & serue it forth’

Blauche bruet
Take hennys or porke halff roystd & choppyd . do it in a pot
do almonde mylke ḱer-to . A-lye it vppe wit flour of rys / do ḱer-in a lytyl
broth’ of wyn’ & hole clowys and maces . seson’ it vp wit vyneger
& powderys / And a lytill sugar straynyd wit alkenet / .

Sauce sarçens . /
Make ḱykke mylke of almondes do it in a pot wit flour of ḱys . saffron’
gynger maces quybylys canel & sugar . rynse ḱe botteme of ḱe dyschis
wit fat broth’ . when ḱe seu ys boylyd . messe it fort . & stykke ḱer-
yn almondes fryed wit sugar
. Veel in bukinadd²

Choppe veel in peces . do it in a pot . do ḱer-to oynown’ys cut greet . & herbis
and good powderys . clowys maces sugar . saffron’ & salt . boyle it wit
a lytly swethe broth’ . afftur put ḱer-to cowen mylke . boyle it vp’ wit
ʒolkys of eyryn ’ . so ḱi’ it be rennyng & serue it forth’ . ḱu may
make it wit mylke of almondes . in ḱe same manner . & when’ it
is boylyd . seson’ it vp wit powdur of gynger & venegur .

³Puyuenade .
Thake mylke of almondes . drawyn’ wit swethe’ broth’ . do ḱer-to

¹ This is probably meant to read bruet instead, as bruel makes no sense here.
² One of the letters is illegible, most probably an ‘a’ thus ‘bukinaddde’.
pynnys a greet deel. take wardowunys & quynces & costard sodyn’ & grawdyn’
& drawyn þorwʒ a straynour. wit wyn’ and good powderis. do it to-gedur boyle
serve it fort as rennyng potage. kynde stued.

Take a kydde. zif þu willt þu may rest it a litil or ellys choppe’ it a lytyl
raw in peces do it in a pot. do þe-to oynonowunys herbys. & swethe broth’
and wyn’. & hohe hole clowys maces & powdur. & stue it to-gedur. seson’ it
vp wit sawce gynger or galentyn’. & wit a lytyl lyour of bredd. saffron’
& salt

. Stued’ partryche’.

Take partrych’ or wodecok. drawe’ wassche hem clene. stomp hem vp wit
hole clowys. chowche in a pot of herde. do-þer to datys cut gret. reysonys
of corans & wyn’. and as moche of swethe brothe & salt. stoppe þu pot
set it on’ a cole fyyre. when it is boylyd Inowʒ. seson’ it vp wit
powdur of gynger and vergeowus. & a lytil colour of saffron’ & serve it forth’

A losed beeff

Take lyre beeff. cut it in þynne leches lay hem on a bord. tak fat
of moton’ or of beeff. herbys and oynowunys hewyn’ to-gedur smal strowʒ
þe leche of beeff wit powdur of peper & a litil salt. þan’ strowyn’ on’
suett of þu erbys. & rolle vp þer-ynne. put hem on a broche rost hem
zif þu wilt þu may endor’ hem. & make hem a seruise. or eþu put hem
in wyn’ and so moche fresche broth’. & þo hem in a pot to-gedur. wit
hole clowys and maces. herbys & oynowynys hewyn’ smal & powdur
saffron’ and salt. a-lye it wit sauce gynger or galentyn’. stewe it to-
gedur & serve it forth’. /

ζ Pyke yn sauce.

Take pyke þyʒt hym and þe powche & þe fee. seeþ hem in halff
wyn’ & halff water. casth þer-to parcell and oynowunys mynced smal. lat
hem to-gedur. & seeþ a pyke in good pike sawce. and as he.
sepit blow of þe graue. & cast it to þe powche and fee. take pay./
=nemayn’. or tendur bred & cut it in manner of bruesse. tost it on’
a rost yryn’. þen’ mynce þe powche and þe fee. but fyorst boyle
sauce gynger wit þe powche & wit þe fee. to alye it wit ale.

cast þer-to
cast þer-to a gret quantite of al powdur gynger salt & saffron'. & good quantite of vergeowus. þan' cast þe bred in a cargeowur. & þe pyke a-bouyn', and cast þe sauce of þe powche & þe fee a-bouyn' vp-vn þe pike in þyschischis1 & serue it hoot //

Curbut tostyd yn Sauce.

Kyt away þe fynyys of curbut. & cut þe fysche in maner of an hastewth put it on a rowunde broche. whan it is halff rostyd. spryng on smal salt take vergeous or veneger. and wyn' powdur of gynger a lytil & cast þer-on in þe rostyg. and haue a vessel þer-vnþur. to kepe þe droppyd down. & cast it aþen' ouer. when' it is rostyd Inowg þe sauce & cast it on' þe fysch' in dyschis al hoot.

Sawmon’ Rostyd in Sauce.

Cut a samon’ in rownd peces rost hem on a rost iryn’. tak powdur cane & wyn’ draw it þorwg3 a straynour. mynce oynowunys smal. & þo togedur. boyle it. take veneger or vergeous. & powdur of gynger & salt do þerto lay þe samown’ in þischis. and powr’ þe syryp’ a-bouyn’

Brawn’ in Confythe.

Sede ffresche brawn’ tyl it be Inowg3’. pare it and grynde it in a morter. temper it wit melke of almondes drawyn’ þorwg3 a straynour in to a pot. do sugur þer-to Inowg3 & powdur of clowys. lat it boyle take flour of cane. or powdur of canel Inowg3 & þo þerto. & boyle it. þo þerto powdur of gynger. take it out of þe pot. do it in a lynnyn’ cloth & presse it þer in. þanne lethe it fayr’. but not to þynne’ take þe bar’ lylkys of a bor’. & schete hem endelangeris. thorwg3 þe leschis & serue hem fort a lesche in a dische.

Blawnchid brawn’.

Make a steff mylke of almondes blanchid. dyse þe brawn’ smal do it þerto in a pot wit sugur and salt. boyle it to-gedur. þi’it be Inowg3. lath it be dowcet. do it in a basyn’. las lat it stonde.

---

1 This is probably ‘dyschis’ misspelled - also þ is occasionally used instead of d.
lat it ston\textsuperscript{1} tyl it be cold'. & leche leche it so \textsuperscript{1} it be not tho thynne & serue it forth a leche or .ij. in a dische.

\textit{Leche L}umbard' . /

\textbf{Boyle datys in swete wyn'}. grynde hem \& drawe hem wit \textsuperscript{2} same wyn' . as chargeaunt as \textsuperscript{2} may \textsuperscript{2} hem in a pot \& sugur \textit{per-wit}. boyle it put \textit{per-to powd}ur of gynger \& cane\textbf{ll} a gret de\textbf{ll}. stere it well \textsuperscript{1} to-ged\textup{dur} . 3if it be not styff I-nogh . put \textit{per-to hard 3olkes of eyeryn'}. or gratyd bred . or 3if \textsuperscript{2} wilt boyle brawn' . \& draw it hot \textit{porw}g' a strayne\textit{ur} wit lichow\text{ur} . \& \textit{b} to-ged\textup{ur} in \textsuperscript{2} boylyng . and so \textsuperscript{2} may \textsuperscript{2} . wit almaner of leche lumbar\textit{des} \textsuperscript{1} \textsuperscript{1} \textsuperscript{2} makys . \& in lentyn' \textsuperscript{2} my\textit{3}t make brawn' of sow\textsuperscript{2} of fysch' when' it is boyl\textit{yd} take it owt of \textsuperscript{2} pot do it on a bord \& presse it to-ged\textup{ur} . when it it\textsuperscript{2} cold' cut it in leche\textbf{3} \& serue it forth a leche or .ij. in a dysche \& powr' a lytyl clar' a-bouyn' /

\textit{Caylee} .

\textit{Take thykke mylke of almondes drawyn' p vpp' wit wyn'}. do it in a pot do \textit{per-to raysons} \& \textit{f}y\textbf{gg}es . \& \textbf{patys} cut \& sugur \& good pow\textbf{deres} \& salt boyle it vp' colour it wit saffron' \& messe it fort a stondyng potage

\textbf{Blanck desyre} . /

\textbf{Blanche almondes} grynde hem . drawe hem wit swete broth' . \& make a thykke mylke \textit{per-of}. tak brawn' of caponis sod\textit{yn} tendur hewyn' \& groddyn' smal . and temper it vp wit sum of the mylke \& \textit{per-to sugur} I-nogh'. \& boyle it as mortrewys . take sum of \textsuperscript{2} melke boyle it \& cast it in a cloth' as creme . \& haue out clene \textsuperscript{2} \textit{water}. \& put it tho \textsuperscript{2} \textit{opur}. \& a-lye it vp \textit{per-wit}. put \textit{per-to a cupfull} of swete wyn'. \& loke \textsuperscript{1} it be salt \& dow\textit{cet} \& serue it forth . and on' fysche days . tak pyke . haddok or codlyng' . \textit{s} dyn'. do away \textsuperscript{2} skyn' \& \textsuperscript{2} bonys \& make it in \textsuperscript{2} same maner as \textsuperscript{2} doyst \textsuperscript{1} \textit{opur}. \& draw \textsuperscript{1} mylke . wit \textsuperscript{2} broth of fresh congur'. or of \textit{opur} fresche fysche .

\textbf{Blawman'ger} . 5

---

\textsuperscript{1} A supralinear \textit{do} has been inserted here in the manuscript, the lettersize is the same as the rest, thus not ordinary superscript.

\textsuperscript{2} The correct word ought to have been ‘is’.
Take a thykke melke of almondes blawnchyd. drawyn’ vp wit fayre water. grynþ dysse boyle hem vp wit þþ mylke. thake brawn’ of capons’ or of faysantys or of partrichis sodyn’ tendur & tosyd smal put þer-to sugur & salt. loke it be stondyng’. & dresse it fort as rys kut almondes in lengche. frye hem a lytyl. & meddyl hem wit sugur & planthe clowys a-bouyn & on fysche days.take pyke or haddok wel sodyn’. & pike þþ fysche fro þþ bonys. & rubbe it dorwgh’ a straynour wit þþ honþ þþ it be smal smal. & put it þer-to in-steþ of flesche.

. Blannk dowcet /.

Take brawn’ of capon’s grown’dyn’ & drawyn’ vp wit wyn’/ do it in a pot do þer-to a lytyl hony or sugur. and a-lye it vp wit almon’dys & powdur of gynger. and cowche of on’ 3olkys of eyryn’. And on fysche days. take parche pike. or haddok / . or ður good fysche. & worche it vp in þe same maner. & make peletys of past & put þer-on. as þþ doyst 3olkys on þþ ður.

. Chykeney .

Do almon’d de mylke in a pot. take kernelys of okerorys rostyd. grynde hem. draw hem vp wit wyn’ or ale. do þer-to a good porcon’ of sugur sawn’derys saffron’ & powdur. seson’ it vp wit vynegur & powderys. & take þþ schellys & set on’ a bonyn’. puy amour .

ς Blannk desyre .

Take 3olkys of eyryn’ sodyn’ hard & saffron’ & bred grown’dyn’ temper it vp wit cow mylke. boyle it. do þer-to whyte of eyryn’ cut smal. & spynde of porke coruyn’ þer-to. A-lye it vp wit raw whythe 3olkys of eyryn’

. ðage . /

Take porke grown’dyn’ & rys cryued. do it in a pot wit þþ broth of þþ same. do þer-to sawnderys powderys & sugur seson’ it vp wit sugur vynegur. & when’ it is dressyd cast on’ almon’dys
cut . & fryd . & gynger mysyd . & powdur of gynger in maner as ζ

Take flowur of rosys . wasschen and growndyn’ & almonde mylke . & take
Brawn’ of capon & growndyn’ / & loke þ it be stondyn . & cast þer-yn
sugar . & cast þer-on flourys of rosyn’ . & serue it forth’

Sypres .

Take porke soden’ . grynde it temper it vp wit mylke of almondes
drawyn’ wit broth’ . & a party of wyn’ . or ellys a lytyll vynegur
do þer-in fyges and resons’ of corans . sugur saffron’ & salt . boyle it
a-lye it vp wit 30kys of eyryn’ . when’ it ys boyled . do þer-yn powdur
of gynger & messe it forth as mortrewys . & cast a grage a-bouyn’.

Creme boyled . ζ

Take swete creme of cow¹ mylke do it in a pot . do þer-to buttur
clarifyed . set it on þe fyer’ . ster’ it . when’ it is boyled . haue 30kys
of eyryn’ drawyn’ drawyn’ thorwgh a straynour in-to a bolle . & powr’
boyled creme þer-to . wit a ladyll ster’ it well for qualying . & put
it in a pot 3en’. & 3iff it be nep² þeue it a lytyl mor’ of þe fyer’
loke þ it haue swethe sugur Inowgh’ . & of þe b buttur . & lo² it be
stondynge as mortrewys & colour it wit saffron’ . loke it be saltyd
& messe it forth’ & stroyn on powdur of gynger

Lymed mylke . ζ

Take cow mylke and sugur . do it in a pot sett it on’ þe fyer’ . when’
It boyled . a-lye it vp wit 30kys of eyryn’ . & loke þ it be reynyng
Inowgh . & nowʒ to chargeant . take whythe bred cuted in smal
soppys do hem in dyshys loke þe mylke be salt . & powr’ it a-bouyn’.

Mortrewys of ffyssche /

Take howu’d fyssche . haddok and coddelyng sodyn’ . & pyke it
clene fro þe bonys . do away þe skyn’ . þe lyuer þer-wit grynde almondes
wit broth of þe fyssche . make a good mylke of almondes blanchyd
temper vp þe fyssche þer-wit . do þer-to paynemayn’ gratyd & sugur . set
it on þe fyer’ . when’ it boyled . loke it be stondynge . messe it forth’
& stroyn on blanchyd powdur . /

¹ Ink stain on letter number two. The letter is replaced by a superscript ‘o’.
² This word should probably be ‘loke’ judging out of context.
Blanche mortrewys’ . ~ of fysche  

Take haddok coddelving or dornbak soden’ . pike owthe þe bonys do a-way þe skyn’ . grynde þe fysche . make mylke of almondes blanchyd temper vp þe fysche þer-wit . take paynemayne Igratyd & sugur sett it on’ þe fyer’ when’ it boyled’ . loke it be stondying’ . messe it fort & stow on blanche powdur .

