Magdalena Bator

Culinary verbs in Middle English

Chapter One: Introduction

1.1 Medieval recipes – an overview of the available sources

The earliest traces of English food vocabulary are probably those in Alexander Neckam's *De Utensilibus*, from the late 12th century. It was written in Latin and contained a few Anglo-Norman and English glosses. The recipes included there can also be found in fuller forms in some later collections. Our knowledge of the early Middle English food traditions comes from literary descriptions of feasts and banquets; however, they are not very helpful when it comes to linguistic research, as they are usually very scarce in detail and limited to the enumeration of the meats served, telling us nothing about the way of cooking or serving them. The earliest detailed menu description, *Treatise of Walter of Bibbesworth*, comes from the late 13th century. However, it was written in Anglo-Norman, thus, is of little use for a comprehensive study of the English culinary language of the period.[1]

Another source of information concerning the food eaten at particular periods is narrative texts and verse, e.g., Chaucer's *The Canterbury Tales* or *Morte d'Arthur*. However, as noticed by Shaw (1991: 8), these usually show extremes (either excess or default, gluttony or drunkenness, and frugality or starvation), and lead to moralizing, preaching or ridiculing rather than a realistic presentation of food habits of the time. Shaw enumerates the following reasons for writing about food and drink in the Medieval times:

> (…) for moralizing purposes, for characterization purposes, to illustrate and exult the wealth of a character or a social class, to satirise a determined estate or professional group, to reflect religious customs or the flouting thereof, to lend realism to a text, or, on the contrary, to add fantasy thereto, and thus to heighten its interest, or finally, to spark off further dramatic incident, in the fulfilling of all which functions, moreover,

---

1   It is not suggested, though, that the study of Anglo-Norman cannot help with the study of English. On the contribution of the study of French and Anglo-Norman to the study of English and vice versa, see for instance Durkin (2012), or Rothwell (2001). On a brief characteristics of Anglo-Norman, see for instance Trotter (2008).

humour, satire and irony will often be included to endow and enliven these manduca-
tory and bibulatory episodes with a further literary dimension.

<div align="right">(Shaw 1991: 28)</div>

The other sources of culinary tradition imply historical documents, such as *A col-
lection of ordinances and regulations for the government of the Royal household,
made in divers reigns. From King Edward III. to King William and Queen Mary.
Also receipts in ancient cookery* (the recipes included here were later reprinted in
the collection *Forme of Cury*); or are archaeological attestations – which may serve
as evidence for the foods that were eaten at a particular period or the way of their
preparation (see for instance Woolgar, Serajeantson and Waldron (eds.) (2009)); as
well as medical recipes[2], which mostly contain recipes intended to cure rather than
to dine (see for instance Taavitsainen, Pahta and Mäkinen (eds.) (2005)).

All these sources have contributed to the appearance of numerous cultural
and sociological studies concerning food in Medieval England, such as Wilson's
(1991) *Food and drink in Britain. From the Stone Age to the 19th c.*, three books
by Hagen on the Anglo-Saxon food and drink (1994, 1995 and 2010), Hammond's
(2005) *Food and feast in Medieval England*, and many others, including some
special studies such as Lee's (2007) work on the role of food and drink in the
burial rituals.[3] However, the most important source of information for a linguistic
analysis is the manuscripts containing medieval recipes.

The present author is familiar with no extensive semantic analysis of the cu-
linary language conducted so far.[4] Such a linguistic research requires a study
of specific culinary recipes rather than materials included in the household

---

2   Unlike culinary recipes, the medical ones, which survived till present times, come
    from an earlier period. There are three major Old English medical texts: *The Leech-
    book of Bald, the Lacnunga* and *the Old English Herbarium* (Thomas 2011).

3   Additionally, for a brief sketch of studies on food seen from the historical perspective,
    see Super (2002) and Woolgar (2009).

