

Assessing Palaeographic Evidence for Discourse Structuring in Middle English Recipes

Ruth CARROLL¹

SUMMARY

Previous discourse-analytical and textual studies of the structure of Middle English recipes have not made sufficient reference to the manuscript evidence (or lack thereof) for textual structuring. This article demonstrates that the palaeographic evidence shows a contemporary (medieval) perception of the Middle English recipe as having only a two-part structure. The article goes on to reiterate the suitability of Hoey's concept of the 'discourse colony' for characterising medieval recipes, and to propose an additional criterion of palaeography/layout to augment Hoey's apparatus for characterising colony texts. The palaeographic evidence is shown to support this characterisation: the nature of recipe compilations as discourse colonies explains their palaeographic features.

Key words: discourse analysis, discourse colony, historical pragmatics, manuscripts: palaeography, Middle English, recipes

RESUMEN

Los estudios previos de análisis del discurso y crítica textual de la receta inglesa medieval no tienen en cuenta la evidencia paleográfica (o la ausencia de ésta) en la estructuración del texto. Este artículo demuestra que existía una idea medieval de la estructura de la receta en dos partes, si consideramos los elementos paleográficos empleados. Se incide, además, en lo apropiado de aplicar la noción de colonia discursiva' de Hoey para caracterizar las recetas medievales. Este artículo propone aumentar los criterios que evalúan las colonias con la adición de uno nuevo denominado paleografía/disposición del texto. Este nuevo criterio apoya esta caracterización bimembre de la receta: la naturaleza de las compilaciones de recetas como colonias discursivas explica sus características paleográficas.

Palabras clave: análisis del discurso, colonia discursiva, pragmática histórica, manuscritos, paleografía, inglés medio, recetas.

¹ Earlier versions of portions of this paper were presented at the following conferences: ICEIL 12 (Glasgow, 2002), Finsse2 (Tampere, 2003), Recipes in Early Modern Europe (Oxford, 2004), ESSF-7 (Zaragoza, 2004), and ICEIL 13 (Vienna, 2004). I am grateful to all who have commented on this work, and also to my university department and to Turun Yliopistosäätiö, the University of Turku Foundation, for funding toward travel expenses.

1. INTRODUCTION

As the field of historical discourse linguistics has emerged and developed, a number of researchers have written about medieval recipes as a text-type. Of particular interest for the purposes of the present study are those analyses which make reference to the structuring of information within the recipe text-type (Stannard 1982, Hunt 1990, Görlach 1992 and 2004, Taavitsainen 2001, Alonso Almeida 2002, Grund 2003, Mäkinen 2004), and the assumptions or conclusions which have been drawn about subsections in the structure of the text-type. This study shows that although such analyses may be analytically useful, they are anachronistic, not reflecting contemporary medieval perceptions of the structure of recipes. As will be shown, the palaeographic evidence does not support postulating more than two subsections in the medieval English recipe.

This paper is based on my own consultation of eighteen manuscripts and four complete facsimiles², as well as reference to pictures, photocopies and digital images of other manuscripts, and scholarly commentary and catalogues. The paper begins with a presentation of present-day analyses of the internal structure of the medieval recipe. We then turn to the very different way in which medieval recipes are presented on the manuscript page. A many-to-one relationship between form and function is seen in the pragmatic interpretation of the palaeographic evidence. Next, the concept of the ‘discourse colony’ is introduced, and illustrated by means of a brief case study of the medieval culinary collection *Diuersa Seruicia*. It is demonstrated that the manuscript evidence supports the analysis of medieval recipe collections as discourse colonies. The paper concludes with calls for a re-evaluation of some of the prototypical characteristics of the discourse colony, the proposal of an additional criterion of palaeography/layout to augment Hoey’s apparatus for characterising colony texts, and a plea for greater attention to manuscript description by scholarly editors of medieval texts.

2. INTERNAL STRUCTURE OF THE RECIPE

2.1. PRESENT-DAY SCHOLARLY ANALYSIS

In much recent scholarly analysis, the internal structure of the recipe is divided into between four and six parts, not all of which are necessarily present

² The manuscripts I have consulted in the course of this study are: British Library manuscripts Harley 279, Harley 1605/3, Harley 2320, Harley 5401, Additional 32085, Add 33996, Add 46919, Royal 8 B iv, Royal 12 C xii, Julius D viii, Sloane 7, Sloane 2584; Bodleian Library manuscripts Douce 257, Rawlinson D 1222, and Ashmole 1444; and Trinity College, Cambridge, manuscripts O.2.16, O.7.20, and O.7.23. The facsimiles are the Tollemache *Book of Secrets*, Sloane 2584, Harley 2253, and Pepys 1047.

in every recipe. Table 1 is a summary of different researchers' analyses and terminology. Stannard (1982) laid the groundwork for such consideration, although his study was not primarily about text-structuring, but rather about identifying and categorising the sorts of technical or specialist information which can be found in recipes. He did however identify four clear components of the recipe, which can serve as a framework of comparison for all subsequent analyses, and as will be seen, none of them in fact depart radically from this framework.

insert table 1 near here

It was Hunt (1990) who turned attention to the consistency of form found in the recipe (in his case, medical recipes).³ He also noted that at least for Latin recipes or those from a more learned tradition, the name of the remedy was distinguished from the indication, the name being given as a rubric, and the indication exhibiting variation in placement within the text. Görlach's treatment of what he terms the "standardization of arrangement [of] subsections" of the recipe (1992: 746; 2004: 125) is more cursory, but can be seen to support Stannard's analysis of the essential components, listing "'title', 'ingredients', 'procedure', 'how to serve up'".

Taavitsainen does not purport to actually chart the structure of the recipe, but does make the interesting observation that recipes found in surgical tracts are less standardised in form than those found in remedybooks. For example, she finds wide variation in the recipe title, both in its form and placement. The most consistent feature she identifies is the statement of efficacy, which although an optional component, and one varying widely in form, is "placed last in the overall structure of recipes" (2001: 104). The research upon which the present paper is based has been largely restricted to those recipes found in collections or remedybooks, and does not include those found in more learned tracts. It is to be hoped that future research will fill examine the extent to which the conclusions of the present paper also hold for recipes found within surgical tracts and learned treatises.

Alonso Almeida (2002) is the only scholar to suggest storage instructions as a further subsection of the recipe, although he does not list it in his final summary, and so I have marked it as optional. He gives one example, from an edition of the medieval Spanish MS Parmense 834: *guardarlo en un bote de vidrio* "keep it in a glass container" (2002: 670-671). He also notes that culinary recipes may include other components, such as the number of servings (2002: 655), although this is mentioned only in passing, and is never drawn into the tables which diagram his analysis.