Mortrewys of flessche .

Take brawn’ of capons’ & porke soden tendur . grynde it temper it vp wit mylke of almonde wit brothe . set it on þe fyer’ . do þer-to sugur & saffron’ . when it boyled . take some of þe melke boyleng fr’ þe fyer’ . alye it wit ʒolkys of eyryn’ . þi it be chargeant . & ster’ it wel þi it quaylyngit wele quaylyng put it to þi obur & ster’ it wel to-gedur . serue it forthe as mortrewys . & strow on’ powdur of gynger .

Blanche mortrewys of fflesche .

Take brawn’ of capon’ or partrych’ or fesant’ sodyn’ tendur . hew it smal . temper it vp on’ a bord . gryn’dit it take mylke of almondes blanchyd . & þa as þu doysth wit flesche .

Mortrewys ðucas

Take brawn’ of capons’ or fesantys sodyn’ tendur . & hew it grynde it smal . temper it wit melke of almondes . drawyn’ wit osay seson’ it vp wit sugur & good powderys & salt . & ʒyff þu wilt þu may alay it wit paynemayn’

Payne fondew  

FFrye bred in grece or in oyle . put it in red wyn’ . grynde it wit reysens . & draw it wit hony claryfyed & glayr’ of eyryn’ & water schome it clene2 & put it tho þi obur . do þer-to clowys maces & paryd gynger myn’syd & good powder’ & salt . loke it be stondying & florysch’ it wit anneys in confyyt /

Cawdeu /

Draw ʒolkys of eyryn’ þorwʒ a straynour . wyt wyn’ or wit ale . þi it be

---

1 Superscript ‘o’ replaces a crossed out ‘a’.
2 Superscript ‘e’ replaces an illegible letter.
ry3gh' renyng put þer-to sugur saffron' & noo salt . bethe it wel to-gedur

set it ouyr þe fyer' of clene char'-colle . ster' well þe bottom & þe sydys
tyl hit be schaldyng hooth . þe schalt sele be þy staff . when it be-

comeit gynnjt to come belyne . þan take it off . & ster' it al-way fasth' . & ziiff
it be nobe a-lye it wit some of þe wyn' . ziiff it come to hastly set
it in cold' water to þe myddyl of þe poth . & ster' wel al-way & serue it
forth'

Cawdell ffery ::

Take thynne mylke of almondes . drawyn' wit baster or wit oþur
swethe wyn' . do it in a pot wit sugur & saffron' . set it on' þe fyer'
ster' it when' it is at boylyng . haue 30lkys of eyryn' in a bolle drawyn'
þorw3gh a straynour . lathe hoot wyn' renne þer-to . & ster' it euer-mor'
well for qualyng tyl it be a-lyed . so þe þynke it be stondyng . ziiff
ow3th leue of þe wyn' kepe it . put þy cawdel in-to þy pot' . ziiff
it be ne þe set ægen ouer þe fyer' steryng al-way . make it not to hot
for qualyng . ziiff it be chargeant . a-lye it wit þe þemenant of þe
wyn' . & dresse it fort a stondyng potage . strowe on' blanche powdur
þe mayst ziiff þe wilt draw paynemayn' & make it vp in þe same
maner . Or þe may 3yff þe wilt . setthe clene wyn' ouer þe fyer'
& when' it is at boylyn'g haue 30lkys of eyryn' drawe þorw3g
a straynour in-tho a bolle . put þy wyn' þer-to & saffron' & loke it
be be stondyn'g . & serue it forth . & strowe blanche powdur aboue

Charlet /

Do chow mylke in a pott . haue sodyn' tendur or eþ of
þe loyne veel . hew it smal . do þer-to saffron' & salt . set it on þe fyer
when it is at boylyn'g . haue 30lkys of eyryn' straynyd þorw3g
a straynour . put þer-to wyn' or ale . bethe it to-gedur . put þer-to melke
ster' it when it be-gynnjt to ryse . sett it fro þe fyer' . hele
it lathe þe crudþe gadur . serue it fort . iij . or . iij . leches in a dysche'
wyf þe whey . 3yff þe wilt haue it en-forsyth . lay it in a cloth
or on a bord . and presse it tho-gedur . lyke chese . þan cut it
in leches . in smal peces . & lay . iij . or . iij . in a dysche . grynde
almondes y-blanchyd . draw vp a dykke mylke wit wyne /.
put *per*-to **powdwr** of *gyngher*. of canell a gret dell. off sugur & saffron’
or sawnderys & salt. & hole clowys & maces  seth it on *p*° fyer’. ster’

it well. when it is at boylyng. take it of. & powr’ on *p*° charlet

*Perys in conffythe,* <

*Take hony boyle it a lytyll. do *per*-in sugur. powdwr of galungale clo wys
bressed annesys. saffron’ & sawnderys. & cast *per*-in *by* perys. soden &
paryd & & cut on peces & wyn’ & vyd vynegur. & seson’ it vp wit powdwr

of *gyngher* & canell & *po* *per*-in so *p*° it be brown’. Make quynces in

*n*° same maner. *all* saue vynegur do *per*-to clo wys & maces. & *ziuff

*p*° will. do *per*-to clo wys mynced. & colour it wit saffron’

*Perys in syyp’,* <

*Boyle wardowynys *b*° bay be somdel tendur. par’ hem. cut hem & *l* peces
drawe a gret del of canell. *porwgh* a straynour. *bree* tymys. or on fowur
wit good wyn’ do hem in a poot. put *per*-to sugur a gret deH. &
powdwr of annesys. clo wys & maces & *ziuff *b*° willth dates al-so mynsyd
& reysens of corans. set it on *p*° fyer’. & when’ it boylidy cast

in perys’ lat it stew to-gedur. when it is boylidy. loke it be
brown’ of canell. put *per*-to powdwr of canell. & powdwr of *gyngher

a gret deH. let it be somdel dowcet & sere it forth’.

*Perys in Compost /*>

*Take wyn’ & a gret del of canell and whyth sugur. set it on *p*°
fyer’. lath it nogt boyle. draw it drowzzg a straynour. lethe datys
dyn . & do to-gedur in a pot. boyle wardowyns .par’ hem. cut hem’
cast hem in de seryp’ . & sawnderys *per*-wit. boyle hem. a-lye hem
vp wit chardequinces . & salt / loke it be dowset & chargeant. do it
out of *p*° vessel in a treu vessel. lathe it kele. par’ smale reysons
& take tryed *gyngher* paryd. com hem. *ij* days or. *iiij* in wyn°ee
& *hen* lay hem in hony claryfyed cold’ a day & nygt. *hen* take

*p*° reysens out of *p*° hony . & cast hem to *p*° peris° in compost
& sere it fort wit syyp all cold’

*Brawn’ Ravn’, Brawn’ sypres’, Brawn’ bruse

---

1 Judging from the context, this ought to have been ‘in’.

2 MS: superscript ‘e’ replaces some illegible letter.
Boyle fffresh’ brawn’ in fayr’ water tyH it be tendur. blanche almondes grynde hem. draw hem vp. wit som of þe broth’. & a party of wyn’. as hothe as þe maysth’. pan make hoth’. & þo þyn’ brawn’ in a straunour hoth’. & draw it wit þe melke hothe. do þer-to sugur a gret deHl & vynegur. set it tho þe fyer’. boyle it. salt it. do it in a-noþur vessel. when it is cold’ yff þe may noþwt hau it out chawfe þe vessel wit-out in hothe water. or elys aþens þe fyer’. lay a cloth. on a bord’. & turne þe vessel vp-se down’ þer-on’. & schakethe it þe fall out. cut it in dyn’ lechis & serue it forth’ iij. or. iiij. in a dysche. & strow on powdur of gyndur & paryd gynger Imysed’. wit anneys clowyrs maces & anneys in confythe þe 3yff þe wilt þe may draw som’ þer-of wit þe same broth’ . & wit a party of wyn’ wHl w’-out melke. colour ryd as bryzt as lambre w’ saffron’ when’ it is cold’ dysyt. & florysch þe oþur þer-wit’. or elys þe may cut it in leches as þe poist1 þe oþur & serue fort in þe same maner Ør zyff þe wilt þe may turne it vn-to a-noþur colour wat þe wylt zyff þe wilt haue a grene colour. draw it wHl melke of almondes & grynde Inn’blande as in a morter & saffron’ þer-wit’. Or elys put þer-to saffron’ when’ it is grown’ moche or lyttyll. afþur þe wilt make þy colour . & colour it þer-wit. when’ þe takyst it fro þe fyer’. And þo þer-wit as þe þedyst wit þe oþer 3yff þe may þo þer-to powderis or þe may put þer-to a gret quantite of canel genger And sawnderis. to makett brown’ & serue it fort in þe same maner . Ør zyff þe wilt þe may take tursawke . wasche it & wryng’ it well in þe wyn’ þe seson’ it vp þer-wit. when’ it is boylid colour it þer-wit. blew. or sanger sanguyn’ . wheþur þe wilt . & þe þer-wit as þe dedist wit þe oþur . Ør þe may zyff þe wilt. when’ þe takist it þro þe fyer . & hast all seson’ it . haue fresche brawn’ sodyn’ tendur and when it is cold’ ket it in thyn’ lechis Ør dyse it or cast it in a pot. & ster’ it to-gedur. and put it in-to þe oþur fosteHl. when’ it is cold’ lechis. & þe þer-wit as þe dedist wþ þe oþur. Brawn’ Kyall in lentyn’ Take sown’ dis of stokfyse þe ben well dryde. & lay hem in water and eche day chawnge þe water twynnis. than’ take hem vp. lay hem on

1 Looks like a superscript ‘d’ above ‘oi’ in the MS, though this seems to make little sense.
2 A superscript ‘t’ replaces the letters ‘yl’ which have been crossed out.
a bord’ & schrape1 hem elene wit þ[e] egge of a knyfe. whassche hem s
sedde hem in fayr’ water. take hem vp. seeþ hem in broth of congur
or of øpur goode fysch’ till day be tendur. or ellys in þ[e] same water
and put elys þer-to to amende þ[e] broth’. þan blanche almondes
greunde hem & draw hem wit þ[e] same broth’ hoothe. & make
vp þ[e] sowndys. & grynde hem wit þ[e] same broth’ sooth. & ʒif
þ[u] wilt þ[u] may take some of þ[e] elys þer-to. & temper hem vp wit
þ[e] broth’ hoothe. draw it as hoot as þ[u] may suffir þyn honþ[e]
þer-ynne. make it in all maner as þ[u] makyst brawn of flesche
and ʒiff þ[u] wilt when it ys seson’nyd whythe. take eyryn &
breke an hoole in þ[e] gret enþ[e]. & þo owthe all þ[e] is in þ[e]
eye. whassche þ[e] schellys drye hem. set hem in salt vp ryþth’
and put þer-in som of þ[e] whythe brawn’. & take som of þ[e]
same brawn’ cold’ colour it wit saffron’. meddy[þ] it wit powders
put þer-in pepyns. of þ[e] gretnesse. of þ[e] zolke of an eye. put
þer-in. & fylle it wit þ[e] brawn’. þ[u] it stande fulle. when it is
cold’. pille of þ[e] scheþ. set hem in salt as egges or in cryspis
& puche hem wit clowys a-bouyn’. iiiþ. or fyue in an egge.
ffylle vp þ[e] crown’ wit blanche powdur. and serue hem forthe in-
stede of eyryn’. þ[u] may do wit brawn’ of flesch in þ[e] same
maner. or þ[u] may þo þer-to somdel of powdur gynger & & change.
þ[e] colour. cut it in peces. serue it fort as þ[u] dedyst brawn’ in
flesche tymé

ßbytryne in lentanyl’.

Tak brawn’ þ[u] mastik in lentanyl’. do þer-to powdur of peper. & a
lityþ powdur of clowys. & powdur of canell a gret delþ & sawnderis
so þ[u] it be brawn’ of sawnderis. ʒiff þ[u] wilt take blanchyd almondes & dyse
hem in-to a party of wyn’ & a party of vynegur. & do to-gedur. when’
it is boylyd put in-to a-nolþur vesseþ. when it is cold’ leche it
& serue it fort as þ[u] doyst brawn’ Ñyll.

ßbytryne in ffllessche tymé

Tak canynes feeted clene scaldyd sede hem in wyn’ & wit a party
of swete brothe þ[u]dey ben tendur. take hem vp lay hem on a bord’
pike away þ[u] bonys & kepe þ[e] seynowes. hew all to-gedur
grynde it temper it vp wit þ[e] same broth’. do it in a pot.

1 Superscript ‘a’ above the ‘a’ which is already there, though just slightly illegible.
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dyce ṣ sowndys . take blanchyd almondes . powdur of peper . powdur of clowys & a lytl powdur of canell . and gret del of sawn’deris . or ʒiff ṣ wilt saffron’ alyl alytyl . set it on ṣ fyer’ . when it is boyled put ṣer-to 3olkys of eyryn’ . & powndur of gyngier mysyd small . vynegur and salt put it in a vesseļ . when it is cold’ leche it & serue it forth’

Venyon’ Rostyd . ṣ .

Take fayr’ feelettes bonden . cut away ṣ skyn’ . parboyle hym ṣ’dey be steff thorwʒ . laarde hem wit salt lard . put hem on’ small’e brochis . rost hem . ʒiff it be neb’ ṣ mayst bast hem .
take hem off cut hem in brode lechis . lay hem in dischis . straw on’ powdur of gyngier & salt . do wit buttes off venyson in ṣ same maner & serue hem fort

The sydvs of deer’ of hev grece l-rostyd .