4   Some studies dealing with a restricted area of the semantic field 'food', and/or
    restricted to a short period of time, were handled. For instance, Frantzen (2011)
    analyzed the culinary language in the Anglo-Saxon penitentials, Kornexl and Len-
    ker (2011) dealt with lexical pairs within the culinary vocabulary, similarly, Weiss
    (2009) concentrated on lexical items referring to animals and their meat, Lehrer
    (2007) discussed wine vocabulary, and Bator (2013b) analyzed terms referring to
    herbs and spices in the 14th and 15th centuries. Bator (2011) conducted a general
    study on the food vocabulary in the 14th and 15th c. recipes. Additionally, a number
    of studies on more general topics dealt among others with food vocabulary, for in-
    stance, Baugh and Cable (2006), Lutz (2013).

accounts or provided by archaeological evidence. Thus, it has been decided to base the present study exclusively on the available editions of manuscripts containing Middle English culinary recipes. Unfortunately, the earliest culinary collections are Anglo-Norman records of menus of the upper class, which poses a number of restrictions concerning any linguistic research of the early culinary language. The earliest English material attested comes from the end of the 13th c. and is rather scarce. Thus, the author has no other choice but as to concentrate on the period of the late Middle Ages, i.e., the 14th and 15th centuries, from which a representative sample of recipes could be collected. Scully (1995: 5) calls the period "a hey-day for medieval cookery" due to the greater availability of culinary evidence comparing to the earlier times. It should be remembered that the available culinary material gives us an insight into the food habits of the upper classes only. The diet of the poor and middle classes can only be deduced from literary and archaeological material, since no recipe collections were created by peasants (see for instance Dyer 1988 or Carlin 2008). Black (1981: 54) suggests that "the poor lived mainly on porridgy gruels and salt bacon". However, she claims that their diet was definitely nutritious and healthy, full of fresh vegetables, fruit and herbs.

With time, more and more culinary evidence is being discovered. In 2002 Hieatt (2002: 19) wrote about more than forty known culinary manuscripts. Six years later she (2008: 11–20) enumerated 82 manuscripts, which, if not entirely devoted to culinary recipes, do contain at least single folios of them. When it comes to the availability of the edited material, Hieatt (1998) writes:

> By 1900 around thirteen culinary manuscripts of English provenance, whether Latin, Anglo-Norman or Middle English, had been edited and printed, in whole or in part, including those simply collated. The number of recipes printed from these manuscripts amounts to about 1850. Since 1900 (and almost *all* in the last decade or so), something like twenty-one additional manuscripts have been edited, in whole or in part – not counting those re-edited – giving us around 2075 recipes not previously printed, as well as a great many new (and often corrected) versions of some which had been edited before.
>
> (Hieatt 1998: 104–105)

Additionally, Hieatt (1998, 2008) noticed that almost 2000 recipes have not been edited yet.

The corpus for the present study has been based on the available editions of Middle English recipe collections coming from the 14th and 15th centuries.

1.1.1 The 14ᵗʰ-century collections

The earliest culinary collections were written in Anglo-Norman and found in two manuscripts, i.e., the MS Additional 32085, from the late 13ᵗʰ c., and the MS Royal 12.C.xii from the early 14ᵗʰ c. The latter was edited by Meyer in 1893. Later, both collections were published by Hieatt and Jones (1986: 859), who claim that these are the only two Anglo-Norman collections found so far: "No new Anglo-Norman collections have turned up since that time, although we have searched in a great number of libraries and their catalogues". All the recipes from the MS Royal as well as a great deal of those in the Additional MS were translated into Middle English and included in the collection *Diuersa cibaria* (= DC). The collection consists of recipes from the early 14ᵗʰ c. It was based on the MS Additional 46919, which was compiled under the direction and partly in the hand of William Herebert of Hereford. The manuscript has been dated to 1325 (Hieatt 2006) and includes 63 recipes. They are available in the edition by Hieatt and Butler (1985). A distinctive feature of these Anglo-Norman recipes is the use of fresh fruit and flowers, which were not found in any of the French recipes.