³ After commenting on the "thorough-going multilingualism" of recipe collections, he goes on to point out that "[s]ome consistency is achieved, however, in the *form* of the medical receipt" (emphasis in the original) (Hunt 1990: 17).

STANNARD 1982	HUNT 1990	GÖRLACH 1992	TAAVITSAINEN 2001	ALONSO 2002	GRUND 2003	MÄKINEN 2004
(medieval recipes, cross-linguistic survey)	(Anglo-Norman medical recipes)	(English culinary recipes, diachronic survey)	(Middle English medicinal recipes, in surgical tracts)	(comparative study: medieval Spanish and English recipes)	(alchemical recipes in CCC, Oxford, MS 226)	(recipes & recipe paraphrases found in herbals)
purpose (or intended result)	<i>rubric</i> (type of remedy name) Not necessarily present in vernacular / popular receipts indication (condition the remedy is for) sometimes placed at end	title	title (or opening lines) (no standardized form) may be preceded by explanations of efficacy of application.	titulo (stating the therapeutic goal / purpose)	heading (defined structurally – any material preceding <i>Text</i>)	purpose (usually found at end of recipe, before any supplementary: including information)
ingredients & equipment	composition (ingredients) – “the greater part of the medical receipt”	ingredients	instructional part (how to make the medicine)	ingredientes (also: substitutable ingredients may be mentioned at end of recipe)	substantias (& equipment) Not necessarily all introduced at beginning	ingredients (usually opens recipe)
rules of procedure	preparation (“usually known as the <i>cofession</i> or <i>ayuntamiento</i> ”)	procedure	this includes ingredients section	preparación (notes that this section may be combined with ingredients section)	procedure major part of most recipes (May contain sub-recipes: “ingred, proced, result”)	procedure
application & administration	application	“how to serve up”	explanations of application may be found at recipe opening	aplicación dosis, uso, duración	result may include possible applications; also has organizational function	administration
rationale “often discovered by reading between the lines” (p.66)	STATEMENT OF EFFICACY		efficacy (again, much variation found) “placed last in overall structure”	almacenamiento (storage instructions)		
incidental data catch-all for additional information: synonyms, names of authors, prognostications, formulaic phrases, etc.		references to source may occur in heading, in efficacy or both	eficacia	doing formula varied in form and content (not formulaic phrase) Also functions organizationally		justification
				# de comensales (number served)		additional information

table 1 KEY: **bold**: explicitly said to be obligatory or essential; CAPS: said to be frequent; *italic*: explicitly said to be optional, or lacking in many recipes

Grund (2003) gives a detailed explanation of the extent to which medieval English alchemical recipes mirror the structure of other medieval recipes. He found the procedure to be a larger and more important part of the recipe than the ingredients, in contrast to Hunt's findings for Anglo-Norman medicinal recipes⁴. His analysis is perhaps more structurally oriented than those of his predecessors – he defines the heading as those words preceding the first instruction (2003: 459n8), as well as explicitly noting that both the statement of result and the closing formula carry a linguistic-organisational load, signalling the end of a section of the recipe or of the text as a whole.

Mäkinen (2004) returns to Stannard's model in order to point out the clear difference between recipes in herbals and those found in other medical writing, i.e. that herbals begin with ingredients, and state the purpose of the recipe only at the end of the text⁵. The herbal recipes are thus perhaps the most structurally distinct, with recipes embedded within surgical tracts being so varied that some easily fit this general pattern and others much less so.

This is the structure present-day scholars have found in the medieval recipe. It is an informational structuring, but there is a strong inclination amongst scholars to consider these informational categories also as textual units within the recipe (Hunt calls them "components" (1990: 17); Görlach "subsections" (1992: 746; 2004: 125)). This is justified to a certain extent; it enables detailed study of such sections (for example, Jones 1998), permits comparison between the ordering of information (as done in Mäkinen 2004), and allows observations such as the fact that efficacy statements, as well as titles, are more likely than other sections to be points of code-switching (see, among others, Pahta 2004: 90-93).

However, there is some danger of imposing our present-day expectations on the medieval text, for example with respect to a distinction between ingredients and procedure. Of course today recipe users expect to find the necessary ingredients listed separately before the actual instructions begin. Such separate listing of ingredients can be found as early as the mid-sixteenth century (in some German recipes) – but to date the present researcher has never seen such a division in medieval manuscripts. In fact, it is not standard in English, even in printed recipes, even through the mid-eighteenth century⁶. Both

⁴ Carroll (2004) shows this contrast to be valid for culinary recipes as well. Anglo-Norman language recipes require a listing of ingredients, but not necessarily a procedure section, but it is the reverse for English-language recipes.

⁵ Both Mäkinen and Grund also make reference to sub-sequences. In Grund's case these are stages within a long and complicated recipe; in Mäkinen's case these are recipes for the same purpose, and calling for the same ingredients but following different procedures, which are presented as one recipe, without "an interrupting 'for the same' or 'another'" (2004: 160).

⁶ Rankin's 2004 presentation included an illustration of a recipe with a separate ingredients section, dated between 1540 and 1560. However, Hannah Glasse's *Art of Cookery Made Plain & Easy* (1747) still intersperses ingredients listings with preparation.

Alonso Almeida 2002 and Grund 2003 do make explicit that the ingredients need not all be listed before the procedure begins; Mäkinen 2004 gives an example of a short medicinal recipe with the structure INGREDIENTS – PROCEDURE – INGREDIENTS – PURPOSE (2004: 147). However, it would be more accurate, according to the palaeographic evidence, to say that for medieval recipes the ingredients do not constitute a distinct section at all⁷.

The textual distinction of ingredients from procedure within the medieval recipe (although it would seem to be supported by many researchers, to a greater or lesser extent) is in fact anachronistic. Even more broadly, there is only one proposed recipe section from table 1 that is a visually distinct entity on the manuscript page. There is no palaeographic evidence for the structures of Table 1 having been recognised by either the medieval scribe or the medieval reader.

2.2. PALAEOGRAPHIC EVIDENCE FOR INTERNAL STRUCTURE

Visually, medieval recipes have quite a different structure from the ones diagrammed in Table 1. Several pages of the fifteenth-century Wagstaff Miscellany (Yale University Beinecke Library MS 163) can be viewed on-line at the Yale University Library site, including the opening of a small collection of wine recipes (ff. 122v – 123r)⁸. What is immediately clear from this image is that the recipe title is a palaeographic reality. In Hieatt's 1988 edition of the culinary recipes from this manuscript (ff. 57r – 76v), a facsimile page shows the titles to be rubricated, underlined in red. What also becomes clear, however, is that there is no other apparent hierarchy within the text. The body of the recipe is presented and perceived holistically.