Wasche hem do a-way ṣ fylettes . do hem on’ a broche . & schoiche ouer-dwarthe . & ažen crosse-wyse . in maner of losenges . in ṣ flesch’ syde . rossche hem . take red wyn’ powdur of peper & salt & basthe hem alway till day ben’ Inowʒg . haue a chargeowur vndur-neb’ to kepe ṣ fallyt . & bast it ṣer-wit ažen . ṣ pan take it off . smythe it as ṣ lyst & serue it forth’.

Chikenys ʃfarsyd /

Schalde ṣ chekenys . breke ṣ skyn’ skyn’ at ṣ skyn’ atke hem ṣ skyn’ ryse fro ṣ flesch’ . draw hem. chopp off ṣ heddes . whassche . hem . tak ʃfarsor of fatt sodyn’ pikyd & hewyn’ small wit raw 3olkys of eyryn’ . and hard 3olkys crommyd small & reysans of corans . powderis erbys parboylsd & hewyn’ small saffron’ & salt do to-gedur . & ʃfarse ʒowur chekenys ʃer-wit . by-twene ṣ ʃlessche & ṣ skyn’ . & then repleun’ hem in hoothe broth’ . & ṣen make hem smoţ wit ṣyn’ hon . ṣ ʃfarsor be d euyn’ vnbur ṣ skyn’ . parboyle hem a lytyl . roste hem . ʒiff ṣ wolt ṣ may endor’ hem & serue hem fort as ṣay ben’

Chykenys endoryt /

---

¹ This is a unique use of something that appears to be the re-abbreviation in word-initial position.
Seekalde chekenys draw out þe brest bon wit þyn’ hond’ saue þe flesch’. lat þe skyn’ be hoole. rost hem tyll dey ben Inowweg þen endor’ hem wit 30lkys of eyryn’. when þe endoryng is steff & hard lat hem no mor’ rost. Endor’ kydde in þe same maner. In þe rostyng turnyng ażens þe fyer’.

ffellettes off porke endoryd

Rost ffylettes of porke. endor’ hem wit þe same botur. as þu doyst chekenys. turnyng a-bowt ouer þe spethe.

Pekok Rostyd

Breke þe nekke by þe hed. kepe þe skyn’ hoole. put a pyn’ þorw3g þe skyn’ of þe necke. blowe hyym þe skyn arese fro þe fflesche. ffle of þe skyn wit þe federys. kepe it hole. draw þe pekok. lat þe legges ben on’ & þe bon off þe necke. stuff/hym wit-yn’ wit powderys & salt. do hym on a broche. trusse þe feet to-ward þe body’ as he was wenthe to sytthe on þe perche. & sett þe necke a-boue þe spethe. & in þe same maner rost hym’ & bast hym wyn’ powderis & salt. when he is rostyd. take hym off.

& when he is somde cold’ set þe skyn vp on hym. & sowe hym or prykke it to þe body. & sett hym on a tarage & sprede þe tayle a-brode. & serue hym fort as he war’ a quyk pekok /

Capon’ off hey grece 1-rostyd.

Sele a capon’ of hey grece. ouer euyn. schald’ hym. draw hym at þe vent. drawe hys lyuer & hys gyser at þe gorge. take þe leeff off grece. parcell & a lytyll ysope & rosmary. & a leff or ij off sawge & do it to þe grece1. hew it small & hard 30lkys of eyryn’ [. . . ]
cromelyt small. & resons of corans. good powderis & saffron’ & salt meddyl it to-gedar. farse 3our capons þer-wit. broche hym. loke he be stauche at þe vente & þe gorge. þe farsor may not out rost hym longes wit sokyng’ fyuer. kepe þe grece þe fallyt /

---

1 MS: Second ‘e’ is in superscript as replacement for an error/ink stain.
2 Illigible/Smudged MS.
& basth hym \( \text{per-wit} \) . kepe hym moysth tyl \( \text{b}^n \) \text{serue} hym forth . sauce hym in wyn' & gynger as \( \text{b}^n \) \text{posth an \( \text{o}^\prime \)ur}

Capowns \text{Stued}_C

Take parcely sawge yspohe rosemarye & tyme . breke it a lytiH

by-twene dyn' hon\( \text{h}^e \) . & stoppe \( \text{b}^e \) capons \text{per-wit colour} hem wit saffron'
cowche hem in an herdyn pot . yff \( \text{b}^u \) haue it . or eH in a brasse
pot . & lay splentes vn\( \text{h}^n \)urne\( \text{h}^e \) . & eH a-bowte \( \text{b}^e \) sydes . so \( \text{b}^1 \) \( \text{b}^e \) caponis'
towche not \( \text{b}^e \) sydes . ne \( \text{b}^e \) bottom of \( \text{b}^e \) pot & strowe on of \( \text{b}^e \) herbis
in \( \text{b}^e \) pot . among \( \text{b}^e \) capons . put a \text{quarte} & a pyntye of \( \text{b}^e \) best
wyn' \( \text{b}^1 \) \( \text{b}^u \) may gethe \( \text{I} \) . & no no\( \text{h}^u \)ur \text{lycour} . an qw\( \text{z}^e \)elue a syluyr dische
a-boue . \( \text{b}^1 \) \( \text{b}^e \) breordes of \( \text{h}^e \)sche be wit-ynne \( \text{b}^e \) breordes of \( \text{b}^e \) pot
or eH take a\( ^2 \) a lydde \( \text{b}^i \) is made ma\( \text{h}^e \) \text{per-forr’} . & make a botour
of qwhithe of eyryn' & flowr' & pow\( \text{h}^u \)ur a-bouyn' on \( \text{b}^e \) lydde
& al a-bowthe \( \text{b}^e \) breordes . & stoppe yn lynnown’ cloth or papyr
a-mong \( \text{b}^e \) batowur . by-thwene \( \text{b}^e \) lydde & \( \text{b}^e \) pott . so \( \text{b}^1 \) \( \text{b}^e \) brethe
go not owth . loke it be thykke of batowur\( ^3 \) . & sett \( \text{b}^e \) pott on
a char'-colle fyer' to myd-sy\( \text{h}^e \) . & set a quelme vp-on \( \text{b}^e \) lydde
\( \text{b}^i \) it a-ryse not wit \( \text{b}^e \) hethe . & lathe it stewe esyly & long'
when \( \text{b}^u \) trowyst it is I-now3g . take it fro \( \text{b}^e \) fyer' ʒiff it
be a pot of erde . set it on a wespe of stre . \( \text{b}^i \) it towche nogh'
\( \text{b}^e \) cold' grownd' for brekyng of \( \text{b}^e \) pot . when \( \text{b}^e \) heth it weH
ouer-passyd . take of \( \text{b}^e \) led . & take owut \( \text{b}^e \) capons wit a prykke
& lay hem in a-no\( \text{h}^u \)ur vessell . tyl \( \text{b}^u \) han sen hym\( ^4 \) all \( \text{b}^1 \) \text{hay ben}
I-now3gh . & ʒiff it be ne\( \text{h}^e \) cowch hem in a3en & stewe hem bettur
\( \text{h}^a \)panne\( ^5 \) make syryp' of good wyn & mynsed datys . & caneH draw
wit \( \text{b}^e \) same wyn' . do \text{per}-to reysens of corans sugur saffron’ & boyle
it a lytiH . take it fro \( \text{b}^e \) fyer' meddyH powdur of gynger . wit
a lytill of \( \text{b}^e \) same wyn' & \( \text{b}^o \) \text{per-to} . lay \( \text{b}^e \) capons in dischis’. do
a-way \( \text{b}^e \) fathe . of sewe . & \( \text{b}^o \) \( \text{b}^e \) sewe to \( \text{b}^e \) syrpp’ . & powr' a-bouyn'
on \( \text{b}^e \) capons & \text{serue} hem forth . a rybbe of a be\( \text{f}^e \) beeuff & a capon’
in a dysche’ .

---

1 MS: The first ‘e’ is cluttered by ink and thus replaced by a superscript ‘e’.
2 MS: One can tell that it is an ‘a’ even though it is cluttered, yet it is repeated.
3 MS: Ink clutter partly obscures legibility, ‘batowur’ is the most probable reading.
4 MS: Superscript ‘e’ above ‘y’.
5 MS: Slightly illegible, the most obvious reading is ‘panne’. 
Take garbages of ʒonge gees. ʃh³heddes neckys & wynges. ʃh³ geser & ʃh³ harthe. & ʃh³ l̄uer. boylit l-nowʒ3gh. lay it on abord'. cut ʃh³ wynges at ʃh³ lowutis. & ʃh³ feet fro ʃh³ legges. & cut euery clow fro ʃhur. cut ʃh³ geser & ʃh³ herthe & ʃh³ lyuer in longe lechis. haue fayr’ whyte grece hoothe in a fryyng panne. & cast in aull ʃh³ flesche. ʃffrye it a lytil. & put ʃer-to powdur of peper a lytil & salt. haue ʒolkys of eyryn’.

doʒ3 a straynour. & powr’ in a ʃffryyng panne. when’ it is harde alytil turne it & frye it nowgʒ to moche but as it may vnneʃh³ holʃh³ to-gedur. & serue it forthe.

Goos or capons’ ʃffarsyd

Take parcely & swynys grece. & ʃh³ suet of a schepe parboyle hem in freshe broth’. take hem vp do ʃer-to harde ʒolkys of eyryn’ & heu hem to-gedur wit ʃh³ Ius of grapis or mynsyd oynownyns. & powdur of gynger. canel peper & salt & farse ʒowur capons or gees ʃer-wit broche hem make hem stauche at ʃh³ vente. & at ʃh³ gooet. so ʃh¹ʃh³ farsour go not out & rost hem vpp’.

Brestys off moton in sawce

Take brestis off moton’ rostyd. choppe hem take vergeous. chawff it in a vessel ouer ʃh² ʃffyer’. do ʃer-to powdur of gynger. & cast it ouer ʃh³ moton’ choppyd.

Pyggys ʃffarsyd.

Take porke sodyn’ tendyr. do away ʃh³ skyn’ & ʃh³ bonys. hew ʃh³ ʃfflesche & half a docen’ fyggis ʃer-wit. grynde it smal wit ʒolkys of eyryn’. & ʃh³ ʃer-to a few reysens fryd. & powdur sugur & saffron’ & salt. ʒiff ʃh³ porke be fat ʃh⁶ ʃer-to gratyd bred. & ʒiff ʃh⁶ w……..til creyme of cow mylke. & ʃffarse ʒour pigges ʃer-wit but no to fuH ʃffor brekyng. sewe ʃh³ bely. rost hym serue hym’ fort wit sauce gynger.

Curbut boylyd.:

Mape² a trowʒt in ʃh³ hed. make ʃh³ sauce of fayr’ water parcely.

---

¹ Some illegible letters.
² This word makes little sense, it is more likely that make was the intended word.
& salt. when it be-gynnyt to boyle some it clene. draw þe trowȝt
as ȝiff þe wilt haue hym rownd cut hym on’ þe bakke. in too
places. or. iij. noȝt thorwȝg. & drawe in þe stooche ney-þe hedþe
as þe doïst a Rownd pyke. & þe sauce is verte sauce. serue hym fort
cold’. cowche on hym haylyft of parcery Or eþ þe powche
as þe doyst þe powche of a pike. & mynse it wit þe grauε & powdur
of gynger.

<Crabbe or lobster.
Take a crabbe or a lobster. stopp’ hym in þe vent. wit/on off his
lytyl clowys. seþ hym in fayr’ water & no salt. Or elys stopp’ hym
in þe same manere & cast hym in a-nouyn. & late hym bake. serue
hym cold’. & sauce hym wit vynegur.

Breme in sauce.
Take a breme. drawe hyma at þe bely & prikke hym in þe chyne
boon’. iij. or. iij. rost hym on a rost yryn’. take wyn’ boyle it
cast þer-to powdur of gynger & vergeous. do þe breme in a dysche &
powr’ þe syrype’ a-bouyn’.

Breme in brace.
Byȝe the a breme in þe same maner. take powder of canel a
gret del. drawe it dorwe a strangour wit red wyn’. put hoole clowys
maces sugur & sawnderys þer-to set it on’ þe fyer’. when it boyled
put þer-to powdur of gynger & vynegur vergeous. loke it be chargeant
of powderis. lay þe breme in a chargeowur. & powr’ þe brace
a-bouyn’.

Tenche in brace.
Split tenchys be þe bakke. evyn’ porwȝ þe hedde. so þe bely
be hole’ do a-way þe drawȝt. schooche hym’ a lytill. ouerthwarthe
in þe fishce syde. lay ouer a rost yryn’. rost hym’ til he be Inowȝg
lay hym in dischis þe fyshce syþþe vp-warde. take þe same brace
as þ þoisth to þe breme powr’ it þer-on & serue it forthe. /

1 MS: A superscript ‘e’ replaces the partially smudged final letter.
Sole in brace

fflee solys . drawe hem . rost hem þey ben I-no3gh’ . lay hem in dischis . make brace as þu poist for þe breme . aH saue clowys and maces & powr’ it þer-on & servé it forth

Storgeon Bylyd .

Take storgeon . cut of þe fynmys fre fro þe tayle . to þe hedde on þe bakke syde . chynne hym as a sawmon & þe sydys in fayr’ peces . and make a sawce of water & salt . when it boylé seome it clene . cast þe peces þer-yn’ . & lathe hem boyle I-no3gh . take hem vp servé hem forth wit foyllys of parcely wet-in vynegur & cast þer-on in dischis . þe sauce þer-on & servé it ys vynegur

ς. Haddok yn gyne ς

Drawe an haddok at þe bely . ziff he be large cut of þe hedþe rost þe body on a rost yryn tiH he be Ino3gh stepp’ breed in þe brothe of sawmon . or of oþur good fysche . drawe wit þe broth a thyn lyour . hew parcelly’ & þerþo þer-to . & agret quantite of red wyn’ . hole clowys maces powdur of peper & a gret þereH câneH & þe lyuer of þe haddok & þe powche clene schauyn’ . but þe powche be Ino3gh . boyle it bettur in a-noþur broth to þe lyuyr’ & hewen smal in-to a pott & resens of corans . saffron’ sawneris & salt . boyle it vp wit powdur of gynger & vergeous . & þo a-way þe sckyn’ of þe haddok . lay hem on a chargeour & powr’ þe gyne a-bouyn’ & servé it ffórthe .

