FURTHER NOTES ON *THE FORME OF CURY* ET AL.: ADDITIONS AND CORRECTIONS

CONSTANCE B. HIEATT
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH, UNIVERSITY OF WESTERN ONTARIO

When our edition of fourteenth-century English culinary manuscripts, *Curye on Inglysch*,[1] was published in 1985, the late Sharon Butler and I, having first rejoiced that the product of about fifteen years' work had finally appeared, turned to the task of finding where we, whether as editors, typists, or proofreaders, had failed to achieve perfection. It says much for the skill of the Oxford University Press printers and the vigilant editors of the Early English Text Society that the great majority of the flaws which have come to my attention over the past two years are strictly attributable to Dr Butler and me. Happily, blemishes in accidentals are infrequent, often representing notes and corrections which simply disappeared in the course of the many revisions made to our material; but more essential matters that escaped our attention up to press-time require a number of alterations.

Our most glaring oversight was the manuscript of *The Forme of Cury* in the John Rylands University Library of Manchester. Gauged by the availability in secondary literature, that we missed the valuable edition of some early Latin recipe manuscripts in the Bibliothèque Nationale published by Marianne Mulon as early as 1971[2] is more heinous. The descriptions of the Manchester manuscript in N. R. Ker's *Medieval Manuscripts in British Libraries*[3] and G. A. Lester's *Handlist of Manuscripts containing Middle English Prose in the John Rylands University Library of Manchester and Chetham's Library, Manchester*[4] were not available to us during the final preparation of our edition. Nevertheless, in the essential matter of primary material, my most acute embarrassment arises from finding that our search through

[1] Constance B. Hieatt and Sharon Butler, eds., *Curye on Inglysch: English Culinary Manuscripts of the Fourteenth Century (including the Forme of Cury)* (E.E.T.S. ss. 8, London: Oxford University Press, 1985).

[2] 'Deux traités inédits d'art culinaire médiéval', *Bulletin Philologique et Historique* (1971 for 1968), 369–435.

[3] N. R. Ker, *Medieval Manuscripts in British Libraries* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, I, 1969; III, 1983).

[4] G. A. Lester, *The Index of Middle English Prose, Handlist II: A Handlist of Manuscripts containing Middle English Prose in the John Rylands University Library of Manchester and Chetham's Library, Manchester* (Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 1985).

countless library catalogues stopped short of discovering this major example of the most important Middle English collection.

Now that I have had the opportunity to examine Rylands English MS 7 (hereafter MS M), I can report that, if we had included it in our collation, it would have changed very few of our readings, none of them of genuine linguistic or culinary importance. However, MS M is in some respects the best, as well as the earliest, copy of what we have labelled the *beta*-version of *The Forme of Cury*, a group otherwise consisting of British Library Additional MS 5016 (A, our base manuscript) and the Morgan Library's Bühler 36 (MS B). MS M ought to have been the base.

A belated acquaintance with it provides the major impetus for revising some pages of our edition, but it is not the only reason revisions are necessary. The texts printed by Mulon necessitate several other changes, as do other results of my further research in the past two years. It seems appropriate to let such revisions and new suggestions, as well as some other necessary corrections, follow a general discussion of MS M. This discussion supplements and corrects the remarks about the manuscripts of the *Forme of Cury* printed on pages 20–30 of our edition. Detailed notes on variant readings significant enough to be worth noting are postponed to the listing of page-by-page changes and corrections which follows here; these should be regarded as addenda to the original textual footnotes.

MS M is, in general, most closely parallel to MS B in its readings, but it is much more complete in that it contains all of the first twenty or so recipes[5] (which are completely or partially missing in B), the table of contents, and, most significantly of all, the headnote attributing the collection to the cooks of Richard the Second. M is thus almost as complete as A, but not quite. For one thing, it has lost two leaves which contained recipes 194, 195, and 196, and about half of 197 (Hieatt/Butler numbering, here and throughout). In addition, M, like B, skips one recipe ('French iowtes', 75) which is contained in most of the manuscripts of the *alpha* group and thus appears to belong to the original collection;[6] and it lacks the last recipe promised by its (and A's) table of contents. This should be 'Payn puff' (204), but is mislabelled in B and in the tables of contents to both A and M; the immediate common exemplar evidently had this error in the table of contents, and may have also had it in the heading of the recipe concerned, since, of the three, only A gives the correct title at the head

[5] Not including those which appear only in mss of the *alpha* group.