This is the usual appearance of medieval English recipes in manuscript form. Culinary recipes, medicinal, lace-making, dying recipes: none show palaeographic evidence for a four-, five-, or six-part structure. At most, and usually, there is a clear division into two parts – title and body⁹. Occasionally, a third element may be found, in addition to the body and title: a recipe number. New York Pierpont Morgan Library MS Bühler 36, a manuscript con-

⁷ One manuscript which provides possible counterevidence against this view is Glasgow MS Hunter 185, in which Alonso Almeida has found the punctus serving to separate an ingredients section from a preparation section (2001: 217). However, his analysis is explicitly based on Görlach's 1992 model of recipe structure. "[which] may well help us to identify, and predict, particular uses of punctuation marks" (2001: 212). Without the influence of Görlach's model, a different interpretation of this punctus could likely be found.

⁸ <http://highway55.library.yale.edu/PHOTONEGIMG/screen/S327/s3276301.jpg>

⁹ Of course I am not the first to draw attention to the highlighting of titles on the page. For example, Hargreaves notes, "in most collections there is clear indication, by titles, rubrication, underlining, paragraphing or marginal mark, that a new recipe is beginning" (1981: 96). However, his emphasis is rather different from mine here.

taining the culinary recipe collection, *Forme of Cury*, is an example. In addition to having an extremely clear division between title and body of recipes (with a full line skipped both before and after titles, bodies usually beginning with a blue initial, and with the titles centred on the page and in a much larger script than the bodies), Bühler 36 also includes marginal numbers to the right of the recipe titles¹⁰. Such numbering systems will not be discussed here, but will be referred to again in section 3.3.

A brief look at three other images will give an indication of the wide range of variation found even within this simple textual structure of title and body. California Huntington Library MS 1336 can be described verbally in terms very similar to those used for Beinecke 163: the use of red ink with titles, and bodies presented holistically; but it appears significantly different when examined visually (an image of ff. 12v – 13r is available at the Digital Scriptorium, on-line)¹¹. In the collection of medical (and some non-medical) recipes found on ff. 2v – 18v and 19r – 34v, titles are rubrics, written in red ink, not underlined. The titles are not indented or centred, but begin at the left margin. The body of the recipe begins immediately following the title, not on a separate line. In addition to the red ink of the recipe title, each new recipe is signalled by a marginal paraph¹². The red flourishes filling the ends of lines after the close of recipe bodies further visually reinforce this scribe's convention of beginning each new recipe (title, followed by body) on a new line.

Also bound into this manuscript, indeed inserted into this collection, is another quire containing medical and some non-medical recipes, one page of which (f.19r) is available as an image on-line¹³. This scribe has also made a clear distinction between titles and bodies of recipes, but only by leaving space for rubricated titles. Otherwise, the use of the manuscript page is economical: no blank space is left within the writing space. The title of one recipe begins wherever the body of the previous recipe ended, and the body of a recipe follows immediately on from its title. However, the effect of the use of red ink for titles clearly distinguishes them from the bodies of the recipes, and makes it entirely clear where one recipe begins and another ends.

The image of Huntington Library MS 58, ff. 41v – 42r (on-line at the Digital Scriptorium)¹⁴ is markedly different from the two collections seen in

¹⁰ The on-line catalogue reads “numeration in red”, but I have been unable to verify this with any published images. A black and white representation of part of one page of the manuscript can be seen on the endpapers of Sass 1976.

¹¹ <http://digitalassets.lib.berkeley.edu/ds/ucb/images/heh/150/001488.jpg>

¹² The paraph symbol used here does not resemble any of the symbols illustrating Parkes's glossary entry for *paraph* (1992: 301, 305), but is the same as that found on plate 3ii of Parkes 1979, which he transcribes in print using the traditional paraph symbol ¶ (1979: 3).

¹³ <http://digitalassets.lib.berkeley.edu/ds/ucb/images/heh/150/001489.jpg>

¹⁴ <http://digitalassets.lib.berkeley.edu/ds/ucb/images/heh/150/002902.jpg>

Huntington 1336, in that it lacks any use of rubrication. However, the two-part structure of these recipes (title and body) is still clear: each title is given its own line(s), on which it is centred or indented. Each title begins a new line, and each body begins a new line. The titles are clearly separated, by their indentation, and by being alone on a line or lines. The recipe body then begins with a capital letter (not rubricated or decorated) at the left margin.

Recipes often close with formulaic phrases such as “and serve it forth” in the case of culinary recipes, or efficacy phrases in medicinal ones (Jones 1998, Alonso-Almeida and Cabrera-Abreu 2002). However, such phrases are not set apart palaeographically; they are not marked as in any way separate from the rest of the body. Some scholars (including Alonso-Almeida and Cabrera-Abreu, 2002) have interpreted these phrases as markers to signal the end of a recipe. If so, they are textual or linguistic markers, but not visual ones.

Note also that in addition to the variation with regard to whether the title is technically a rubric, there is variation in whether or not the words of the title indicate purpose. Mäkinen (2004: 17) is one of the researchers who has drawn attention to the fact that purpose need not be presented in the heading, or even necessarily early in the recipe. Alonso Almeida (pers. com.) notes a sequence in Glasgow MS Hunter 185 where a later reader has underlined the phrase indicating purpose, which is found four lines after the title. Within the same collections we have seen both titles that did express purpose and those that did not. For example, in the catalogue transcription of Beinecke 136 we find both *Ffor to make of reede Wyne White*, a clear expression of purpose, and *Ffor Wyne tht saveryth of the vessell as it Were rotyn*, which pragmatically implies a remedy but does not explicitly state it.

In their very different ways, each of the manuscripts we have seen signals a clear distinction between title and body of the recipe, but presents the body itself as a whole. This layout persists in the English recipe tradition through at least the mid-eighteenth century. This is the pattern in almost every manuscript consulted for this study. The division between title and body may be signalled in a variety of ways, as will be discussed in the next section, but it is extremely rare to come across a manuscript recipe collection which fails to make a generally consistent visual distinction between title and body¹⁵, and I have yet seen no manuscript which runs recipes together so that a page of recipes looks like unbroken prose¹⁶.

¹⁵ The Anglo-Norman recipe collection in British Library MS Royal 12 C xii is one which does not clearly exhibit the two-part structure described here.