Soupys chawmbyrlayn . ς

Take wyn câneH . powdur gynger & sugur of eche a porcon’ . stepe it aswyle to-gedur . hong a stranour of ouer a vessel lat it renne þer-ynne . ij . or . iij . take paynemayn’ cut it in maner of bruesse tost it in brode scheuys & cast þer-on . blanche powdur powr’ þe syryp a-bouyn’ & servé it forth’ .

Codlyng . lyng . hake . or . haddok .

Draw hem at þe bely sckale hem clene wit þe egge of a knyff . wasche hem make þyn1 sawce of water & salt . when

1 MS: This is obviously a rare misspelling of ‘deH’.
2 MS: Some illegible clutter above ‘y’ , though the word is clearly ‘þyn’.
it boylyt scome it clene & cast in þe fysch & þe lyuer þer-bit
& sauce it wit garlyk . strypp' þe haddoke & serue hym cold' wit sauce gynger

* Baase molet . or breme .

Drwe all þe belly . sckale h clene wit þe egge of a kyllw wasche hem . make þy sawce of water and salt . when it boylyt scome it clene . schooche þe fisch & ouerthwart þe to þe syde . cast it in-to þe boyllyng sauce . & parcely boyle & serue it fort sumdell hot . Baas & þe molet sauce gynger . & þe breme wit garlek

Congur . turbut . & halybut /

Schald' a congur not in to hot water for brestynyng of þe sekyn' . cut of þe hedþ. & þif Þe will þe may clene out þe congur a lytil be-for þe nauyl by þe bely so þe þe may louce þe gut . take it out at þe thorothe . & þe lyuer & þe gut & all þe brawyte cut all þe bely ouerthwarthe in royn' þe peces . loke þe heris ben schouyn' a-way . boþ on þe bely & þe bakke fro þe hedþ to þe tayle . & schaue clene all þe fysche . but saue þe sekyn' hole . & loke it be ryȝt drawe . þe Turbut by þe fyn' by neþ þe gylle & cut of þe hedþ. þe whythe syþ fro þe blake . & geþur of þe gylle wit a knyff of boþ syþ. þiff þe turbut be large . cleue hym down' ryȝt by þe chyne . ʒ & þiff he be lyti ll cut hym ouer the synde & cut it in ffay water & þe þer-to but a lytyll salt or ell noon . when it boyllyt scome it clene . when þe congur is I-noȝgh take it vpp' wit a scomer . lay it in a vesell wit fayr' water & salt . in an-opur vessell and þe turbut or þe halybut ys boylyd powr' owthe þe brothe & put þer-in a lytil downhill cold' water . take vp þe fysche wit þyn' hondes ffor brekyng & lay it in water & salt . & serue þe congur . þe hedþ & . iȝ . or . iij . peces by-for þe nauyl in a chargeowur for þe soueraynth sckrow on folye foyles of parcely . & serue þe remenant for opur . men . & sauce it wit verte sauce . Off turbut or halybut oon . or . iij . off þe breddy peces in a chargeowur . & sauce it wit verte sauce & strowe on foyles of parcely

* Giruard & Roche boylyd .
Draw hem in þe syþ fro þe fyn downward & saue þe sownþ & þe
reffett wit-yyn’ hem . sclat clene þe poke & saue it clene . lat it hong
by wasche hem . make þy sauce of water & salt . when it boylyt scome
it clene & cast yn’ þe fysche . when it is boylyd . I-noȝgh . take it vp
esyly wit a schomer . lat it drye & serve it fort cold’. sauce it wit sauce gynger

’Ò þlays solys & flownderys .boylyd .

Draw þe plays vnþur þe fyn’ . kut þe hed by þe gylle . clene hym a lytil
afftur þe schulliers a-long-ast þe chynne on þe whythe syde . fflee þe
Soole . draw hym by-neþ þe gylle . lat þe be on . / draw a fflowndur
a þe bak-syde vnþur þe ffyn’ . stooche ouerthawarth þe brest . as a saynt
andrewys cros in withe syde . wasche hym make þy sauce of water
& salt . when’ it boylyt scome it clene . & cast in þe fysche . stròw
on parcely put þe-þo ale scome it . serve it forthe . & þe ffloynþperes
in þe same sauce . & þe solys drye . sauce hem wit whythe wyn’
or ale powdur of gynger & mustar’

. Welkys boylyd ’έ

Do welkys in a pot . wit water . so þe day may’ ffleþte þer-yyn . set hem
on an hesy fyer’. Lat hem stonde sokyngly & long or day seþþ
þan take hem off & powr’ a-way þe water . & wit a prykke pyke hem
out of þe schelle . do a-way þe hat of þe forhedþ do hem ina vessel
wit cold’ water so þe þay be vnneþ wethe . & a greet del off salt
scowr’ hem þer-wit þyn’ honþþ . þa all þe skynne go off . wassche hem in
iiij . wateris . or . iiiij . & lay hem in clene water tyl þe serve hem fort . þan’
þo hem a-brod in dischis/ & stròw þer-on foylys of parcely

Perche boylyd

Draw a perche at þe gille . lat þe bely be hole . make a steff
sauce of water & salt . & ziff þe wilt þe may put þer-to ale . when
it boylyt scome it clene . & cast þer-in þe perche . lat it boyle wele/
þan strype off þe skyn’ on bothe þe syþ . lat þe hed be on & þe
tayle . lay hym in a dysche . stròw on hym foyl of parcely . serve hym
cold’. sauce hym wit vynegur .
ffresche makenêl yboylâd
Draw a makenêl at þe gylle. saue þe bely hole wasche it. make
þy sauce of water & salt. when it boylâd cast in parcely & croppys of
myntes & Inne þe fysche þer-to. serve it fort. & sauce it wit vertê sauce
Schrympys boylâd /

Take quyk schrympis pyke hem clene. make þy sauce of water &
salt. when it boylâd cast hem yn’ lat hem boyle but a lyty þe.
lay hem drye. when þe watyr lay hem drye. when þe pole’
þay stop’ vpp’ de myddyêl. scharp’ in hyȝth’e & serve hem fforz hothe. & sauce
hem wit vynegur.

Soupys in-dorr’ . Ɪ
Blanche almondys grynþ hem. temper hem vp wit fayr’ water
in-to a gode mylke. drawe it dorwȝte a straynoyr in-to a pot. do þer-
to saffron’. and ȝiff þe wîlt þe may colour it a lytyþ þer-w’. put þer-
to sugur & salt. set it ouer þe fyer’. ster’ it. when it ys at þe boylýng
do it yn’ a lûtiþ good wyn’. take it fro þe fyer’. ster’. it for
quaylyng. haue whythe bred cut in dynne scheuys as brues
tost it a lûtþ ouer a rost yryn’ þe it be somdel brown’. depe it
a lytyl in wyn’. & lay it aȝen on þe rost yryn’ frye it. & þe
a lytyl mylke in þe dyschys. & cowche. ij. or. iij. lechys
of bred in þe dysche & powr’ on mor’ mylke a-bouyn’ & serve
it forthe .

Othe mylke off almondes
Blanche almondes grynde hem draw hem vp wit fayr’ water
þe þer-to sugur & hony claryfyed set it on þe fyer’. saue it. ster’ it
when it boylâd. serve it forthe hothe. & bred tostyd in a-nopur
dysche . Cold’ mylke off almondes.

Do | fayr’ water in a dysche or in a pot. do þer-to blanchyd
sugar. or blak sugar or hony claryfyd. so þi it be somdel dowcet
do a lîtyl salt þer-to. set it on þe fyer’. when it ys at boylýng

1 MS: Superscript ‘c’ is crossed out and replaced by another superscript ‘s’.
scome it clene . lat it boyle but a whyle . ṭan take it of & lat
it kele . blanche almondes . grynde hem temper hem vp wit ṭe same
water in-to a dykke mylke . put ṭer-to a lytyl wyn’ ṭy it haue a lytil
sauer ṭer-of & serue it . cut bred in schyuys . tost on a rost yryn’
tyl dey wey somdel brown’ . ṭan bast it a lytil wit wyn’. & lay it
a-ʒen on ṭe rost yryn’ ṭy it be hard & serue it fort in a-nothur dische
wit ṭe mylke .

Storgeon’ for sopers

Take calues fete & ṭe flesshe of ṭe hede & ṭe longes sedyn dendr’ hew it smale
temper it w’ same broht or ʒyf ṭe wylt ṭy may grynd it & strow of folys of parcelle
& poud of peper & poud of clowys ʒyf ṭe wylt & salt boyle it to-gedyr take
it vp lay it on clene bord kepe yt yele to-gedyr ṭy renne not al ode wen
yt ys colde cut it yn lechys of veneger yn a bol of ter & mynsyd onyons foyles
of parcelle & mynsed gynger lay ṭe legches ṭeryn & wen ṭu seruyst hem lay noo in
yn a dysshe & somdele of ṭe sauce ṭer-wyth

Cole leche Veand

Take quinces boyled par’ hem peke ote ṭe corys & do away ṭe skyn & cut yn pe-
cys do hem yn a pot of ṭe wylt ṭer-to whyte grece hony or sugeris stowed yn a-ley
hem vp wyth hony claryfye & raw ʒolkes of eyeryn & a lytyl melke of almondes saff-
eron & leche yt fayr’

leche lombard

Claryfye hony put ṭer-to hony late yt boyle lange ṭan put ṭer-to almondes cut sma=
le & gratyd brede ṭy yt way charsant ster’ yt wel to-gedyr late yt not boyl-
le to long for brenyn of almondes take gratyʒt brede strow yt on a clene
borde take yt ote of ṭe pot lay yt ṭer-on & strow on mor’ gratyʒt brede &
couche yt to-gedyr ṭy yt ren not to brode wen it is cowlde cut yt brode
lechys & serue it forḥ ij or iij lechys yn a dysshe & strow on poudyr of
gynger ʒyf ṭu wylt ṭy may do it hote haue smale cofyns bakyn by-for’ & pou=
r’ yt ṭer-yn & serue it forḥ in-stede of bakyn mete Or ʒyf ṭe wylt pour’ yt
by ṭy on syde & creyme of almondes or ells a stondyng potage of quynis
or of frute coloured ʒolow & fył vp ṭy oþer syde & strow on annys yn comfyty
oþer drage wat ṭu wylt & serue yt forthe
Cowlde bruet of rabettes

Grynde reysonys or dates & draw hem vp osee put þer-to creyme of almondes & poudyr of canyl a grede dele draw þem wþ swete wyne & poudyr lombarde poudyr of grayyns & poudyr of gynger & a lytyl vynygyr & wyte sugyr set yt on þþ fyer' & wen it ys boylyd take yt offe put yt yn a bol haue rabettes buleþt yn good broþe & salt take hem vp vn-vache by þþ bak fro þþ bonys on boþ þþ sydes & ley hem yn þþ sew wen þþ shalþt serue hem lay hem yn dysshys & pour' þþ sew þer-to & serue it forþ & þyf þþ wylt chope hem yn pyces & rayse þþ pysis & þþ wynges of þþ chekenys & kepe hem hole & chope þþ body & do yt yn þþ sew & serue yt forþ on þþ same maner as sew ryal or egr' douce —

Dþyvers desyr'

Grinde reysonys draw hem wþ ossee or wþ oþr swete wyne þþ yt be somde¼ le þinne do yt yn a pot do þer-to mynset dates & reysonys of corans clowes & mace poudyr of peper poudyr lombard sugyr & take pygges clene scaldyt kyde lomd conynges or chekynys chopped smal yn pyces fryeyt do yt to-þþer seson yt vp wþ poudyr gynger & salþþ & þyf þþ wylte take venygyr & make egr' douce þer-of & serue it forþ & þyf þþ wylt grynde almondes & do yn þþ same maner & colour' it wþ þþ turnssole or late it be wyte weþer þþ wylþþt þyf þþ wylþþt þþ may make past of þþolkys of eyeryn & þþyt flour' ma¼ ke it a þþyme foyle & cut it yn smale peletes or ellþ yn pynees & fry hem yn wyte grece late þþ flesshe be oute & wen þþ sew boyleþþ do it þer-to & serue it forþ Or þþ fþþ wylþþt make foyles of past & couche þer-yne flesshe of caponyes & porke soden & gþþunden seson it vp wþ pouderes & salþþ make þþ pe¼ letes þþer-of eche of þþ grettymes of þþ fyngyr loke it be wel closyd & fryyd do it in dysshys & þþ syrep a-bouen? late no vynygyr cum þer-yne þþ fþþ wylþþt may¼ be a stondyng potage þer-of draw yt more ca chargeant & dresse yt forþ as mortres þþ þþ makyst of resenes of þþ same colyr as þþ oþþer by-for' & de¼ þþ part þþ wythyn þþ dressyng & þþ fþþ wylt make þþer-of a bakyn mete haue a coffyn bake be-for' & put þer-yne eche by hym-sylfe or ellþ departe to-gedyr þþ on wyth þþ oþþer rede & serue it forþ þþer þþ wylt coulde or hote & strow on a drage or þþer gynger mynsyd anes yn comfyte & blaunche poudyr
& serue yt forþ' wen' yt be yn furme of potage or of bakyn mete yn wat kynde þþ wylþt make yt & 3yf þþ lyst þþ may ley yt w' 30lkys of eyeryn & after þþ boyling take sum of þþ same wyne & set it on þþ fyr' yn a pot wen yt ys at boyling haue 30lkys of eyeryn draw yt þrewe a strynur yn a bol & pour' yn þþ wyne sowlty & rennyng & ster' yt yn þþ bol for quallyng & loke be ryʒt chargeaunt of 30lkys & put yt fast yn-to þþ oper sew þþ yt ys made be-for' ster' yt wel to-gedyr set yt forþ' loke no vynygr cum þþ-to loke yt be douset & sumdel bydyng of poudyrs & þþ wylþt make yt of fysshe þþ may yn þþ s'me maner as þþ dytdyst wyth flesshe / take calwer' samon braces & molettes splatted & coppyd yn pyces & fry yt & do þþ-w' sa þþ dytdyst w' flesshe Or take pyk perch' eles haddok & braces soden pyke oute þþ bonys grynd yt medele yt w' gode pouderes & salʒt & make yt yn rounde peletes haued batour' made w' mylke of almondes put peletes þþ-yyn Take hem vp fry hem hoyle rollyng hem kepe hem round lay hem yn dysshes & pour' þþ seryp a-bouen & 3yf þþ-w' wylþt þþ may do w' flesshe yn þþ same maner