Other 14ᵗʰ-century recipe collections include:

Diuersa servicia (= DS), a collection of 92 recipes, dated to about 1381 and included in the MS Bodleian Douce 257. It was first published by Pegge (1780) under the title *Ancient Cookery*, as a supplement to his *Forme of Cury*. Later, the recipes were edited by Hieatt and Butler (1985).[5]

Utilis coquinario (= UC), edited from the MS B.L. Sloane 468 in Hieatt and Butler (1985), and dated to 1395. The collection consists of 37 recipes.

Probably the best known collection is the *Forme of Cury* (= FC), which, according to Hieatt has survived in six manuscripts (2006: xiv), and has been represented in at least eight collections (as a whole or partially) (1998: 108). The title has been recorded only in one manuscript, i.e., the MS B.L. Additional 5016 (the MS A). Following the head-note in the vellum scroll of the manuscript, it should:

> techiþ a man for to make commune potages and commune meetis for howshold as þey shold be made craftly and holsomly. Aftirward it techiþ for to make curious potages & meetes and sotiltees for alle maner of States bothe hye and lowe. And the techyng of the forme of making of potages & of meetes bothe of flessh and of fissh.
>
> (Pegge 1780: 2)

---

5   In the present study, the later edition has been used.

This note differs in the MS M (John Rylands University Library of Manchester) in that it is a collection of "curious metes for hy est astates" rather than for all men of both high and low social classes, as indicated in the MS A. The collection was compiled by the Chief Master Cook of Richard II. It was first edited by Samuel Pegge in 1780 and later copied by Richard Warner in 1791. In the present study the edition by Hieatt and Butler (1985) will be followed, together with later corrections and additions published in Hieatt (1988b). *The Forme of Cury* contains 205 recipes and has been dated to 1390 (Hieatt 2006).

Goud Kokery (= GK) is a collection of 25 miscellaneous recipes from various sources, dating from 1340 to 1480, and published in Hieatt and Butler (1985).

Hieatt and Butler's *Curve on Inglysch* also includes two menus for the banquet given for the English king in 1397 shortly after King Richard II's marriage to Isabella of France in 1396; as well as 7 other menus, which are rather general suggestions than historical records. They were all based on the MS Cosin V.III.11 (C), dated to the end of the 14th c. (= Cosin).

1.1.2 The 15th-century collections

The 15th c. presents us with a wider range of the culinary material than the previous century. Thus, the following collections are available:

A fifteenth century cookry boke published by Anderson (1962), with 153 recipes, divided into 11 groups: *fleysshe; fysshe; byrdys; mete pyes & tartes; daryoles & other tartes & frittours; mylke, eyroun & notys; frutes & flowres; potages dyuers; sauces pur diuerse viaundes; cakys, bredes & amydon; swetes*; and the recipe for *cokentrice*. The collection has been based on the MS Harleian 279 (1430), the MS Harleian 4010 (c. 1450), as well as the MS Ashmole 1429, the MS Laud 553 and the MS Douce 55, from c. 1450. The collection has been based on the same material as that used for Austin's (2000) collection, therefore it will not be included in the analysis in order not to duplicate the data.

An ordinance of pottage (= OP) edited by Hieatt (1988a) is one of the longest and most widely disseminated 15th-century culinary collections. It is based on the Yale University's MS Beinecke 163. The collection has also survived in the British Library Sloane MS 7 and 442 and in the Bodleian Library Oxford MS Rawlinson D 1222. It consists of 200 recipes, with a section of 8 'additional recipes' and 3 menus from the MS Sloane 442. Hieatt (2006) dated the collection to 1460, with the exception of the three menus, which are dated to 1475.