¹⁶ I am not surprised to be told that some exist (Kari Ann Rand Schmidt, pers. com.). It seems entirely plausible that an occasional scribe working with limited space and resources, perhaps inexperienced in the consultation of recipes (see section 3.3, below), would run recipes together into a visual mass. I would be very surprised, however, to learn that such collections were at all frequent.

2.3 FORM AND FUNCTION

Jacobs and Jucker distinguish between those diachronic pragmatic studies which begin with a linguistic form and analyse its changing functions (“diachronic form-to-function mappings”) and those which do the opposite, beginning with a pragmatic function, and studying the different linguistic forms that manifest it over time (1995). Even synchronically, however, pragmaticians and discourse analysts are aware that the mappings of form to function and function to form are more often many-to-one than one-to-one. Alonso Almeida has reiterated this point with regard to the punctuation used in medieval English recipes (2001: 229). It can seem to be true of palaeographic forms and functions as well.

The scribal means of distinguishing titles from bodies of recipes may include rubrication (as we saw on Huntington HM 1336, f. 19r) and placement on the page (as we saw on Huntington HM 58, f. 42r). We have also seen the combined use of both red ink and the spatial setting apart of titles, in Beinecke MS 163, where it could be suggested that the red underlining is redundant. Similarly, MS Bühler 36 uses a larger script for titles, where their placement alone would have been sufficient to mark them apart.

As more manuscripts are studied, more forms for this function are found. Glasgow MS Hunter 185 marks the beginning of a new recipe not with red but with green ink¹⁷. The titles of the Anglo-Norman culinary recipes in British Library Additional MS 32085 are given in wide margins next to the body. The medical recipes found on 101r – 101v of British Library Sloane MS 2584 have their titles underlined in the same ink as the script. The scribe of Bodleian Library MS Rawlinson D1222 not only left a blank line between titles and bodies, but allowed larger ascenders and descenders on the letters of the titles than were used within the body of the recipe text.

Bodies can be further distinguished from titles, for example, by the use of initials to begin them. This is the case in Cambridge, Magdalene College MS Pepys 1047, whose recipe bodies begin with capitals that can be up to twice the size of other letters, this in addition to the fact that titles are red, and centred on the page, with blank lines before and after them. Some indication has already been given of the range of other forms for the function of distinguishing bodies from titles on the manuscript page – the first letter of the body may be rubricated with a splash of red, the body may begin on its own line, or be marked with a paraph or double virgule (as is the case in British Library Additional MS 46919, for example).

¹⁷ I am grateful to Francisco Alonso Almeida for this information. He notes further that sometimes the green marks the title of the recipe, but at other times the title and body are not distinguished and the green merely serves to distinguish one recipe from another (a situation analogous to the collection mentioned in footnote 15).

One result of the many-to-one mapping of forms to the function of setting apart recipe titles from the body of the recipe is that different manuscript versions of the same text may use different strategies. The *Forme of Cury* text in British Library MS Harley 1605/3 has rubric titles found on the same line as the end of the body of the preceding recipe, while the version in British Library MS Additional 5016 also has rubric titles, but a full blank line is left between the end of the preceding recipe body and the title of the following recipe. The latter manuscript has numbered the recipes of this collection¹⁸; the former has not.

More problematic for the text linguist than the differing layouts of the collections, however, is the fact that almost no two collections contain precisely the same inventory of individual recipes. As will be shown in the next section, this need not be treated as a problematic feature once it is accepted that it is in fact a prototypical feature of the kind of text that a recipe compilation is: a discourse colony.

3. THE LARGER DISCOURSE STRUCTURE: THE DISCOURSE COLONY

3.1. HOEY'S CONCEPT OF THE DISCOURSE COLONY

Let us now consider the larger context in which recipes are found. It is in one sense obvious, but in another quite remarkable, that recipe collections are unprototypical as texts. One does not normally read a recipe collection from beginning to end, as one might a saga, but rather in a hypertextual way, jumping from one place to another in the text. Moreover, it is far more conceivable for a remedy book than for an elegy or a sermon that readers would in fact never read the text in its entirety, but would skip over those recipes for diseases they have never suffered from, or for those dishes they do not care for. It is not inconceivable that one given reader might only ever choose to consult a single recipe within the entire text. Pérez Marín (2004) gives the poignant example of a late sixteenth-century Mexican medical text where the section on venereal disease has been read and re-read, but many other pages remain to this day uncut.

These obvious but remarkable features of texts such as recipe collections have been described and analyzed by Hoey (1986, 2001), who calls such texts 'discourse colonies'. Further research has shown that recipes (Carroll 2003)¹⁹,

¹⁸ A small black and white image of one recipe from the manuscript can be seen at <http://www.pbm.com/~lindahl/foc/FoC035small.html>

¹⁹ In an article pleading for accurate manuscript descriptions it is only proper that I take the opportunity to correct an error in my 2003 article, which states that an illustration is found in both manuscript compilations of the lace-making recipes. In fact, that illustration is only present in the Harley manuscript. I am grateful to Noemi Speiser for noting this.

and even the scientific and technical books and medieval miscellanies which may contain them (Alonso Almeida 2005, Carroll 2003), share many of the characteristic features of modern English discourse colonies.

Briefly, these characteristic features are as follows: (1) the order of units is not semantically important; (2) there is a break in continuity between units; (3) there is a framing context that enables the reader to correctly interpret the text (in Hoey's analysis this is usually and minimally provided by a name given to the text); (4) there is no single named author; (5) a reader may choose to read only one unit at a time, or indeed ever; (6) a unit may be reprinted in another work; (7) when revising or reprinting the discourse colony, some individual units may be added or removed; (8) the units are in a matching relation with each other with regard to function (and probably also demonstrate linguistic parallelism); (9) units are often given a sequencing that is semantically arbitrary (such as alphabetical order), which enables ease of reference. Each of these features is illustrated in section 3.2.

3.2. A BRIEF EXEMPLARY STUDY OF A DISCOURSE COLONY

Oxford Bodleian Library MS Douce 257 is an anonymous commonplace book, dated to the years around 1381²⁰. It has been printed by Samuel Pegge, Richard Warner, and more recently for the Early English Text Society (Heatt and Butler 1985). Following Heatt and Butler, the collection is usually referred to by a title, *Diuersa Seruicia*, adapted from its incipit (cited below). Heatt and Butler list ninety-two recipes in it, of which over eighty are culinary recipes, very similar in style and function. The remainder include two remedies for salvaging venison that is going off, one for food that is too salty, and general serving suggestions for game birds.