[6] Ker states (III, 401) that recipe 75 'was added to the "Brander Roll" [MS A] in a blank space,' but he was apparently misinformed, or misled by the annotation at the bottom of the sheet on which this recipe is copied (in a relatively modern hand) and added to MS M, with a note saying 'From Brander's MS. Roll, inserted after *Chychus*.' In fact, there is nothing about the recipe in MS A to suggest it was a later addition – quite the contrary, in fact! – and it appears in the same position it occupies in collections of the *alpha* group.

of the actual recipe. Perhaps the scribe of M recognized that something was wrong and simply decided not to copy that last recipe.[7]

MS M is unique in containing, at the top of fo.4r, an inscription which purports to assign an exact date to the collection (or the manuscript?). The first word of this inscription is now missing, except for tantalizing signs of the bottom strokes of several indecipherable letters; the rest reads: 'Inne 1377 [.] 1611 [.] 234 yeres ago'. This indicates, of course, that someone writing in the early seventeenth century thought the manuscript had been written in 1377. There is no way of knowing who this person was, or why he thought 1377 the proper year, but he can scarcely have been wrong by more than a decade or so. I agree with Lester[8] (against Ker) that the palaeography of the manuscript suggests a date in the second half of the fourteenth century, not the fifteenth. The point is so clear that it seems possible, perhaps probable, that the conflict with Ker's dating is only apparent; his 'xv^{2}' may well be a miscopied, or misprinted, 'xiv^{2}'. MS M is unquestionably the earliest manuscript in its group; neither A nor B can be earlier than the second decade of the fifteenth century – if, indeed, either is that early.

Kept with the manuscript is a letter dated 14 December 1915, from John Hodgkin, a Fellow of the Linnaean Society and member of Council of the Philological Society who was an expert on medieval recipe manuscripts, to Henry Guppy, then librarian of the John Rylands Library. Those who have taken an interest in the culinary manuscripts of the British Library's Sloane Collection may recognize Hodgkin's name as that of the compiler of a handwritten index to these recipes, B.L. Add. MS 42562. He was also the author of a number of notes appended to Frere's *A Proper Newe Booke of Cokerie*;[9] among them is his judgement (p. 95) that MS A of *The Forme of Cury*, evidently the only one known to him at that time (1913), was probably a late copy of an original compiled around 1390. In making this remark, Hodgkin was well ahead of his time. Until very recently, all other printed estimates of the date of MS A ignored the fact that the hand is distinctly not one of the fourteenth century. Hodgkin's letter to Guppy suggests that Hodgkin might have produced a more accurate edition of the collection early in the twentieth century, and/or a well-informed study of a large body of culinary manuscripts of the period, including one of the early Latin manuscripts in the Bibliothèque Nationale which was not edited (or known to most of those interested in the field) until Mulon's edition appeared.

[7] It is possible that its absence is simply due to a lost leaf; in his account of MS M, G. A. Lester (2) states that *two* leaves have been lost at the end here, but I do not know what the evidence is for such a loss.

[8] And with Dr Ian Doyle, who has conveyed his opinion of the date of the ms to me in a letter.

[9] Catherine Frances Frere, ed., *A Proper Newe Booke of Cokerie*, with notes by John Hodgkin (Cambridge, 1913).

His letter asks for permission to use MS M for collation with MS A, remarking that 'a collation is very badly needed', and then goes on to say that he had been lent two other Middle English culinary manuscripts, including one of

> the Noble Boke of Cookry which Mrs. Napier transcribed (& in a most inaccurate manner:) I found it easier to make a fresh transcript than to correct the errors in the printed copy: they were too numerous – I have had every MS up to AD 1500 in the B. Mus. through my hands & have made a special study of them. The best cookery MS in the Bibl. Nationale at Paris is a Latin one, *circa* 1300 and I went over to Paris specially two years ago to see it, and elucidate certain words which were not very easy to decipher. If your people would care to entertain the idea of publishing the MS I should be pleased to edit the same. I have long wished to republish the Brander MS, but if yours is a more accurate version this would be better still.

It is a great pity that John Hodgkin did not complete his projected work. He was quite right about the inaccuracies of Napier's *Noble Boke of Cookry*[10] and about the importance of the Latin manuscript (whichever one of the two it was that he had inspected), and would indeed have found MS M a more accurate, if incomplete, version of *The Forme of Cury*.

The manuscript itself begins with the headnote found elsewhere only in MS A. Ker comments that this 'preface' 'is shorter and altered slightly,' but in fact little in the A note is missing except the description of Richard as 'þe best and ryallest vyandier of alle cristen kynges' and one or two short phrases which may well have been added in a later revision. One other difference between the two notes is that the last sentence or two of the note in A appears later, in slightly different form, following the table of contents in M; both forms make good sense, and it is difficult to say that one is more likely than the other to follow its original accurately, but it should be noted that the copy in M is correct in giving 'maysters *of* physyk' where A reads 'Maisters *and* phisik'. M is also probably more accurate in stating that the 'curyous metes' are 'for hyȝest astates' rather than 'for alle manere of states both hye and lowe'. The first note in M reads:

> Copia domini Regis Ricardi secundi post conquestum Anglie. Thys fourme of cury ys compyled of þe chef mayster cokes of kyng Rychardus þe sekonde after þe conquest of Englond by assent of maysters of physyk and of phylosophye. Furst hyt bygynneþ at comune potages & commune metes, and aftirward of curyous metes for hyȝest astates. And þys table sewyng telleþ how þey stonden in ordre by noumbre.[11]

[10] Mrs Alexander (Robina) Napier, ed., *A Noble Boke of Cookry ffor a Prynce Houssolde or eny other estately Houssolde* (London, 1882).