96 recipes, found in the MS Harley 5401, have been edited by Hieatt (1996) and published in the article "The Middle English culinary recipes in the MS Harley 5401: An edition and commentary"[6] (= Hrl). It is a collection of culinary recipes which were found in a fifteenth century manuscript devoted to medical matters. The culinary part of the manuscript has been signed by "Thomas Awkbarow", who according to Hieatt (1996) was a northerner. She also claims that the spelling used within the collection suggests that the author was from the east coast. Following *LALME*, the manuscript "appears to be in the language of NW Lincs". A number of recipes found in the MS Harley 5401 correspond to recipes in the *Forme of Cury* or Austin's collection but the majority of these constitute different versions of the dishes. Many recipes from the collection have not been found in any other medieval manuscript. A great deal of the recipes refer to the preparation of shellfish, which may indicate a coastal location as a place of origin of the collection. The collection is dated to c. 1490 (Hieatt 2006).

Probably the largest 15th c. collection has been edited by Austin (2000). The first of his *Two fifteenth-century cookery books* has been based on: the Harleian MS 279, which is composed of three parts: 'Potages dyuers' (= PD) with 153 recipes, 'Leche viaundez' (= LV) with 64 recipes and 'Bake metis' (= BM) with 41 recipes. The manuscript is dated to 1435. The second of the books (*A boke of kokery*) has been based on the Harleian MS 4016, from c.1450, and consists of 182 recipes (= BK). Austin's collection has been supplemented with 19 recipes for sauces, based on the Ashmole MS 1439, dated to c.1410 (= Ashm); 25 recipes based on the Laud MS 553 from 1430 (= Laud); and 12 recipes based on the Douce MS 55 from about 1450 (= Douce).

Additionally, Banham and Mason (2002) have edited 5 recipes for confectionery found in an early 15th-century manuscript in Lincolnshire, dated by Hieatt (2006) to 1420. They are probably the only surviving culinary recipes which come from an English monastic household. What is striking is that the recipes are written in Latin, "[t]hey have clearly been translated from English, since several English words survived the process" (Banham and Mason 2002: 48). No English equivalents of the recipes have been found.

In her article "The third 15th century cookery book: A newly identified group within a family"[7], Hieatt (2004) extracted 8 recipes which were included in a collection of recipes corresponding to those edited by Austin (2000) or Hieatt (1988a); however, the extracted eight mid-15th-century recipes were found in

---

6   Published in: *Medium Aevum* 65.1 (1996).
7   Published in: *Medium Aevum* 73.1 (2004).

neither. The recipes were found in the MS Douce 55 and collated with the MS Additional 5467 (= MAe).

In 2008 Hieatt published *A gathering of Medieval English recipes* (= GR), in which she included over 500 15th c.-recipes, 356 of which were either never published before or found in different forms than in the previously edited collections. The set has been based on three collections never edited before, i.e., the Bodleian MS Ashmole 1393, the MS e.Mus. 52 and the MS Welcome Western 5650, as well as several manuscripts which earlier might have been used for collation but which contain recipes not edited in any of the earlier collections, and a few recipes found in isolation. Altogether 82 manuscripts have been taken into account (Hieatt 2008: 12–20). The collection consists of the following parts:

- The MS Ashmole 1393: the extract contains 35 recipes, some of which are extremely short and seem incomplete. This leads to the conclusion that even though the manuscript comes from the 15th c. the character of the recipes indicates their earlier origin (e.g., lack of details, omissions, etc.); for the characteristics of medieval recipes see section 1.2. Thus, Hieatt (2008: 22) suggests that it is a later copy of the 14th c. material. However, the collection does not show any direct relation to any other compilation. It has been dated to 1410. (= GR_Ashm)
- The MS Ashmole 1439 (with variants from the MS Harley 279): the collection correlates with that edited by Austin (2000), thus the recipes have not been added to the present corpus in order not to duplicate the analyzed material.
- The MS Ashmole 1444: the recipes are dated to c. 1390. Most of them were also edited in Hieatt and Butler (1985); however, there are 5 recipes which either differ from the versions in Hieatt and Butler or have not been found there nor in any other collection, thus they have been added to the corpus used in the present study. The collection contains also a number of 16th century recipes, but the present study comprises the period until the end of the 15th c., hence, this part has been excluded from the database. (= GR_AshmB)
- The MS e. Mus. 52: the recipes represented in the manuscript are often early ones, corresponding not only to Austin's (2000) or Hieatt's (1988a) collections, but also to Hieatt and Butler's (1985). The manuscript has been dated to the end of the 15th c. The collection comprises 101 recipes and additional 26 entitled 'confectionary series'. Out of these, there are 35 recipes for which Hieatt (2008) finds no correspondence in any of the earlier editions or which correspond to familiar dishes; however, they differ in details and wording from the other collections. (= GR_eMus)