This recipe collection demonstrates eight of the nine features described by Hoey as being characteristic of discourse colonies. In Hoey's analysis, the most prototypical discourse colonies will have all nine characteristics (he analyzes dictionaries as having all nine)²¹, hile something like a shopping list, which he analyzes as having only 5-7 characteristics, is less prototypical as a discourse colony. Hoey's own analysis of the modern English cookbook showed it to be less prototypical than *Diuersa Seruicia*, showing only six or seven features (Hoey 2001: 88).

²⁰ In the discussion which follows I use the words *collection*, *compilation*, and *colony* roughly interchangeably, to mean a group of very short texts (in this case, recipes) brought together into a larger text (in this case, a medieval cookbook). I am not using *compilation* in the technical sense of *compilationes* (see, for example, Taavitsainen 2005: 185).

²¹ Hoey himself uses the word *central* (2001: 87), not *prototypical*.

To illustrate the applicability of the discourse colony model to the medieval recipe, here is a brief summary of Hoey's nine characteristics with reference to the *Diuersa Seruicia* collection as found in Douce 257. Of the ninety-two *Diuersa Seruicia* recipes, sixteen are also found in the recipe collection of British Library MS Harley 5401, ff. 95 – 103r (edited by Heiatt in 1996). However, the order in which they are presented in the two manuscripts is radically different. Table 2 shows the numbers (following Heiatt and Butler's numbering) of the recipes from Douce 257 that are also found in Harley 5401, and indicates on the lower line of the table the positioning of these same recipes within the Harley 5401 collection.

Douce 257	18	25	34	35	40	64	65	67	73	74	76	78	82	83
corresponds to	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=
Harley 5401	81	15	16	76	18	71	67	68	72	73	14	74	75	17

Table 2

Two recipes which Douce 257 presents one after another (*Sandale* and *Apulmose*, 34th and 35th respectively in the collection) are in Harley 5401 presented far apart from each other, with *Sandale* as the 16th recipe in the collection and *Apulmose* the 76th. The recipe for *Porreyne*, which in Douce 257 is number 76, some fifty recipes after the recipe for *Mylk rost* (number 25), actually precedes the *Mylk rost* recipe in Harley 5401. This illustrates Hoey's first characteristic, in that the order of presentation of individual recipes is relatively unimportant to the interpretation of any individual recipe. Their semantics are unaffected by the shifts.

Such variation in order of presentation is permitted because of the second characteristic, the break in continuity between units²². Recipe 19, *For to make fruturs*, and recipe 20, *For to make charlet*, are not read together as continuous prose, but in fact have no more connections to one another than they do to other recipes elsewhere in the collection. There does exist a broad organisational principle in Douce 257, that recipes for meat are to be found in the first half of the collection, and recipes for fish in the latter half. After recipe 59 is written, *Explicit seruicium de carnibus; hic incipit seruicium de pissibus* (Heiatt and Butler 1985: 74). Nonetheless, other recipes are mixed in with these, so that part one includes a recipe for apple fritters (19), as well as other non-meat

²² This break in continuity is also palaeographically visible, in that a virgula suspensiva is found after almost every recipe.

dishes made of figs and raisins, or hawthorn flowers. Such dishes are also found in the second half of the collection, where a fig dish is followed by a recipe for a rice and apple dish. Still, it is true that no fish recipes are found in the first section, and no meat recipes in the second. Similar organisational principles can be seen in modern discourse colonies, as analyzed by Hoey. For example, hymnals may group all hymns suitable for opening a service near the beginning of the hymnal, and all Easter hymns in another section; and telephone books may list corporate subscribers separately from private householders.

Hoey's third characteristic is that of the framing context. The framing context aids in the interpretation of the components of the colony by labelling them or delineating their validity²³. For example, a reader finding a colony labelled as a cookbook will know to expect recipes, whereas a colony labelled as a dictionary can be expected to contain definitions. A bus timetable is valid only for the city, routes and time period specified. We have already seen one sentence which might be described as part of the "frame" of *Diuersa Seruicia: Explicit seruicium de carnibus; hic incipit seruicium de pissibus* (Heatt and Butler 1985: 74). In fact, the text is also framed at its beginning and conclusion:

1. *Hic incipiunt diuersa seruicia tam de carnibus quam de pissibus* (Heatt and Butler 1985: 62)

2. *Explicit de coquina que est optima medicina* (Heatt and Butler 1985: 79)

Although this characteristic is thus shown to be true of *Diuersa Seruicia*, the medievalist must be cautious to avoid anachronistic assumptions about the frequency with which texts are given titles. The modern student reading *Beowulf* is often surprised to learn that there is no evidence of this "title" for the text being used either by the poet or the scribe. An incipit, a preface, or indeed a table of contents (as is found in British Library MS Additional 5016) does meet some of the expectations of a framing context, but each does so in a different way.

The fourth characteristic of the modern discourse colony also betrays the present-day assumptions behind the formulation of the discourse colony model: the anonymity or multi-authored nature of the prototypical discourse colony. Some medieval recipe compilations and other historical discourse colonies are attributed to individuals [Heatt notes that the compilation in

²³ The framing function may also be interpreted in another way, and that is that one expects to find such small texts as recipes, hymns or dictionary definitions collected together into colony texts or compilations. The recipes discussed in this paper are found in colonies, but there also exist recipes which have been added to margins, flyleaves, or other scraps of space, not as small collections, but in twos or even singly [Hargreaves refers to them as *casual waifs* (1981: 94)]. The Digital Scriptorium illustrates an example, Huntington MS HU 1051, f. 50v.:

<http://digitalassets.lib.berkeley.edu/ds/ucb/images/heh/150/002431.jpg>

Harley 5401 is attributed to a Thomas Awkbarow, for example (1996: 55)], but in the medieval period the lack of authorial attribution for a compilation is nothing like as distinctive as it might be in the modern period, when we do expect novels, poems, and scientific treatises to be attributed. In other words, high expectations of authorial identification may be anachronistic for medieval texts. Still, for our purposes here we may observe that *Diuersa Seruicia*, in MS Douce 257, is indeed anonymous.

The fifth characteristic is that a reader is not expected to read the whole of the compilation, but in fact may conceivably read only one unit. British Library MS Sloane 442, on folio 12r, contains one single recipe from the *Diuersa Seruicia* collection. It is the only recipe from that collection that we have any evidence of the Sloane 442 scribe being familiar with.

Hoey anticipates, with regard to this characteristic, a possible objection, which is that some units in a compilation may cross-reference one another. In discourse-analytical terms, they may be connected by cohesive ties. Hoey's analysis is that such ties will tend to be no stronger between adjacent units than they are between non-adjacent units (2001: 74). This is indeed the case with *Diuersa Seruicia*.