[11] Here and elsewhere ms abbreviations are expanded; one which may be dubious is the superscript sign for *s* which usually indicates *-es* but is sometimes here interpreted as *-us*.

At the end of the table of contents, on fo.11v, after the notation 'Explicit tabula', the second note intervenes before the heading 'Incipit forma' (top of fo.12r): 'þys table conteneþ in noumbre of dyvers potages and dyverse metes and soteltees, an hundret foure score & fourtene; & here sewyng þe fourme of þe ensaumple telleþ how a man schal make hem.'

The table of contents itself is, in all important respects, identical with that in MS A, except that it skips the title and number of recipe 75, which, as already noted, is missing here, as it is in MS B. All recipes are numbered, and the spelling variants are too minor to be worth noting; just as an example, *Connat* (20) is here (and later) spelled *Connate*, a spelling which agrees with MS B against MS A. So as well do several title spellings here, but not all; *Haares* appears in the contents titles of 25 and 26, while the later recipe titles agree in spelling the word *hares*, as do A and B. Alternate titles in the table start with rubricated capitals; the first letters of the intervening recipes are lightly-drawn, small ones indicating which capitals should be inserted.

The first recipe page (fo.12r) is very carefully worked, with a large rubricated decorative capital resembling those in the most handsome manuscript of *The Forme of Cury*, B.L. MS Harl. 1605, although the capitals thereafter are simpler in style. The spelling within the recipes is often closer to that of MS A than that of MS B, which M resembles more closely in other respects;[12] for example, the scribe favoured A's *grece* and *coraunce* over B's *grees* and *corauns*. But sometimes the M spellings are unique; M gives *ryȝt* for A's *right*; *hote* rather than AB *hoot*; and *wiþ* and *oþer* for AB *wt* and *or*.

The readings of the recipes agree with MS B against MS A about three times as often as they do the opposite, but note that MS M supports A in about ten significant instances. Many, although not all, of the variants M shares with one but not the other are for one reason or another unquestionably the correct readings. A few are no doubt coincidental, but overall it is evident that M has fewer obvious errors than either A or B. Further, M contains at least two correct readings not found in either of the parallel manuscripts, giving *yfarced* in Recipe 63 where A and B both give the dubious spelling *yfasced*, and including the *pynes* (pine nuts) omitted by A and B in recipe 102. In one or two cases, the M scribe appears to have started to make a mistake found in either A or B, but has stopped and corrected his work, which suggests that all three scribes may have occasionally corrected errors in the original. M is not the original, for it has unique errors of its own, some of which preclude it as a possible source for A or B; most notably, it skips the last half of recipe 134, 'Sobre sawse'.

[12] Perhaps the judgement of Lorna Sass (reported by Ker) that 'the orthography is closer to the Buhler manuscript in the Pierpont Morgan Library, New York, than to Add. 5016' was based on the spellings of titles in the table of contents.

Variants of conceivable significance are reported in detail below, among other corrections and additions to the Hieatt/Butler edition *Curye on Inglysch* (for which, as remarked above, these are not the only changes needed). All changes below are keyed to the relevant pages of our edition.

p.ix *add between L and P*: M Manchester, John Rylands University Library of Manchester English 7.

p.2 n.3, . . .la Prose d'Orange: *read* la Prise d'Orange.
n. 4, . . .parler de array: *read* parler del array.

p. 3 . . .closed season: *add* with wheat pottage. . . .cubebs, and enough spicerie: *read* cubebs, cloves, and enough other spicerie.

p. 6 . . .Viaunde de Cypre and Mawmenny: *delete* and 'Mawmenny'. in France which we suspect; *revise to* in France (except, in some cases, in early Latin manuscripts) which appear.

p. 7 n. 1: *add*: Both have been edited by C.B. Hieatt and Robin F. Jones – see 'Two Anglo-Norman culinary collections edited from British Library Manuscripts Additional 32085 and Royal 12.C.xii', *Speculum*, 61 (1986), 859–82.

p.15 . . .only complete manuscript: *add* which we had seen.

p.16 . . ., and the *DNB*'s account . . .'fl. 1500': *change to* Ker says Nicholas Bollard 'wrote at Avignon in s. xiv' and 'is wrongly included in DNB' (I, 305).

p. 20 The manuscript . . . MS A: *revise to* MS A, one of only two manuscripts which actually contain this title.