Viande Xyal

Grynde resonys draw hem w' venyger bast'rd claryosey or w' þþ best wyne þþ þþ may haue take dates cut grete resonys of corans clowes maces pi= nes & flour' of caneH 3yf þþ haue yt put yn a pot 1 & sum of þþ wyne þþ-wyth & suer claryryed a grede dele & paryd gyngyr þþ-wyth boyle yt wen yt ys boylþʒt y-now take þþ seryp of þþ raysens & creyme of almondes þþ-wyth & past ryal & pyuadegobet ryal & gynger yn comfyʒt & charde quyns or charde wardoun & poudyr of gynger & canyl do al toge= der yn a pot set yt on a fyer' ster' yt wel wen yt ys at boyling take yt of loke þþ yt be douset & þþ yt haue y-now of pouders & sumdele salt dresse yt forþ' as flat potage & 3yf þþ serue yt forþ' hote florysshe yt wyth blossomys of safferon haue fysshe braune soden & draw yt þru a strynor colour'yt w' safferon þat yt be as bryʒt as lambyr wen yt ys couwe florysshe þþ

1 MS: ‘put’ with superscript ‘o’ above the ‘u’.
Grynde resonys draw hem vp w' þ same maner of wynys as þ' dedyst þ' 1145
oþer by fore put þer-to creyme of almondes do yt yn a pot do þer-to al maner
of hote spyces as þ' dedyst þ' oþer & paryt gyngyr & dates cut & suger
claryfyed & do þer-to sum of wyne boyle yt wel take yt of & put yt
to þ' oþer wyth poudyr canyl gyngyr lombart & oþer gode poudyr set yt
on þ' fyer' ster' yt wel wen yt ys at boyling take yt of loke þ' yt
be doucet & þ' yt haue y-now of poudyrs loke þ' haue braune of
caponys fesauntes or partrychys soden tendyr & tosed smalle put þer-
to late yt not be stondyng loke þ' be ryʒt broun
ʒ of cane ll & saundres & safferon & messe yt for
þe a flat potage florysshe
þe wyth sugyr styket vpon & wen yt boylyth no leme
of fyer' ryse a-boue þe pot no a-boue þe sew
ʒ Bely of1 on fysshe days
Splaʒt peks & tenchys elys & perchys coppe hem & do hem togedyr yn a pan
boyle yt w' redwynye take yt vp lay yt on a clene cloþ lay yt vp on a borde pi=
ke oute þ' bonys stryfe of þ' skyn kepe þ' pyces hole & couche hem yn dyshes /
þ' peke & þ' tenche þ' geþer & þ' culpens of þ' helys & stryfe þ' skyn of þ' þyes
& couche on a dysshe & ouer-charge not ʒour' dyshes ouer mykyl w' ʒour' fysshe
set hem yn a coulde place þ'r' þay may stond styþ & set þ' pan a-ʒen ouer þ' fyr'
take barbyl or cunger or plays or bonnebak or turbut or oþer gode fysshe þ' wyl
a gely & þ' skyn of þ' heþ loke þey ben clene & do þer-to boyle yt yn þ' same
broþ' þan scome yt clene þ' þer leue not fat of þ' fysshe þer-on take yt vp
w' a scomer do yt wer' þ' wylʒt pou' þy þroþ' þ'rew a clene cloþ ynto a cle=
ne pot set yt a-ʒen to þ' fyr' put þer-to poudyr of þe þeper & longe þeper bruset
yn a mortar or þ' may ʒyf þ' wylʒt haue smale baggyes of lynnyn cloþ iiij or iiij
& put ʒour' pouders þer-yyn swe þ' þ' pouders goo not oute & honge hem on
þ' sydys of þ' pan wyle ʒe boyle ʒour' fysshe alwey tyl ʒe seson yt þan take
hem oute & wrynge oute þ' þroþ' & do þ' bagges a-wei & þ' ys better maner þan
take vp sum þer-of & pou' yr dt on þ' þerde of a dysshe tyl yt be cowld þ'r' shalʒt
þ' se ʒyf yt be chargeaunt & ells take mor' fysshe þ' w' a gely & boyle yt þer-yyn

1 Possibly the name of one or two of these fish in the recipe is missing, i.e. ‘Bely of tenche’.
do a-wey þe fysshe seson þe broþ wyth vynygyr & salȝt colour’ yt wær water of saf-
feron douce þe haþ be soked longe to-gedyr so þe water haue draun’ oute þe colour
of þe safferon & þe shal kepe 3our’ gely cher’ & bryȝt as þe lambr’ do a drape
or in on þe brede of a dysshe & þe shal se yf þe colour’ be gode salt yt take
a clene clōþ bynd þe corners to-gedyr & hong yt vp þe gely þer-yn
& haue a vessel þer-vndyr to kepe yt þre yt renmeth not oute & fyl vp þer-w’
3our’ dysshes & when þe most hete ys w’drawyn plante yt blanchyt almo-
dys þe may honge þer-yn & falle nouȝt þe bottom & hole clowys & maces wen
ys coulde florysshe yt a-bouen w’ paryt gynger & servye yt for þe

Crystal Gely

Take gode wyte wyne þe wyl holde ys colour’ & boyle 3our’ fysshe þer-yn &
do þer-wyth yn maner as 3e do wyth þe oþer & 3eue yt none oþer colour’ þan shalt þe haue
gely as bryȝt as seluer & servye yt for þe

Gely of flesshe /

Le conyngges & scalde pygges take of þe skymmys scalde chykeys draw hem
& ȝyf þe wyly may charpe a kyd & do hyt to-gedyr boyle yt yn red wyne
take yt vp lay yt on a clene clōþ dry þe pyces of þe kyde & of þe conyngges &
of þe pygges & couche yt yn dysshes coppe þe chekenys do þer-to set þe dysshes
yn a coulde place þe yt may stonde styl set þe broþ a-ȝen to fyr’ loke þe
yt be wel scomyt þe þer leue no fat þer-on take calues fete clene scaldyt
clene hem seþ þe hem yn þe same broþ tyl þey be tendyr loke þe broþ be sleue
scomymet vp yqal maner as þe dost þe flesshe fyl 3our’ dysshys þer-w’ & do
þer-to yqal maner as þe dest to fysshe

Creyme of almonðys

Blanche almonðys grynde hem kepe hem as wyte as þe may temper vp a ryk mylke
w’ fayr’ water draw yt vp yqal clene pot set yt on þe fyer’ster’ yt wel
wen yt be-gynnyth to seþ take yt of ȝyf þe haue y moche do þer-to a dysshe
ful of vynygyr ȝyf þer be lytyl do yn þe lesse hele þe pot late yt stonde
lytly wyle haue a clene clōþ holdyn a-buode by twyne fowr’menster-
yt & cast þe creyme þer-yn w’ a ledyl a-buode as þe clōþ & rub þe clōþ vndyr-

Branche almonðys grynde hem as wyte as þe may temper vp a ryk mylke
w’ fayr’ water draw yt vp yqal clene pot set yt on þe fyer’ster’ yt wel
wen yt be-gynnyth to seþ take yt of ȝyf þe haue y moche do þer-to a dysshe
ful of vynygyr ȝyf þer be lytly do yn þe lesse hele þe pot late yt stonde
lytly wyle haue a clene clōþ holdyn a-buode by twyne fowr’menster-
yt & cast þe creyme þer-yn w’ a ledyl a-buode as þe clōþ & rub þe clōþ vndyr-
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ne⁴ towart & frowart w¹ p⁵ egge of a ladyl p¹ p⁵ may draw oute p⁵ water
p³n gadyr to-gedyr yn-to p⁵ myddyl of p⁵ clo⁴ bynde p⁵ corneres to-gedyr
honge yt on a pyn lete p⁵ water soke oute do yt yn a bol temper yt vp wyth
whyte wyne bese yt w¹ a sauce tyl yt be as soft as p⁵ wylt ——

hages of almayne

Dræw eyryn p⁵ rew a strynor & parboyle parsoly yn fat bro⁶ hew yt yn harde 3ol=
kys of cyeryn to-gedyr do þer-to poudyr of gynger suger & sal⁴t & cake mery & put
yt yn a streynor ende late yt honge yn a boylyng pot parboyle yt take yt vp
late hym kele cut yt smal take p⁵ drawun eyeryn put hem yn a pan loke p⁵ pan
be moyst of grece late p⁵ batour’ þen a-brode yn-tyl a foyle couche þer-yn p⁵
harde 3ol kys of eyeryn & p⁵ mery & p⁵ parcelle & turne p⁴ four’ sydys to ge-
þ¹ yt close a-bouen & lygge squar’ take of þe same batur’ wete þe egges
þ¹ yt hold stauche & close yn þe stufe turne yt vp soden & fry yt on boþ sydes
& serue yt forp⁶ ———

Quistes
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Appendix 1: f.3r

- Capons of hyȝt g’od resy
- Swan’ rostyd
- ffesantes rostyd
- Grethe tarthys
- And a sotylte
- b† 2e cowrs
- Blancke desor’
- pyggis rostyd
- kyde Crane
- ffesantes heyron’
- Chykenys rostyd
- Breme in brace
- Cartes Drawn’ bruse
- Conyngges rostyd
- And a sotylte.
- b† thryd b† cowrs’
- Bruet of almayne
- Ste le lum bard
- Venysone’ Cygret (?)
- Chekenys partryche
- peions . Xabettes
- Quails larkys rostyd
- payne puffle & perche boylyd
- A dysche of gely
- lon’ ffretoures
- And a sotylte.

ffor b† kyngges tabioun on fysche day
b† ffyrs th cowrs

- […]3
- C[…]bil & op[…] potage
- powderys fysche
- pyke . lomperay .
- ffresche fysche
- And the bakyn methe

List of Courses

- b† 2e cowrs
- A potage
- Trught . perche
- fflawnderys
- Scrympys
- Crabbys . And
- Lopsterys boylyd
- And a bakyn methe
- b† thryd b† · cowurs

- ff for the pyne In the Ey
- Take the Iuse off Red
- ff[…]
- i or ii droppeys & putt yt
- In the sor’ ys and take ther-of Æest […]
- ffor ¼ knyȝthys tabioun / The ffyrs th cowrs .
- Venysone wit formente
- Yand bruce
- Borys hed†
- Swan’ rostyd
- pyke in sauce
- Custede halibath
- And a sotylthe.

-The 2e cowrs .
- A potage Icallyd gely
- An potage blauce desore
- pyggis I-rostyd
- kyd I-rostyd
- chkelys’ indoryd
- Breme in sauce
- Cartys . brawn’ bruce
- Conyngges I-rostyd
- And a sotylthe.

-The thryd b† cowrs
- Bruet of almayne
- Stewed lum bard
- Venysone’ Cygret (?)
- Chekenys partryche
- peions . Xabettes
- Quails larkys rostyd
- payne puffle & perche boylyd
- A dysche of gely
- lon’ ffretoures
- And a sotylte.

ffor b† kyngges tabioun / The ffyrs th cowrs .
- Venysone wit sy[…]p[…]cer??
- The ffyrs the cowrs
- Venysone wit fyrmente
- Yand bruce
- Grethe fflesche
- Borys hed†

1 Probably meant to be ‘chekeny’s’
2 Illegible letters are marked with dots and put in square brackets.
Appendix 2: A Fuller Discussion of Hands in MS Sloane 442

The image examples from the MS that follow are divided into three categories – 1A-F, 2A-D, and 3A-B, each category successively discussed. Category 1 represents hand I, the second represents hand II, and the third hand III.

Ex.1A f.33v ‘medical section’

Ex.1B f.2r ‘medical recipes’ (located in the beginning of cookery section)
All the images 1A-F are listed as examples of folios ascribed to ‘hand I’, in order to give account for only three hands, as listed in the BL Catalogue. However as the images clearly show, the handwriting on these folios varies a lot, thus justifying a closer study.

The script on ex.1C f.31v tilts upwards to the right. The open form ‘w’ is carried out in two strokes (with a pen lift), whereas the open form ‘w’ in the following image of ex.1D f.28r is written in a single stroke (without a pen-lift) – resulting in two differently shaped characters that might indicate that the hand is not the same. Another feature, present in the examples on ff.2r, 28r, and 33v, but absent in the example on ex.1C ff.31v, is the ‘2-shaped’ ‘r’ (employed for both Anglicana and Secretary).
The script on f.31v has many of the same features as the script on f.6r, but there are some features that make them different. First of all the hand on f.31v is untidy compared to the example of f.6r, due to the ‘upwards tilting’, in addition the ‘w’ employed is not the same. F.31r has an open variant performed with two pen strokes that are typical of Secretary, whereas on f.6r the ‘w’ has the more elaborate ‘113’-shape, typical of Anglicana. Also on f.31r only the double compartment ‘a’ of Anglicana is used whereas on f.6r and its likes, the single compartment Secretary ‘a’ is predominant. In sum these discrepancies place f.31v in the ‘hand I section’ and f.6r in the ‘hand II section’.