Following the recipe for *spynete* (a pottage of hawthorn flowers) is found a recipe which cannot be interpreted without reference to the *spynete* recipe:

3. *For to make rosee & fresee & swau: þey schal be ymad in þe selue maner.* (Hieatt and Butler 1985: 71)

Another cross-reference in the collection, though, is between non-adjacent recipes. Recipe 37 (*Murrey*), found in the first half of the text, is referred back to by recipe 85 (example 4), from the second half of the compilation:

4. *For to make morrey, require de carnibus vt supra* (Hieatt and Butler 1985: 78)

Hoey's sixth characteristic is that a textual unit from one collection may come to be found in another. This has already been shown to be true for *Diuersa Seruicia*. Many of its recipes are found in Harley 5401, where they are alongside and mixed in with many recipes from the *Forme of Cury* collection, and others as well, thus creating the new and different compilation, neither *Diuersa Seruicia* nor *The Forme of Cury*, but "Thomas Awkbarow's Cookery and Confectionary".

The seventh characteristic is the flip side of the coin: recipes may have some independence from the collection, but collections are not dependent upon any single recipe either. The population of the "hive" (Hoey uses an extended bee-hive or ant-hill metaphor) may change over time. In addition to Harley 5401 and Sloane 442 there are five other manuscripts which contain recipes from *Diuersa Seruicia*. New York MS Whitney 1, ff.12 – 14v contains recipes 3-26, 60, 63-69, and 74 (Hieatt and Butler 1985: 59-61).

This is not so much a new collection as a different (shorter) version of the same collection – the same discourse colony but with a smaller “population”.

The eighth characteristic of prototypical discourse colonies, suggests Hoey, is that many or all of the units will be in a matching relation with each other, serving the same functions. Of course the function of almost all culinary recipes is to give instructions for preparing a dish. As noted above, this is true of most of the *Diuersa Seruicia* recipes. Matching linguistic structures can also be seen in this collection.

The majority of the recipes begin with a title of the form *For to make NP*:

5. *For to make bruet of Almayne* (Hieatt and Butler 1985: 68)
6. *For to make oystryn in bruet* (Hieatt and Butler 1985: 76)
7. *For to make tartys of fysch out of lente* (Hieatt and Butler 1985: 78)

This is often followed by an instruction to take the first-needed ingredient [what Taavitsainen (2001: 95) calls the “conventional formula” of the imperative *Take*]:

8. *tak mulbery & bray hem in a mortar* (Hieatt and Butler 1985: 69)
9. *Nym þe flowrys of þe hawborn clene gaderyd* (Hieatt and Butler 1985: 71)
10. *tak a pound of rys* (Hieatt and Butler 1985: 75)

Further, as has been noted above, recipes commonly close with a formulaic phrase. In this collection almost all recipes end with one of the following:

11. *& messe yt forþe* (Hieatt and Butler 1985: 62)
12. *& dresse yt forþe* (Hieatt and Butler 1985: 63)
13. *& serue yt forþe* (Hieatt and Butler 1985: 63)

The final characteristic of discourse colonies is the only one that *Diuersa Seruicia* does not exhibit. If the reader is expected not to read through the entire colony every time it is used, but to skip directly to certain items, then it makes sense for the colony to be ordered in such a way as to facilitate the finding of required items. They will be given an arbitrary sequencing that does not reflect any semantic ordering but that makes them easy to locate. Hoey lists three such sequences: alphabetic, numeric, and temporal (2001: 86). A fourth ordering which a medievalist might mention is that found in some medical recipe collections: the *de capite ad pedem* sequence.

Several times already, reference has been made to the numbering of recipes within *Diuersa Seruicia*. However, this numbering is editorial, not contemporary with the text. The compilation as it appears in the Douce manuscript was not numbered by the scribe. There do exist medieval English recipe collections with original numbering; one, the Bühler 36 version of the *Forme of Cury*, has already been mentioned. A second example is the British Library Additional MS 5016 version of the same text, in which the numbers correspond to the table of contents preceding the collection. Some medieval English

recipe collections (such as that in MS 136 of the Medical Society of London (Dawson 1934)) were alphabetically ordered. Strictly speaking, however, the Douce version of *Diuersa Seruicia* does not exhibit this property.

What is found in MS Douce 257, though, are some marginal notes. Heiatt and Butler (1985: 79) observe that a later hand had rewritten two titles in the manuscript margin, with significantly different spelling from the original (*blank de syry* > *Blank de surre* and *ballok broth* > *Balough Broth*). Without consulting the manuscript, one might assume (as I did initially) that this was some sort of correction, but the manuscript shows some later reader to have evidently added a marginal title for each and every recipe on that page²⁴, thus making it easier to find (or skip) those recipes again in the future.

This ninth characteristic, then, while not anachronistic, is perhaps too narrowly defined. What it illustrates is the importance of structuring a discourse colony in such a way as to facilitate its use as a colony, allowing the reader to ‘scan’ the text for the specific units which are of interest (see Hoey 2001: 89-90). It is not only sequencing which contributes to this ability, but also the text’s layout, and even the internal structure of the units themselves. This is discussed in the following section.

3.3. PALAEOGRAPHIC EVIDENCE FOR COLONY STRUCTURING

In the introduction to their edited volume about the problems involved in defining and classifying medieval miscellanies, Nichols and Wenzel comment that “the concern with genres has largely been linked to analysis of the texts contained in the manuscripts rather than the study of the manuscripts themselves” (1996: 2). Even in Hoey’s present-day analysis of present-day tokens of the text category he has newly labelled as the discourse colony, there is no attention paid to typography or layout on the page of such texts.

Yet if a writer, a scribe, or an editor expects and is willing for readers to pick and choose from amongst the recipes in a collection (or the entries in a dictionary, or the hymns in a hymnal), then one might reasonably expect efforts to be taken to facilitate that choice. If the titles stand out, it is easier for the reader to scan the text, either to see what is on offer or to find again a textual unit that a prior reading showed to be worth returning to.

Facilitating the scanning of the text is the obvious function of the numbering systems and tables of contents which are found in some manuscripts. Also

²⁴ There are four recipes on the page. A third, faint, title, not mentioned by Heiatt and Butler, is visible in the margin. Whether a title for the fourth recipe on the page was also recopied into the margin is extremely hard to determine, due to damage of the page, but seems likely.

telling is the fact that many originally unnumbered collections acquired numbers later (and in some cases, especially of bound volumes, tables of contents). Of course scholarly editions of recipe collections also tend to be editorially numbered, even when they are editions of collections that are themselves unnumbered.