- The MS Rawlinson D 1222: the majority of these recipes correspond to Hieatt (1988a) or Austin (2000), but there are also a few recipes corresponding to *Noble book of cookery* or *Forme of Cury*. 85 of the recipes have not been found in any of the other editions. They have been dated to 1450. (= GR_Rwl)
- The MS Sloane 7 and Sloane 442: they consist of 23 recipes, either not mentioned in the other editions or representing such different variants that we have decided to include them in the present corpus. The collection has been dated to 1480. (= GR_Sl)
- The MS Sloane 1108: it is an early 15th c. manuscript in which for 11 recipes no parallels were found in any of the other editions. The collection has been dated to 1420. (= GR_Sl)
- The Cambridge University Library Ll.I.18: a late 15th c. manuscript, whose significant part corresponds to *An ordinance of pottage*. 68 recipes either have no parallels in the other editions or differ significantly from the versions found elsewhere. They have been dated to 1485. (= GR_CUL)
- The National Library of Wales MS Peniarth 394 D: contains 44 recipes which show no close resemblance to any of the recipes printed before. The collection has been dated to 1485. (= GR_Pen)
- The New York Public Library MS Whitney 1: this is an early 15th c. manuscript (from 1425). The majority of the recipes parallel those printed in other sources, but Hieatt identified 6 recipes which have not been found elsewhere. (= GR_Whit)
- The Society of Antiquaries MS 287: with 8 recipes not found elsewhere, dated to 1480. (= GR_SA)
- The Trinity College Cambridge MS 0.1.13: the collection corresponds to *An ordinance of pottage*, with the exception of 7 recipes which come from an unidentified source. They have been dated to 1465. (= GR_TC)
- The Wellcome Western MS 5650: the manuscript partly corresponds to the collection in *An ordinance of pottage*, with the exception of 19 recipes. The collection comes from 1470. (= GR_WW)
- The collection contains also a number of recipes found in isolation in various manuscripts, from various periods, i.e., altogether 13 recipes which either had not been edited before or differed from the previous versions considerably.

A collection of a different character than the above mentioned ones is *Liber cure cocorum* (= LCC). It is an early 15th-c. doggerel collection first edited by Richard

Morris in 1862. The poem is written in a north-western dialect of Lancashire[8] and contains 127 recipes dated to 1460 (Hieatt 2006).

Finally, we should not forget about the first cookery book published in English, i.e., *A noble boke of festes ryalle and cokery* published by Pynson in 1500. Following Hieatt (2006: xiv), "it survives only in a unique copy in Lord Bath's library at Longleat". However, an edition of the earlier manuscript of the same collection is known, i.e., Napier's edition of 1882, currently available online via www.medievalcookery.com [2008]. Napier's edition (= NBC) contains 253 recipes, which have been dated by Hieatt (2006) to 1475.

The last two collections, i.e., LCC and NBC have not been included in the corpus used for the present study. This can be accounted for by the different character of the former collection, i.e., vocabulary used in verse should be treated separately. The latter has been generally considered as an unreliable edition (see Hieatt 1988a).

The full list of collections and editions used for the present research can be found in the Appendix.