The above examples, taken from ex.1E, illustrate how the three words ‘and’, ‘the’, and ‘Take’ are executed with different strokes on the same folio, most likely by two different hands. Hand A employs the double compartment ‘a’ in ‘and’ along with a looped ‘d’ that ends in an upward stroke to the left. The execution of the ‘a’ is completely different from hand B, who also employs a rather ‘abnormal’ looking double compartment ‘a’ that reminds more of an ‘o’ linked with a modern ‘l’. Hand B also employs the looped ‘d’ – however his ‘d’ ends in a downward stroke. Next one should note that hand A links the ‘t’ and the ‘h’, but leaves the ‘e’ ‘on its own’, contrary to hand B whose characters are joined up all three – the curved stroke of the ‘h’ makes a backward curl to the right, resulting in a joined ‘e’ (reversed, open form). Finally the capital ‘T’s in hand A and hand B are executed with differently performed curls and strokes that affect the looks. It is thus more than just the visual first impression that makes up the conclusion that the above examples of hand A and hand B most likely represent two different hands.
Ex.2A f.35r ‘medical section’

Ex.2B f.6r ‘cookery section’

Ex.2C f.8v ‘cookery section’
Examples 2 A-D represent images of what has been labelled ‘hand II’, characterized by a slanted, relatively even and neatly executed script. The script on ff.6r-9r is slightly more upright than the rest of the folios ascribed to hand II. Due to the ‘thicker’ looking pen strokes and darker ink from f.9v onwards, the preceding folios have either been written with a ‘lighter’ hand or executed with a thinner tip of the pen than is the case for the other folios – or the change might simply be caused by a change of writing tools. Ff.6r-9r are in addition more ‘spacious’ than the other folios ascribed to Hand II, in fact the more ‘crammed’ folios allow for two or three more lines than on ff.6r-9r. On top of these characteristics comes the fact that the execution of capitals change to some extent into more elaborate/embellished shapes from f.9v. Moreover the decending stroke of ‘h’ and also the long ‘s’ are slightly longer on ff.6r-9r. There are also marginalia on ff.6v-9r whereas the rest of the cookery section has none, though the medical section includes some marginalia.

On the grounds of the changes that occur on f.9v – change of ink, more lines on the folios, slightly more slanted hand, end of marginalia (in the cookery section), and somewhat differently looking capitals, one could argue that ff.6-9r there is a slight chance that they were written by another scribe. In that case Hand II would comprise two hands.
Hand III, found uniquely on ff.23r-25v, looks very unlike the other scripts, though most of the same features of hand I and II are present, the strokes are differently executed. The script is upright, like the script on ff.6r-9r, and is very neatly executed with even letter shapes and the large loops of the ‘d’ swing even more toward the left side than is the case for the other hands. Word final long ‘r’ has a very elaborate upward curl attached to it, a feature also present on other folios, however not as large and distinct as this one. Though claiming so is probably biased, this hand does have a rather feminine look to it. There is a fair chance that a woman may have contributed in the production of the MS, since according to Millward and Hayes, female scribes were not as rare as previously thought (Millward and Hayes 2012: 160).

Contrary to hand II, hand III uses the closed 8-shaped ‘g’ consistently. In addition macrons are carried out with a straight horizontal line above letter, contrary to the curved macrons present in the rest of the MS. In general the loops of the ‘h’, ‘l’, ‘d’, and initial ‘v’ are larger, taller, and more elaborately executed. It might be worth noticing the extensive use of diacritics (see Petti 1977:27). While this sign is usually employed to distinguish the ‘i’ from other minims, interestingly it is by this hand used not only above the ‘i’, but also eagerly
above the ‘y’, even though the letter is not affected by the minim problem. The ampersand symbol is also equipped with a straight ‘top-stroke’. In addition hand III uses another variant of the ampersand symbol compared to the other hands (looking much like a ‘z’ with a bar across the mid-section).

The evidence of this report may not be enough to draw any conclusions about hands involved in the MS production – however it sheds light on the the fact that the variation in these hands is relatively prominent, thus it is much in its place to raise the question if the number listed in the BL Catalogue is correct. It is in the case of hand I it seems very unlikely that one scribe produced all these different looking handwritings, which in fact looks like the work of four different persons. A more in-depth study of the whole bulk of paleographic evidence that this MS consists of would probably enable a more precise answer with respect to the number of hands. This study of the hands raises the question whether the number of hands listed is correct. However the extent of the query is considered too comprehensive to be fitted into this project – though it would have been an interesting strand to pursue. Nonetheless this limited study clearly points in the direction of the presence of more than three hands.
Appendix 3: Middle English Variation

Though the full picture is more nuanced, the Norman Conquest (1066) is frequently put forth as the one major incident in the history of the English language that contributed to the ‘fall’ of OE and the coming of ME, and in a way the event does represent a paradigm shift.

For some centuries, English ceased to be the language of government, and there was no such thing as a national, standard literary English; and when English did once again become a major literary language across the whole country it had changed a good deal under the influence of the conquerors.

Barber, Beal, and Shaw 2009:144

The Norman rulers, who spoke Norman French, must have exercised some influence on the English language, yet the language did not change overnight, and influence from previous invaders and settlers is likely to also have contributed to these changes.

During the period between 43-426 AD, when England was a part of the Roman Empire, people spoke Celtic (the ancestor of modern Welsh) (Rogers 2011 [2005]:185). Then German-speaking peoples from the continent invaded the country – profiting from the political vacuum that arose when the Roman troops withdrew – taking over what are today England and southern Scotland (Rogers 2011 [2005]:185). Later also Norse peoples (Vikings: Swedes, Danes and Norwegians) invaded parts of Britain – with particularly aggressive attacks in the ninth century. Viking armies might have taken over the whole of England if King Alfred had not won the battle of Guthrum at Edington in 878 (Barber, Beal and Shaw 2009:138). However King Alfred and the Vikings split the country, so that the Vikings controlled the Danelaw (Northumbria, Danish Mercia, and East Anglia) and King Alfred controlled the south (English Mercia, Wessex, and Wales) (Barber, Beal and Shaw 2009:138).

There must have existed some bilingualism in the period, as the Old Norse and Old English were ‘reasonably similar’ – following that Danes (Vikings) and Englishmen would speak each other’s languages, and mixed marriages would have lead to bilingual children (Barber, Beal and Shaw 2009:140). However it was the language of King Alfred and not that of King Cnut that continued to be used at the end of this period, though it was obviously subject to the mixing in of a good deal of Scandinavian (Barber, Beal and Shaw 2009:140).

In the OE period there were most likely a variety of dialects, but written evidence that may attest it is scarce – a lot of manuscripts, OE as well as Latin, were destroyed by the
invading Vikings (Millward and Hayes 2012:136). Written OE has been grouped into four dominant dialects/forms, though, based on the surviving texts (of which the vast majority was written in the West Saxon dialect). These four dialects were West Saxon, Kentish, Mercian, and Northumbrian – however the last two are frequently grouped into one – Anglian (Barber, Beal and Shaw 2009:110). The dialect that developed into a relatively uniform written literary language that spread, was the West Saxon, so the Old English one refers to is often the Late West Saxon language. This ‘standardised’ OE variant was maintained through the eleventh century, mainly in a few monastic communities. Surviving OE writings from this period are those of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicles, however the most famous literary work is Beowulf, which is actually written in an Anglian variant, with some features from West Saxon (Barber, Beal and Shaw 2009:114, 110).

‘Winchester emerged as the capital of England at this time, and with the sponsorship of King Alfred, its monastery became a recognized centre of learning in Europe with a large library’ (Rogers 2011 [2005]:185). Within the monastic community of Winchester one was particularly concerned with orthography, and it is from this community that the standardised variant of OE spread. The scribes of this community tended to copy manuscripts in their own dialect (West Saxon), and other monasteries seemed to follow in their lead. Also the monastic houses of Worcester and Rochester were concerned with the preservation of OE1 (Clanchy 1993 [2005]:212). Though text production in the OE period was limited, and usually restricted to the elites, it was often located in the monastic centres. However one of William the Conqueror’s doings after the Conquest was to replace most of the scribes with French speaking scribes, and it must be said to be rather impressive that one managed to keep the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle going for as long as until 1154 (the Petersborough Chronicle) (Millward and Hayes 2012:145, and Barber, Beal, and Shaw 2009:173).

Centuries without a written standard probably widened the gap between writing (of the now ‘extinct’ Late West-Saxon) and speech (Middle English dialects). When English again regained its position as written language, it is likely that the ‘pre-Conquest’ written OE was relatively distant from the late Middle English spoken dialects – especially considering that at the time of the Conquest there probably already existed a certain gap between spoken and written language – inasmuch as written language tends to be conservativen in form. However it should be emphasized that ME did not just ‘happen’ overnight with the Conquest – the new

---

1 Clanchy is one of those who use the term Anglo-Saxon for Old English.
spelling conventions of ME might have contributed to the impression that the shift from OE to ME was more sudden than was really the case (Barber, Beal and Shaw 2009:161).

After the Conquest the official language became Norman French, though the most frequently written language was still Latin. For more than two centuries English was reduced to merely a spoken language and definitely the lowest ranking of the three languages (Latin, French, and English) that were in use under Norman reign, even though it was the language of around ninety-five per cent of the population. William the Conqueror replaced the vast majority of the English noblemen (many had died in battles) with his own French-speaking followers, and the expriated lands were redistributed to the new French-speaking elites. Also scribes were replaced by Normans, probably William must have seen the advantages of controlling the written word. Since English was not written for a long while, one could say that OE in a sense buried/masked the changes that took place in oral English, making OE the written evidence that occludes the changes in oral language.

A complex linguistic situation, with a ruling class who, for the most part, did not speak the same language as their underlings, must have led to some ‘mixed-up’ linguistic variants in order to facilitate communication between the two groups. In addition some of the new gentry took English wives, whereby their offspring may have been bilingual. To what extent the mixing of French and English have influenced the changes in the English language in the late Middle Ages might be discussed. If the Norman Conquest never took place, written English might have developed in a completely different direction, the Scandinavian influence might have been even stronger – though one will never know. There is no doubt however that French has influenced the English lexicon, as a generous amount of Norman and French loanwords are proof of (Barber, Beal, and Shaw 2009:155-160) Millward and Hayes 2012:150). Nevertheless Scandinavian loanwords are also frequent, and probably the sum of all ‘linguistic influence’ exercised by invaders, conquerors and new settlers, has without doubt contributed to the shaping of the English language.

Moreover the phonological changes known as the Great Vowel Shift in the mid-fifteenth century (thoroughly described by Millward and Hayes (2012:153-159), and Barber,
Beal, and Shaw (2009:163-167), Machan suggests, might be seen as the sociolinguistic consequences of the late-medieval immigration to London, particularly from East Anglia (Machan 2003: Ch.1 The Ecology of Middle English). The period when London establishes its place as national centre for commerce and the seat of government coincides with these phonological changes. Also the near proximity to England’s first University – Oxford must probably also be seen as part of this process.

The completely ‘new look’ of the written language, represented by the new orthography, must be the most prominent change that took place in the shift from OE to ME (Barber, Beal, and Shaw 2009:161). The changes in spelling were for instance seen in the weakened inflectional system where the OE-endings -an, -on, -un, and -um were simplified into one single ending -en, later on reduced to -e. Also word-final -a, -u, -e became only -e, whereas both -as and -es endings became -es, and -alp and -elp became -elp (Barber, Beal, and Shaw 2009:167-168). In general the case system was considerably simplified. Weakened inflections also affected the ME verb system. Though OE verbs had many inflections, it only had two tenses: present and past. This system was to be replaced by a complicated system that built upon the use of primary auxiliaries (be, have, do) and the modal auxiliaries (shall, should, will etc.) (Barber, Beal, and Shaw 2009:171). With ME came some new consonants; <ʒ> was much replaced by <g> though it was retained for the fricatives, and <þ> and <ð> were replaced by <th> (however thorn is still much in use in Middle English until 1400).

There were several visually different spellings in ME compared to OE, all of which are systematically described in Barber, Beal, and Shaw (2009:161-163). Finally the Great Vowel Shift represented a gradual sound change concerning the vowels and diphthongs, which would eventually affect orthography. In short the pronunciation of these changed, physically speaking, from being pronounced in a back position to a more frontal raised position, resulting in what one might call a more ‘lax’ pronunciation – insofar as the pronunciation itself might be described as a less cumbersome process.

The changes from OE to ME, some of which are just briefly explained here, concern written language – as long as text is the only available material for the study of linguistic changes, one can only assume, by referring to the Uniformitarian Principle5, that changes in

5 The Uniformitarian Principle concerns the idea that one must first look to the present in order to find the answers about the past, or as Machan puts it; ‘Nothing (no event, sequence of events, constellation of properties, general law) that cannot for some good reason be the case in the present was ever true for the past’ (Machan, 2003: Ch.1/loc.138). Transferred to society and language this implies that ‘the linguistic forces which operate today and are observable around us are not unlike those which have operated in the past. Sociolinguistically speaking this means that there is no reason for claiming that language did not vary in the same patterned ways in the past as it has been observed to do today (Romaine, cited in Machan, 2003: Ch.1).
written language reflect changes in oral language as well. As the Middle Ages come to an end and the Renaissance is on the verge, written English becomes less variable, simultaneous with the increasing use of the so-called Chancery Standard – ‘the official language of the London administrators and the direct ancestor of modern Standard English. […] The dialects of spoken language did not die out, but those of the written language did – and although there are some late survivals, they are no sufficient basis for a dialect atlas’ (eLALME Vol.1: Ch.1.1.2).