Here again, as noted above, even broad manuscript-ordering principles can also be of use. The general principle that *Diuersa Seruicia* contains no fish recipes in the first half and no meat recipes in the second is a useful feature for the reader planning meals on days of fasting: such a reader can focus their scanning on the second half of the compilation. In the same way those looking for remedies for headache could restrict their scanning to the early portion of a medical collection which worked through ailments of the body from head to toe.

Any scanning, however, is fastest and easiest when the titles can be distinguished from the body of the text, enabling one to ignore the bodies until the desired unit of text is found. Whether by the use of red ink, underlining, removal to the margin, or separate lines, any distinguishing of the title is better than none. Just as Hoey says of arbitrary sequencing, the lack of such distinction between title and body does not make a recipe unusable, or negate its status as a recipe text-type and as a part of a discourse colony – it merely makes it harder to use. This is why, as indicated at the end of section 2.2 above, although manuscript collections which run recipes together as if unbroken prose may exist, they are presumably very rare.

The presence of marginal hands (British Library Sloane MS 7, folio 59v, for example) of course reinforces the idea that at least when consulting a manuscript for the second time, a reader may skip directly to that point, and read only that single recipe, or (alternatively or as well) point out to a later reader what was felt to be particularly useful or relevant. Again there are other forms for this function, such as the marginal repetition of key words from the text or recipe titles, as in the example of Douce 257 discussed above. Thus we see collaboration and negotiation between the scribe and later readers and text users, especially in the way that such readers appropriate and mark up the text for their own (and subsequent users') use.

4. POTENTIAL PITFALLS IN WORKING WITH EDITIONS

Many historical discourse linguists rely heavily or exclusively on editions. This is understandable, but it places great responsibility on editors to describe the manuscript, especially with regard to visual cues to levels of text structure. Most scholars are well aware of the need to check an editor's policy with regard to modernising punctuation, for example, and they expect to find such

information in the introduction to an edition. They are unfortunately less likely to gain information about the palaeography of the text from the editions they work with, and may not be as mindful about its potential impact.

Hieatt and Butler's 1985 edition of the *Forme of Cury* includes a single black and white photograph of folio 107v of British Library MS Harley 1605 part 3. However, this black and white rendering leaves the reader completely unaware that the titles of these culinary recipes are distinguished from the recipe bodies by being in red ink, or that the capitals that begin each recipe are blue, flourished with fine red filigree. These uses of colour in the manuscript are not mentioned as part of the scholarly apparatus of the edition; such information is only available to those scholars able to consult the manuscript itself.

A second very minor point, but a disappointing one, about this photograph is that no explanation is given of the marginal crosses clearly visible on the page, crosses which precede two of the three recipe titles on that page, and which might thus be taken to be markers of recipe beginnings. In fact, they are the only two such crosses in this entire recipe collection. In this manuscript, the title of a new recipe is given (in red) immediately following the end of the previous recipe, that is, on the second half of the line preceding the body of the recipe to which it belongs. The bodies, as already noted, then begin with a coloured initial at the left margin of the next line. However, on folio 107v the second recipe's title, "Ryse of fische daye", is not found in the expected place, preceding the recipe, but at its end, on the first half of the line which also contains the title for the following recipe. The marks in the margin thus serve as a literal cross-reference.

Another collection edited in the Hieatt and Butler volume is that found in British Library MS Additional 46919, the culinary collection that Hieatt and Butler have called *Diuersa Cibaria*. The recipes are given in the manuscript with their titles in red, and the body of each recipe in brown ink. As in Harley 1605, the titles have been written into the right-hand side of the page, but unlike the Harley manuscript, they are usually on the same line as the beginning of the body of the recipe. Thus, the titles are rarely the first words given. For example, reading strictly from left to right, the manuscript shows:

14. milke of alemaundes flour of =| **Blanc desire** ~
rys braun of chapoun gygnere itried sucre hwit wyn.

Obviously the recipe is not to be read, *flour of Blanc desire*, but *flour of rys*. The rubrication sets the title apart sufficiently that it is easy to read the text correctly. In Hieatt and Butler's edition (1985: 45) the word order of this recipe (for which this was their base manuscript) is the logical one: *Blanc desire. milke of alemaundes, flour of rys, braun of chapoun ...* Yet there is no mention of the rubrication, nor even a footnote to explain the actual word order of the text or its positioning on the page. Again, the scholar must consult the manuscript.

Hieatt's 1998 article, "Editing Middle English Culinary Manuscripts" makes no reference to the desirability of noting such features as rubrication and marginalia. It may be that she and her editors felt this to have been adequately dealt with in other chapters of the volume in which it was published. However, her own (1996) edition of the culinary recipes found in British Library MS Harley 5401 makes a tantalising reference to "underlining in red" found in the recipes, but does not explain where exactly it is found, nor why it was done. (In fact, it is the recipe titles which are underlined.)

5. CONCLUSIONS

The present paper reiterates the utility of Hoey's 'discourse colony' as a means of justifying the textual characteristics of recipe collections (and miscellanies) which might otherwise be seen as problematic. An addition is proposed to Hoey's listing of colony characteristics: palaeographic choices (or typography and page layout, in modern texts) which facilitate readers' scanning, such as the setting apart of key elements within the textual unit (the title, in the case of medieval recipes) and a clear demarcation of where one unit ends and another begins. Concerns have also been raised about potential anachronisms in Hoey's model, particularly with regard to the expectation that most 'mainstream' (non-colony) texts have conventional titles and known authors.

The paper also brings palaeographic insights to bear on existing research into the structure of the medieval recipe text-type. As useful as it is to distinguish between different kinds of information present in a recipe, it is advised that care should be taken in postulating "sections" of the recipe. For contemporary (medieval) producers and recipients of the recipe text-type, the title was clearly distinct from the body. There are valid linguistic reasons for us today to distinguish the efficacy statement, but the distinction between an ingredients list and a procedure section, even when qualified with caveats (like "these sections may be combined"), is misleading.

Some of these skewed perceptions of the text-type could be avoided by more reference to manuscripts. However, it is also the responsibility of editors to indicate scribal treatment (or lack thereof) of different parts of the text. Understandably, an editor such as Hieatt presumably assumes her audience to be culinary historians rather than historical discourse analysts. Still, it is a pity not to have information about the manuscripts and their text structuring much more readily available. I hope this paper, and subsequent work on this topic, will inspire others to redress the balance.