1.2 Medieval recipes – a brief look at their characteristics

The food habits of the upper class in medieval times were rather regular. The aristocracy usually ate twice a day. Meal times were determined by practical considerations, namely, cooking had to be conducted during daylight. Brears (2008: 369) claims that "[a]s a general rule, there were two meals each day, dinner served at 10 a.m. and supper at 4 p.m., although these could be moved an hour forward or back depending on the season, or the particular preference of the head of the household." Additionally, the more important members of the household might have been served breakfast in the morning, very often in their private chambers.

The late medieval recipes are a resource for the food habits at aristocratic households, feasts and banquets. (For information on the food habits of the other classes, see for instance Tannahill 1988 or Mennell 1996). The recipes give us fundamental evidence for actual ingredients, processes, final dishes, and the manner of serving them at table in the aristocratic households. Medieval feasts consisted of at least two courses, each composed of several dishes. The number of dishes depended on the occasion and on the financial situation of the host. The order of

---

8   See Wilson (1991: 205).

the dishes was not always the same. Definitely it was the soup which came first, followed by something more substantial, such as roasts of various kinds or pies. Then, lighter and/or richer dishes, such as tarts and fritters were served, then non-sweet delicacies, such as small game birds. Finally, something sweet was offered. Freedman (2007: 49), suggests that "[t]he courses were distinguished more by methods of preparation than by basic ingredients so that, partly for health reasons, boiled dishes came first, then roasts, and then fried foods." Brears (2008) agrees that the order of serving dishes depended on the way of cooking them; however, he suggests a slightly different sequence. Thus, first boiled, baked and fried foods were served, and only later roasted dishes were offered. As suggested by Henisch (2009), the cook was to entertain the master and his guests with a great variety of rich and luxurious dishes. At the end of each course a 'subtlety' might have been presented (see for instance Hammond 2005, Hieatt and Butler 1985). These were food decorations made to look like something else, e.g., birds with feathers or sugar sculptures. Their main function was to amuse or impress the guests as well as the host. Subtleties were usually made of sugar or marzipan, but in fact any material (often non-edible, such as wax, silk, plaster, wood, etc.) might have been involved in order to achieve the desired result. They might have been painted or gilded, and decorated with jewels, flowers, etc. Davidson (2006: 762) distinguishes two types of subtleties: the plain ones, "made of anything from pastry or butter to wood and canvas", and the elaborate ones, which included live participants. The subtleties were usually part of a spectacle taking place between courses. The entremets[9] involved a mixture of singing, acting, mechanics, and carpentry combined together in order to create an allegorical fantasy or a political message, etc.

Medieval recipes were very general in terms of instructions, especially in terms of specifying the quantities, temperatures or times. Their function was to consult rather than to teach. They were more like a list of ingredients defining the order of adding them and not detailed instructions guiding the cook step by step how to prepare a particular dish. Food historians, e.g., Hammond (2005) or Scully (1995), suggest that the recipes were intended as aids for the chief cook rather than for those working in the kitchen, who must have worked by memory and experience. The main aim of writing down medieval recipes might have been the estimation of the ingredients necessary to prepare a feast, so that when a menu was chosen, the recipes were used to prepare a 'shopping list'. The recipes might also have been memory aids for the cook in order not to forget about any ingredient or about the

9   A medieval course was referred to as 'met', thus, the activities which took place between courses were called 'entremets' (Davidson 2006).

order of adding particular ingredients. Additionally, many recipes do not instruct how to prepare a particular dish but instead give details of the sauce which should be served with the dish. This, according to Brears (2008), proves that the cook's memory had to be refreshed, i.e., they remembered the frequently prepared dishes, such as pastries or breads, and most basic processes, such as plain boiling or roasting, but details concerning foods which were not in everyday use might have been forgotten. On the other hand, Scully (1995) points out that recipes were not written *for* the cook, who was a professional and knew well enough how to prepare particular dishes, but *by* the cook (as some archival material). He writes:

> A recipe collection was compiled in manuscript form not for the cook in a noble or bourgeois household but for the master or mistress of that household. It served to document certain standards of an elite class. Occasionally revised with additions, deletions and modifications, occasionally copied, with the approval of the master or mistress in order to please a flattering friend or relative, a manuscript collection of recipes reposed in the household library, not in its kitchen.
>
> (Scully 1995: 8)

Scully notices that the majority of the surviving recipes are too clean to ever have been used in the kitchen. It is also possible, if we assume after Scully that recipes were written down by the cooks, that the most outstanding chefs were not willing to reveal details of their craft. For instance, Guillaume Tirel, one of the greatest chefs in the 14th c. France, the author of the *Viandier*,[10] explained the omission of instructions on how to cook some of the dishes included in his collection thus: "everyone knows how to do them. (…) as for tripe, which I have not put in my recipe book, it is common knowledge how it is to be prepared" (*The Viandier of Taillevent*, cited after Hennisch 2009: 19). On the other hand, the cook gives detailed descriptions of very complicated and sophisticated dishes, which only a master cook with a group of qualified assistants could stand a chance to prepare, which may be a way of boasting about his competence.

Comparing to their French counterparts, the English recipes were much less detailed. However, the character of recipes changed with time. The later a recipe,

---

10 Guillaume Tirel (also known as Taillevant) is believed to have lived from around 1312 to 1395. He served in a number of noble households. In 1373 he became the chief cook of Charles V and then of Charles VI. The *Viandier* is one of the best known French culinary collections. It was most probably compiled in the 1370's. It is a compilation of dishes gathered by Tirel from the earlier sources (Mennell 1996: 50). An edition of the *Viandier* with translation into English has been published by Scully (1997).

the more details it contains, although a few cases in which the 15th c. recipe is shorter than its 14th c. equivalent were also found (see examples (1a–b) below). Together with the length of the description, the nature of the recipes evolved too. Studies show that the same recipe changes over time in terms of the ingredients used for its preparation, way of cooking, or seasoning (e.g., Hammond 2005). Hence, following recipes with the same title but coming from different periods, one may come up with a different dish (see for instance Myers [Online]). Hieatt and Butler (1985: 9) explain the change of recipes over time in such a way: "these recipes were passed down through succeeding generations, however, there was a tendency to spell out procedures at greater and greater length and to add and/or vary ingredients."

Most of the recipes begin with a title, which depicts the cookbook's repository. The titles usually include the name of the dish or the main ingredient used for its preparation (Carroll 1999). The headings might also refer to a particular quality in the dish, such as the colour of the dish, the method of cooking or the type of the dish. "Recipe names sometimes reveal traditional influences and evolving patterns" (Laurioux 1999: 297). The English dish names very often reflect the French origin of the recipe. Even though the dish might have evolved into a different one than its French counterpart, not only in terms of the amount of details given in the recipe but also in the entire character of the dish; the recipe might even present a completely different dish than the one described in the French recipe of the same title (Hieatt and Butler 1985). Moreover, a number of recipes with a French looking title were never found in any of the French collections, e.g., 'Viaunde de Cypre' (DC_28), which suggests that the Anglo-Norman cooks developed their own recipes (see Hieatt and Butler 1985: 6).

(1a) 14th c.:

A tenche in syuee. Scalde þy tenche & atyre wel & boyle it; & tak þe same broth & myed bred & tempere it togedere, & tak good poudre / of canel & of clowes & do to þe sewe, & coloure it with safroun & salte it & lete hit boile. & tak myced onyounnes & frye hem in oyle dolyf or vynegre or in wyn or in þe same broth, & do hem in þat sewe & sesen it vp with vynegre or with eysel; & after þat lat it no more boyle.

<div align="right">(UC_9)</div>

(1b) 15th c.:

Tenche in cyueye. Take a tenche, an skalde hym, roste hym, grynde Pepir an Safroun, Brede an Ale, & melle it to-gederys; take Oynonys, hake hem, an frye hem in Oyle, & do hem þer-to, and messe hem forth.

<div align="right">(PD_95)</div>