All languages are both constant and subject to changes, or as Lass puts it; ‘a language is a population of variants moving through time, and subject to selection’ (Lass 1997:377). Also Middle English is the sum of several factors that contributed to this highly variable written language. For a long period under the French-Norman rulers written English was not in use as Old English more or less ceased to exist. Contact with people of other nationalities (invaders), as well as the migration that took place within the country made their impressions on the English language. Thus when written English again regains its status in the late Middle Ages, a national written standard is lacking, so speech, represented by the various regional dialects, becomes the model for written language.
Appendix 4: Example Recipes

The following example recipes visualize the development in recipe layout, but they are also meant to illustrate the changes that have taken place with respect to the language of cookery recipes, though the imperative mood is still employed, the modern recipes are of a much more precise character in regard to measures and timings.

Ex.1 MS Sloane 442

f.7r  Iowty on flessche days/

Take parcylye and oþer good herbyes parboyle hem’ well’ in water
presse owt þ water. hew hem ryȝt smalle or grynde hem’
Iowty
ʒif þu wilt . & þu may hew a lytyl fat porke & grynþ ʒer-w’
temper it vp w’ swethe broth. and hit þ be somdell’ chargeaunt
of the herbyes . do it in a pott . boyle it . And lie it vp
ʒer-wit . And ʒif þu wilt þu myȝt draw breþ w’ som of the
broth . & a-lie it vp a lityl þer-w’ . salt hit & serue it forȝth’
w’ rybbys of bacon’ . or of fatt’ flessche ʒif þu wilt . And
fyssche days . þu myȝt parboyle herbyes And make hem’
vp in þe same maner wit broth of fresche fyssche or w’ elys
w’ a dysch melke of almondes & sugur and salt & lat noon’
oþer licowur come þer-ynne . ~

f.12r  Bruit of lombardye .

Thake hennys chekenys conynges . or oþur good flesch’ soden
& tryed do it in a pot do . þer-to mylke of almondes & peper a-lay it
wit bred . & þo þer-to ȝolkys of eyryn’ sodyn’ harde growndyn’ &
drawyn’ vp wit lus of parcyly . þo þer-to a lytyl grece or a lytyl
bottur clayfied . or þe fatte of porke & seson it vp wit powdur
salt & vynegur & make red as blod wit alkenet
TO ROAST PORK.
When the skin is left on the joint which is to be roasted, it must be scored in narrow strips of equal width before it is put to the fire, and laid at a considerable distance from it at first, that the meat may be heated through before the skin hardens or begins to brown; it must never stand still for an instant, and the basting should be constant. Pork is not at the present day much served at very good tables, particularly in this form; and it is so still less with the old savoury stifling of sage and onions, though some eaters like it always with the leg: when it is ordered for this joint, therefore, prepare it as directed for a goose, at page 160, and after having loosened the skin from the knuckle, insert as much as can well be secured in it. A little clarified butter or salad oil may be brushed over the skin quite at first, particularly should the meat not be very fat, but unless remarkably lean, it will speedily yield sufficient dripping to baste it with. Joints from which the fat has been pared, will require of course far less roasting than those on which the crackling is retained. Brown gravy, and apple or tomato sauce, are the usual accompaniments to all roasts of pork: except a suckling pig they should always be thoroughly cooked.

Leg of pork of 8 lbs., 3 hours; loin of from 5 to 6 lbs., with the skin on, 2 to 2 1/4 hours; spare rib of 6 to 7 lbs., 1 1/2 hour.

TO BOIL NEW POTATOES.\(^6\)
These are never good unless freshly dug. Take them of equal size, and rub off the skins with a brush or a very coarse cloth, wash them clean, and put them without salt into boiling, or at least, quite hot water; boil them softly, and when they are tender enough to serve, pour off the water entirely, strew some fine salt over them, give the a shake, and let them stand by the fire in the saucepan for a minute; then dish and serve them immediately. Some cooks throw in a small slice of fresh butter, with the salt, and toss them gently in it after it is dissolved. This is a good mode, but the more usual one is to send melted butter to table with them, or to pour white sauce over them when they are very young, and served early in the season.

Very small, 10 to 15 minutes: moderate sized, 15 to 20 minutes. \(\text{Obs.} —\)

We always, for our own eating, have new potatoes steamed for ten minutes or longer after the water is poured from them, and think they are much improved by the process. They should be thoroughly boiled before this is done.

---

\(^6\)Acton’s directions for how to boil potatoes are really thorough, and slightly humorous – how could one ever go wrong with these instructions?
No.12. COW-HEEL BROTH.

Put a couple of cow-heels into a boiling-pot, with a pound of rice, a dozen leeks washed from grit and cut into pieces, and some coarsley chopped parsley; fill up with six quarts of water, set the whole to boil on the fire, skim it well, season with thyme, pepper, and salt, and allow the whole to boil very gently on the hob for about two hours. You will thus provide a savoury meal at a small cost.

No.13. BACON AND CABBAGE SOUP.

When it happens that you have a dinner consisting of bacon and cabbages, you invariably throw away the liquor in which they have been boiled, or, at the best, give it to the pigs, if you possess any; this is wrong, for it is easy to turn in to a better account for your own use, by paying attention to the following instructions, viz.: — Put your piece of bacon on to the boil in a pot with two gallons (more or less, according to the number you have to provide for) of water, when it has boiled up, and has been well skimmed, add the cabbages, kale, greens, or sprouts, whichever may be used, well washed and split down, and also some parsnips and carrots; season with pepper, but no salt, as the bacon will season the soup sufficiently; and when the whole has boiled together very gently for about two hours, take up the bacon surrounded with the cabbage, parsnips, and carrots, leaving a small portion of the vegetables in the soup, and pour this into a large bowl containing slices of bread; eat the soup first, and make it a rule that those who eat most soup are entitled to the largest share of bacon.
COQ AU RIESLING

I have always loved the Alsatian version of coq au vin and this is it in a stunningly stream-lined version. I replace the onion with leek, buy chicken thighs and ready-cubed lardons. The brown meat is always best in a stew. In fact, nearly always best full stop. I don’t bother to sear the meat, which means you really need skinless portions; unbrowned chicken skin is not pretty. If you’re not buying thighs, but thigh fillets, then it is probably more helpful to think in terms of boned weight, rather than the number of portions: go, here, for about 1.25 kilos.

I tend not to add any cream to this first time around but, if I have a small amount left over, I add a little double cream and turn it into a pasta sauce. I like to eat my coq au Riesling as they do in Alsace, with a huge pile of buttered noodles. Whether you add cream or not is entirely up to you.

2 x 15 ml tablespoons garlic oil
150g bacon lardons
1 leek, finely sliced
12 boneless, skinless chicken thighs
3 bay leaves
300g oyster mushrooms, torn into strips

1 x 75cl bottle Riesling
double cream
salt and pepper to taste
1-2 tablespoons chopped fresh dill to serve

1 Heat the oil in a casserole or large, wide pan and fry the lardons until crisp.

2 Add the sliced leek and soften it with the lardons for a minute or so.

3 Cut chicken thighs into 2 or 3 pieces each, tip them into the pan with the bay leaves, torn mushroom and wine.

4 Season with salt and pepper to taste and bring to the boil, cover the pan and simmer gently for 30-40 minutes, stirring in the double cream for the last couple of minutes if you want. Like all stews, this tastes its mellowest best if you let it get cold and then reheat the next day. But it’s no hardship to eat straight off. Whichever, serve sprinkled with dill and together with some buttered noodles.

Serves 6
MINCE & ONION PIE

CREAM CHEESE PASTRY

Many generations have been brought up on pies like this. I didn’t want to steer too far from tradition, so I’ve kept this one very humble and beautiful – it’s all about a simple filling and a damn good pastry recipe. Serve with some steamed seasonal greens and a spoonful of mashed potato, and you know everything will be all right…

Serves 6
Total time: 1 hour 40 minutes

600g minced beef
olive oil
3 large red onions
8 spigs of fresh thyme
225g plain flour, plus extra for dusting
1 heaped teaspoon English mustard
2 tablespoons balsamic or red wine vinegar
1 beef stock cube
100g unsalted butter
1 big pinch of cayenne pepper
100g full-fat cream cheese
1 large egg

Place a large pan on a medium-high heat, then put in the beef and a lug of oil. Fry for around 15 minutes, or until all the liquid has evaporated, breaking it down with a wooden spoon as you go. Peel and roughly chop the onions and add to the pan, strip in the thyme leaves, and cook for a further 10 minutes, or until the onions are soft and starting to brown. Stir in 1 heaped tablespoon of flour, followed by the mustard, tomato purée and vinegar. Crumble in the stock cube, pour 640 ml of boiling water, then simmer for 30 minutes, or until thickened, stirring occasionally. Season to perfection.

Meanwhile, put 200g of flour, the butter, cayenne pepper and cream cheese into a food processor and pulse until it starts to come together. Tip out on to a flour-dusted work surface and pat and bring it together – try not to overwork it, or you’ll have chewy, instead of lovely, crumbly pastry. Wrap in clingfilm and leave to rest in the fridge until needed.

Preheat the oven to 180°C/350°F/gas 4. Once the pie filling is ready, tip into a pie dish (roughly 25cm). On a flour-dusted work surface, roll out the pastry so it’s slightly bigger than your dish. Beat the egg, then brush the edge of the dish. Roll the pastry around your rolling pin, then unroll on top of the pie. Roughly trim away the excess, and pinch the edges to seal (use any leftover pastry to decorate the top, if you like). Brush the pastry with eggwash and bake for around 30 minutes on the middle shelf of the oven, 45 minutes if cooking from cold, or until beautifully golden. Serve with seasonal veg.
Appendix 7: Glossary of culinary terms  (main sources: MED, OED, and Hieatt 1988)

Some abbreviations used

adj. – adjective
adv. – adverb
n. – noun
pa. – past
p. – participle
pl. – plural
pr. – present
v. – verb
Fr. – French

A

dle n. – ale, beer
dlkenet n. – alkanet, plant root used to make red colour
dlmond, dlmondb n. – almond
dneys, dnnys n. – anise, herb with a sweet taste of liquorice, both the seeds and the stalks were used
daence n. – avens, herb and spice, the root reminds of cloves, also medicinal use

B

bakyn methe n. – pie, pasty
dllok broth n. – fish stew
dast v.pr.— to baste; the action of pouring liquid over the meat to keep is moist during the roasting process
dasth- see bast
datour, datowur n. – batter
dfeff n. – beef, ox
benys n.pl. – bones
beteyne n. – betony, a herb that was also used for medicinal purposes (against anxiety f.ex.)
bettes n.pl. – beet greens
blanche, blanche, blannk adj. – white
blanche powdur n. – white powder: mixed whithe powdered spices, usually containing sugar and spices like ginger, nutmeg and cinnamon – might be the same as dowce powdur
bloþe n. – blood
bonys n.pl. – bones
borage n. – borage, herb, the leaves are edible
borys n. – boar
bowelys n.pl. – bowels (in cooking, the intestines – like liver, heart, lungs)
boyle, boylyng v. – boil
brace n. – the fat from frying: braising sauce
brasse pot n. – cooking vessel made of brass
brawn n. – meat
bred, brede, breed, breþ breþe n. – bread
breme n. – bream is both a sea and freshwater fish, lots of different variants
brestys n. – breast
broche v.pr. (hym ) – the action putting meat on a broche (spit/skewer)
broche n. – spit/skewer used for cooking meat (or fish) over an open fire
brothe n. – broth
bruce v.pa.p. – bruised, crushed
bruet, brueth n. – broth, or food cooked in broth
bukinadde n. – sauce for veel
butter, buttur, buttyr n. – butter

C
calff n. – calf, veal
calues fete n. – feet of calf
canabens n.pl. – dried white beans
canell, canyl n. – cinnamon (Fr. canelle)
capon, capownys n. – male chicken, castrated so that it becomes large and fat
cawdell n. – sauce or custard thickened with egg yolks
cawlys n.pl. – cabbages
ceue n. – broth, sauce, juice
charde quyns/charde wardoun n. – preserves of quinces/wardens (pears)
chargeant, chargeaunt adj. – thick
chargeowur n. – serving dish/tray of some sort
charlet n. – meat boiled in custard of some sort
chawff v. – heat
chaudon, chaudrown n. – sauce or pottage usually made of the various inner organs
chekenys, chykeney, chykenys n.pl. – chicken
chese n. – cheese
chop, chope, choppe v.pr. – chop
chowche v. – arrange
chyn n. – chin
claryfyed v.pa.p. – clarified, clarified butter is made by melting the butter so that the milk proteins fall to the bottom and the clean fat can be poured out and used for frying in
cleue v. – split
clow n. – claw, on bird’s feet
clowes, clowys n.pl. – clove, a spice (not to be confused with cloves of garlic)
codlyng, coddlyng n. – small/young cod
coffyn, cofyn n. – coffin made from pastry (for filling)
cokkes, cokkys n. – cockles, saltwater shellfish
collopes, colponys n.pl. – slices
comfyte, confyzt, confyte, confyyt n. – candy, preserves – annys yn confyte: candied anise
connceys n. – sauce for capon
congur, congyr n. – conger; sea eel
conynes, conyngges n.pl. – rabbits
corys n.pl. – kernels, seeds
couche, cowche v. – arrange
cowrs n. – course
crabbys n.pl. – crabs
crane n. – crane, wading bird
creme, creyme n. – cream, custard
creteneys, creney n. – dish made from chicken, also sauce
cromelyt pa.p. – crumble (i.e. make crumbs of something)
crommys n.pl. – crumbs

croppys n.pl. – sprouts, tips (croppys of nettlys: the young leaves of nettles)

crudel’ n. – curd, curdle

Crustes n.pl. – the crust of bread

cubebe, cubebs n. – Java peppercorn. This variant is rare in Europe today, however common in the Middle Ages, imported from Java via the Arabs. Expensive spice, but cheaper than the ‘regular’ black pepper. See also quibibe, quibylys.
cuplens n.p. – slices
cyue n. – onion sauce