REFERENCES

- ALONSO-ALMEIDA, F. 2001. Punctuation Practice in a Late Medieval English Medical Remedybook. *Folia Linguistica Historica* 22: 207-232.
- . 2002. Estudio Comparativo de los Textos Receta en Español Medieval y en Inglés Medieval. In G. SANTANA HENRIQUEZ and V. SANTANA SANJURJO, eds. *Studia Humanitatis in Honorem Antonio Cabrera Perera*, Las Palmas: Servicio de Publicaciones de la Universidad de Las Palmas de Gran Canaria, 649-76.
- . 2005. All Gathered Together: On the Construction of Scientific and Technical Books in 15th-Century England. *International Journal of English Studies* 5: 1-25.
- ALONSO-ALMEIDA, F. and CABRERA-ABREU, M. 2002. The Formulation of Promise in Medieval English Medical Recipes: A Relevance-Theoretic Approach. *Neophilologus* 86: 137-154.
- CARROLL, R. 2003. Recipes for Laces: An Example of a Middle English Discourse Colony. In R. HILTUNEN and J. SKAFFARI, eds. *Discourse Perspectives on English: Medieval to Modern*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 137-165.
- . 2004. Middle English Recipes: Vernacularization of a Text-Type. In I. TAAVITSAINEN and P. PAHTA, eds. *Medical and Scientific Writing in Late Medieval English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- GÖRLACH, M. 1992. Text-Types and Language History: The Cookery Recipe. In M. RISSANEN, O. IHALAINEN, T. NEVALAINEN, and I. TAAVITSAINEN, eds. *History of Englishes*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 736-761.
- . 2004. *Text Types and the History of English*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- GRIFFITHS J. and EDWARDS, A.S.G. 2001. *The Tollemache Book of Secrets: A Descriptive Index and Complete Facsimile with an Introduction and Transcriptions Together with Catherine Tollemache's Receipts of Pastery, Confectionary &c.* [London:] The Roxburghe Club.
- GRUND, P. 2003. The Golden Formulas: Genre Conventions of Alchemical Recipes in the Middle English Period. *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen* 4: 455-475.
- HARGREAVES, H. 1981. Some Problems in Indexing Middle English Recipes. In A.S.G. EDWARDS and D. PEARSALL (eds) *Middle English Prose: Essays on Bibliographic Problems*. New York: Garland, 91-113.
- HIEATT, C.B. 1988. *An Ordinance of Pottage: An Edition of the Fifteenth-Century Culinary Recipes in Yale University's MS Beinecke 163*. London: Prospect Books.
- . 1996. The Middle English Culinary Recipes in MS Harley 5401: An Edition and Commentary. *Medium Aevum* 65, 54-71.
- . 1998. Editing Middle English Culinary Manuscripts. In V. P. MCCARREN and D. NOFFATT, eds. *A Guide to Editing Middle English*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 133-140.
- HIEATT, C. B. and S. BUTLER eds. 1985. *Curye on Inglysch: English Culinary Manuscripts of the Fourteenth Century (Including The Forme of Cury)*. EETS ss 8.
- HIEATT, C. B. and R. F. JONES 1986. Two Anglo-Norman Culinary Collections Edited from British Library Manuscripts Additional 32085 and Royal 12.C.xii. *Speculum* 61, 859-882.

- HOEY, M. 1986. The Discourse Colony: A Preliminary Study of a Neglected Discourse Type. In M. COULTHARD, ed. *Talking about Text: Studies Presented to David Brazil on his Retirement*. Birmingham: English Language Research, University of Birmingham, 1-26.
- . 2001. *Textual Interaction: An Introduction to Written Discourse Analysis*. London: Routledge.
- HUNT, T. 1990. *Popular Medicine in Thirteenth-Century England: Introduction and Texts*. Cambridge: D.S. Brewer.
- JACOBS, A. and A. H. JUCKER. 1995. Introduction. In A. JUCKER, ed. *Historical Pragmatics: Pragmatic Developments in the History of English*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- JONES, C. 1998. Formula and Formulation: 'Efficacy Phrases' in Medieval English Medical Manuscripts. *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen* 99: 199-209.
- MÄKINEN, M. 2004. Herbal Recipes and Recipes in Herbals – Intertextuality in Early English Herbals and Other Medical Writing. In I. TAAVITSAINEN and P. PAHTA, eds. *Medical and Scientific Writing in Late Medieval English*. Cambridge: CUP, 144-173.
- NICHOLS, S. G. and S. WENZEL eds. 1996. *The Whole Book: Cultural Perspectives on the Medieval Miscellany*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.
- PAHTA, P. 2004. Code-Switching in Medieval Medical Writing. In I. TAAVITSAINEN and P. PAHTA, eds. *Medical and Scientific Writing in Late Medieval English*. Cambridge: CUP, 73-99.
- PARKES, M. B. 1979. *English Cursive Book Hands: 1250 – 1500*. Ilkley: Scolar Press. [Originally published: Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1969.]
- . 1992. *Pause and Effect: An Introduction to the History of Punctuation in the West*. Aldershot: Scolar Press.
- PEGGE, S. ed. 1780. Ancient Cookery. In *The Forme of Cury: A Roll of Ancient English Cookery*. London: Society of Antiquaries.
- PÉREZ-MARIN, Y. 2004. The New World Medicine Chest: Points of Contact and of Departure in the Spanish and Mexican Tradition, 1567-1595. Paper given at the conference: Recipes in Early Modern Europe: The Production of Medicine, Food and Knowledge. Wellcome Unit for the History of Medicine, Oxford (February).
- RANKIN, A. 2004. Medicine for the Uncommon Woman: Noblewomen and Handwritten Medical Recipes in 16th Century Germany. Paper given at the conference: Recipes in Early Modern Europe: The Production of Medicine, Food and Knowledge. Wellcome Unit for the History of Medicine, Oxford (February).
- SASS, L. 1976. *To the King's Taste*. London: John Murray. [Originally published: New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1975.]
- STANNARD, J. 1982. *Rezeptliteratur* as *Fachliteratur*. *Scripta* 6: 59-73.
- TAAVITSAINEN, I. 2001. Middle English Recipes: Genre Characteristics, Text Type Features and Underlying Traditions of Writing. *Journal of Historical Pragmatics* 2, 85-113.
- TAAVITSAINEN, I. 2005. Genres and the Appropriation of Science: *Loci Communes* in English in the Late Medieval and Early Modern Period. In J. SKAFFARI, M. PEIKOLA, R. CARROLL, R. HILTUNEN and B. WÄRVIK eds. *Opening Windows on the Texts and Discourses of the Past*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- WARNER, R. ed. 1791. *Antiquitates Culinae: Or Curious Tracts Relating to the Culinary Affairs of the Old English*. London: Blamire.