D
dage n. – a dish of rice and ground pork boiled in broth
dates, dattes n.pl. – dates
der’, deer n. – dear
desor’, desore, desyr n. – dish from Syria (Fr. ‘de Syrie), so ‘blanche desyr’ means white dish from Syria
dornbak n. – thornback, fish
doucet, douset, dowcet adj. – sweet tasting
dowce powdur n. – mild powdered spices, usually mixed with sugar
dragge n. – a sprinkling of
draw, drawnen, drawyn v. – blend, also the action of removing entrail
drawȝthe n. – entrails
dykke adj. – thick, ‘dykke mylke’ (thick milk) is cultured milk (soured)
dysche, pyschys n. – dish, plate
dyse v. – dice

E
egge n. – blade, edge
ele n. – eel
elys n.pl. – eels
endor v. – to put a layer of glace on a piece of meat or a roast, egg yolks were frequently used
erbis n.pl. – herbs
erde n. – clay (pot of erde)
esy sauce – ‘gentle’ sauce, cooked at a low heat
eyeryn, eyryn n.pl. – eggs

F
farsor, farsour n. – farce of meat (today one usually employs the term minced meat)
fete n. – feet
ffesantes n.pl. – pheasants
fflawnderys n.pl. – flounders, flat sea fish
fisch, fishce, fysch n. – fish
flat potage – thin pottage/soup
fle of v. – skin, flay
lesche, flessche, flesshe n. – meat
fflorye, florysche v. – garnish
flownderys, fflown’peres n. – flounder, flat sea fish
fondew, payne fondew – bread soaked in sweet sauce
fformente, formente, furmente n. – a dish of boiled hulled wheat
foyle n. – leaf
foyls n.pl. – leaves
frute n. – fruit
frydadj. – fried (as in past frydþ: fried pastry/pasta dough)
fyges of amalek n.pl. – figs of Amalek (MED suggests Malaga)
fygges n.pl. – figs
ffyletes n.pl. – fillets
fyn n. fynnyß pl. – fin (of a fish)
fyr, fyyr n. – fire
ffyrmente n. – dish of boiled hulled wheat
fysche, fyssche n. – fish
G

galentyne n. – spicy sauce thickened with bread

galingale n. – galanga (root) used as a spice, also medicinal uses

garbages n.pl. – garbages in this sense are the various intestines of the animal, like liver,
  lungs, kidneys

garlek, garlyk n. – garlic

gely n. – a sort of aspic: spiced jelly made of fish of meat broth with pieces of fish or meat

genger n. – ginger

giruard n. – gurnard, also known as sea robins, bottomdwelling sea fish, firm white flesh

gobettes n. – bits, small pieces

gooet n. – gut, the intestines, might be a specific part of the intestinal tract

goos, gooss n. – goos

gorge n. – throat (from Fr.
gory)

gratyd, gratyʒt v.pa.p. – grated

graue n. – sauce or broth that the meat/fish is cooked in

greece ʒ b falloyt – fat drippings (from the roasting of meat)

grene herbis – green herbs

grethe flesche – good meat

gretmesse n. – size

groddyn’, growndyn pa.p. – ground, crushed, stamped

gruell n. – pottage with pork meat (sometimes also beef)

grynde, grynb v.pr. – grind, crush something (to powder), stamp small/into small pieces

H

haddok, haddoke n. – hake, a sea fish mild in flavor, whiting family

hages n. – haggis: a dish of entrails and herbs, chopped into pieces, stuffed into an
  animal’s maw and boiled

hages of Almayne – stuffed omelette

hak fyssche n. – hake, a sea fish mild in flavor, whiting family

halibath, halybut n. – halibut, sea fish in the flounders family
hare n. – hare
harthe n. – heart
heddes n. – head
hensche n. – an instrument (comb) for carding flax
hennys n.pl. – hen
herbis, herbys n.pl – herbs
herde (erde) n. – baked clay – pot of herde: clay pot
herdyn adj. – made of clay
heu, hew, hewe, hewyn v. – chop
hezelnotos n.pl. – hazelnuts
hole, hoole, howude adj. – whole
hothe adj. – hot, strong
hullys n.pl. – hull, the tough outer part of the grain (those that are removed to make fine flour)

I
indorr v. – endore, make golden with egg batter
inowgh adj. – enough
iowt, iowtes, iowutis (7r) n. – a soup or pottage of boiled vegetables made of meat or fish broth, thickened with bread crumbs
irostyd v.pa.p. – roasted
iryn n. – iron, rost iryn – roasting iron
ius n. – jus

K
kaboches n.pl. – cabbages
kanell n. – cinnamon
kele v. – cool
kernelys of okerorys n. – probably acorns (okekornes)
keupe, keub⁶ n. – cup
kow melke – cow milk
**kuth** v.pr. – cut

**kyd, kyde, kydde** n. – kid (baby goat)

**L**

**lambyr** n. – amber (the colour of amber = yellow)

**lardes** n. – pork fat

**leeff** off grece n. – the layer of fat surrounding the kidneys or it may also be some particular part of a bird: the throat tissue

**leche, lesches, lechis, lechys, lecssyng** n. – slice, strip of

**legches** n.pl. – legs

**lekys** n. (qwythe of lekys) (7v) – leeks (the white part of the leeks)

**lentyn** n. – lent (long fasting period)

**lichowur, liour, liowur** n. – layer

**liuer** n. – liver

**lombard, lumbard** n. – lobster

**lomprey** n. – lamprey, freshwater fish (sucks blood from other fish)

**longes** n. – lungs

**lopresterys** n.pl. – lobster

**losenges** n.pl. – broad noodles

**louce** v.pr. – loose, be rid

**flycour, lycowr** n. – liquid

**lyuer** (n) - liver

**M**

**maces, maʒes** n. – mace: the hard outside of the nutmeg, used as spice

**makerell** n. – mackerel, sea fish

**malowes** n.pl. – mallow, herb, both leaves and flower were used, also in medicine

**marybonys** n.pl. – marrow bones

**mawmeny** n. – dish of chopped meat(s) and spices, mawmeny ryal has no meat but instead nuts and dried fruits (honey and sweet wine)

**melke of almonds** – almond milk

**melle** n. – water mill for grinding grain

**messe it fort** v. – serve it forth

**mortrewys** n. – dish of boiled and ground meat/fish
moskelys n. – mussels
moton n. – mutton
myce, mynsyd, mysyd v. – mince, minced
mylke n. – milk, ‘dykke mylke’ is cultured milk (soured)

N
nauyll n. – navel (on the fish this is of course an imaginary spot, since a fish does not have a navel)
neckys n. 20r – neck
nettlys n.pl. – nettles
nombel n. – the large edible inner organs of the animal: lungs, stomach, and heart – nombel also refers to the stew or soup made from these

O
onyons n.pl. – onions
otemele, othemele n. – oatmeal
ouerthwarthe adv. – across, crosswise
oyle n. – oil, vegetable or animal
oynownys, oynyons n.pl. – onions
oystris n. – ostridge

P
paapelade (hare in paapelade) n. – sauce (for hare)
pacyens n. – patience, dock, spinach dock, a herb used as a green/salad
parboyle v. – parboil
parcelle, parcill n. – parcellyparty n. – part, portion
partryche n. – partridge
paryng n. – trimmings (for ex. bread crusts or fruit peels)
paryt v. – trimmed, finely shredded
past n. – pastry or pasta dough
past, pasth n. – pastry or pasta dough (recipes for leavened bread dough do not occur)

payndemayn, paynemayn’ n. – white bread of the best quality
pecys n.pl. – peas
peke n. – pike

peletes, pelettes, peletys n.pl. – (a meat ball or other) food prepared in the shape of a ball –
most of the recipes in the Sloane 442 refer to ‘peletes’ made of dough.

peris, perys n.pl. – pears
pesyn n. – peas
petidaw n. – dish of goose oddments

pike, poke, pyke n. – a (relatively large) carnivorous freshwater fish of the Esox family
pines n.pl. – pine nuts
plays n. – plaice, a flat fish
plomme n. – plum

pome porr’ n. – a fruit dish
pomys n.pl – a fruit of some kind
porcon, porcyowun n. – portion
porre n. – leek (blananche porre – the white of leek)
porke n. – pork, meat from pig
porpays n. – porpoise; sea animal
porpays in galentyne – porpoise served in a spiced sauce made of bread and wine

potage n. – potage, soup
potthe n. – pot
powche n. – stomach

powders n.pl. – powders i.e. powdered spices
powdur fort – strong powder i.e. a blend of hot powdered spices (like pepper)
powr v. – pour
primerole n. – primrose
puen n. – lesche puen (proven) – dish of eels in almond milk
pygges, pyggis n.pl. – pigs
pyke up v. – coat, cover
pynes, pynnys n.pl. – pine nuts
Q
qualyng pr.p. – curdling, coagulating
quibibe, quibibs, quybylys n. – Java peppercorns see cubebs
quinces, quincies n.pl. – quince, a hard yellow and bitter fruit, in the rose family, grows on small trees, related to apples and pears, must be cooked
quistes n.pl. – wood dove
quyk pekok – live peacock
qwhithe pesyn n.pl. – white peas
qwhythe brede – white bread

R
rabettes n.pl. – rabbits
rede adj. – red (colour)
reffett n. – probably the edible entrails of the fish (liver and roe)
rennyng pr.p. – runny, thin
resons of corans (n) 19r – dried currants (small raisins) (from Fr. raisin de Corinthe sec)
reysens, reysonys n.pl. – grapes (from Fr. raisin)
roche n. – roach, a small fish, found in fresh and brackish water
roo n. – roe deer
rosemary n. – rosemary, a herb
rybbys n.pl. – ribs rys, rysse n. – rice

S
safferan, safferon n. – saffron
sauce verte – green sauce, made from herbs
sawge n. – sage, a herb
sawmon n. – salmon
sawnder, sawnderis, sawnderys, sowndys, sowndys, sawny‡rys n. – sandalwood, used for colouring
schele (hem) v. – scale
schrympis, schrympys n.pl. – shrimps
sckale (hem) v. – scale (to scrape off the fish shells)
schald v.pr. – scold
schellys n.pl. – shells
schepe n. – sheep
scheues, scheuys, schyuys n.pl. – slices (cf. the Norwegian/Danish ‘skiver’)
schooche v.pr. – score, make cuts
sckyne n. – skin
scleue, sclyue v. – split
scome v.pr. – scim
scomer n. – skimming utensil (f.ex. a spoon with holes in it)
scrympys n.pl. – shrimps
seed, sethe v.pr. – simmer
seroppe n. – syrpy
sesownpª v. – season
seue, sew, sewys n. – liquid, sauce
sewe v. – sow
seynowes n. – sinews (muscle tissue, the chewy parts of the meat)
skynne n. – skin
smythe v.pr. – cut up, divide
sokyng’ fyer 19r – slow fire, low heat
soole, solys n. – sole, sea fish in the flounder family
sopers n. – the evening meal
soppys n.pl. – sops, bread to mop up liquid
sotilte, sotilthe, sotylte n. – subtlety, a dish mainly meant as a surprise dish in order to impress guests, more a piece of art than a palatable dish, food made to look like something that it is not
sowndys, sownpª n. – the swim bladder of the fish, used as thickening agent or glue
spethe n. – spit
spices, spyces n.pl. – spices
splat, splatv. – split
stauche, staunch v.a.p.p. – stabbed, stuck
ster, steryt v. – stir
stewe v.pr. – to cook slowly at a low heat
stokfysche, stokkefisch n. – stockfish, dried cod (or other fish)
stondyn pr.p. – thick

storgeon n. – sturgeon, a large sea and freshwater fish, however the dish named storgeon for sopers is a ‘mock’ fish dish, as it is made from veal, containing no fish at all.

stranour, straynour, straynowur, strynur n. – strainer (kitchen utensil)

strepe v.pr. – strip, remove from

suet, sueet n. – sauce, broth, jus

suger, sugar, sugyr n. – suger

swete, swethe adj. – sweet, fresh

T

talage (of powdur) n. – taste, flavor

talbot n. – sauce made of the blood from a hare, also the name of a dish (of hare in talbot sauce)

tarage n. (MED:targe) – a small round shield used for combat, but in this context used as a serving tray

tartes, tarthys, tartys n.pl. – baked pastry dish with filling like meat, cheese or fruit, sometimes baked with a lid of pastry on the top as well (i.e. a pie)

tayle n. – tail (on an animal)

taylee n. – sweet and thick potage of (dried) fruits and almond milk

temper, tempyr (it up) (7r) – stir in, mix

throthe n. – throat

b‘yes n.pl. – thighs

tost v. – toast

tried, tried, tryd v.pa.p. – drain

turbut, turbuth n. – turbot, fish in the flatfish family, lives on the bottom in the sand

turnesole n. – a herb (spurge family) used in cooking/dyeing for its blueish-purple colour

tursawke n. – this is most likely turn(e)sole, see turnesole

tyme n. – thyme, herb

V

veel n. – veal, calf
veneger, venegur n. – vinegar
vente, vent n. – belly (from Fr. ventre)
venyson n. – venison
vergeous, vergeowus, veriouws n. – verjuice, sour juice – especially from grapes
verte adj. – green
vescell, vessel n. – small container for storing or serving food (like a cup, pot, dish, etc.)
vystys powderyng n. – white powder – white powdered spices
vyolete n. – violet, most likely the ‘viola odorata’ which was used both for cooking and medicinal purposes

W
wafferys n.pl. – thin, crispy waffles
wardowunys n.pl. – warden pear, cooking pear
welkys n.pl. – whelks, large sea snails
whessche v.pr. – wash
whete, whethe n. – wheat
whithe wine n. – white wine
whythe wyn n. – white wine
wit whynne n. – white wine
wodecok n. – woodcock
wortys n. – greens/vegetables/herbs, longe wortys probably uncut greens
wyn n. – wine
wynges n. – wings

Y/3
y-now, ynowe adj. – enough
3olkys n.pl. – yolks (eggyolks)
3olow adj. – yellow
yryn n. – iron, rost yryn – roasting iron
ysope n. – hyssop, a herb