p. 24 the only manuscript. . .is: *revise to* this manuscript is.

p. 29 *MS M should be added to the* beta *group; and the remarks in the pages above must, of course, be taken as modifying many statements in this section of the introduction.*

p. 35 *add at bottom of page* Laurioux, Bruno, 'Spices in the medieval diet: A new approach,' *Food and Foodways*, 1 (1983), 43–76.

p. 36 Wright. . .1957: *change* 1957 *to* 1857. 'A Baghdad. . .21–4: *change* 4 *to* 47.

p. 37 Grewe: *correct* Rudolph *to* Rudolf; *add before Napier* Mulon, Marianne, ed. 'Deux traités inédits d'art culinaire médiéval', *Bulletin Philologique et Historique*, 1971 (for 1968), 369–435.

p. 38 [Taillevent.] . . .: *change* George *to* Georges; *add* repr. Luzarches, n.d.

p. 47 n. 16, paschel: *change to* pasches.

pp. 93–7 *add to MS Sources* M *for all the following:* 3–73, 76–93, 95–128, 130–47, 149–56, 158, 160–64, 166–93, 197–203.

p. 98 n. 3.2: *add* a nost] *om.* M.
n. 5.3. .A: *add* M. 4 . . .A: *add* M.

p. 99 n. 7.5. . .A: *add* same M.
n. 9.2. . .P: *add*: gode broth *om.* M. 3 . . .CJ: *add* þey] hit M.

p. 100 n.11.4. . .CJW: add M.
n.13.1. . .A: *add* M; . . .slype A: *add* , *add* M; 3. . .P: *add* , *add* him M; 7. . .pigges A: *add* M.
n.14.3. . .grynde A: *add* M.
n.15.1. . .beest A: *add* M.

p. 101 n.16.2: *add* , morsels M.

p. 103 n. 25.8: *add* M.

p. 105 n. 6 þat^2. . . BCW: *add* M.

p. 108 n. 46.6 be]. . . B: *add* , *add* not *canc.* M.

p. 109 n. 51.7: *add before present note* in] in in M.
n. 54.2: *add* ; in] and BM.
p. 110 n. 55.3. . . B,: *add* dyas *above* dress M.
n. 60.2: *add* ; rede] gode M.
p. 112 n. 64.4. . . B: *add* M.
p. 114 n. 72.2: *add* M.
n. 73.1. . .H: *add* chiches] *om.* M.
p. 115 n. 79: *add* 3 þerto] *om.* M.
p. 116 n. 80.3: *add before present note:* and salt] *om.* M.
p. 117 n. 86.5: *add* ; flour] poudre M; 8 *add* M.
p. 119 n. 95.3: *add* M.
n. 100.1. . .B: *add* M.
p. 120 n. 101.2: *add* , lu M.
p. 123 n. 114.7: *add* M.
p. 126 n. 123.5: *add* M.
p. 127 n. 3. . .*om.* P: *add* M.
p. 128 n. 134: *add* 3–4 and salt . . .forth] *om.* M.
p. 131 n. 149.3. . .salt B: *add* M.
p. 132 n. 153.2–3: *add* M.
p. 133 n. 161.3. . . *om.* AB: *add* M.
p. 134 n. 161.7 . . . AB: *add* M.
n. 162.1 . . . HCJ: *add* ; it] *add* al M.
p. 135 n. 166.1: *add* ; thik] pyke BM.
n. 169: *add* 1 sawge] same M; 2. . .B: *add* M.
p. 136 n. 170.2. . .B; *add* of . . .wyte] *om.* M.
p. 138 n. 180.2: *add* M.
n. 181.1 . . . AB: *add* M.
p. 139 n. 182.7. . .ȝerne B: *add* M.
n. 184.1. . .AB: *add* M.
p. 140 n. 184.6: *add* M.
p. 144 n. 200: *add* 4 soden] *om.* B; 7 *add* , mong M.
n. 202.6: *add* M.
n. 203.1: *add* M.
p. 157 *add before Cotton Titus D xx:* Add. 18165; *correct* Douce 88 *to* Douce 55.
p. 159 *add between B and H*: M Manchester, John Rylands University Library English 7, fos. 4–90. Table of contents. Recipes are numbered in the manuscript. All recipes are included in our collection.
pp. 160–5 An *M* column should come between A and B, with numbers exactly as in B (numbers up to 17, missing in B, are as in A) through 193; for 194, BM 184; M's fragment should be listed as 184*. M is missing other recipes up to 197, which should appear in the M column as *185. 198–203 should be numbered 186–91.
p. 174 *add new entry before bryddys*: Bry *n.* Brie cheese IV 174. Brie cheese was already considered a delicacy in early 14th-century England, as we may see in the fact that Queen Isabella, wife of Edward II, sent a special gift to one of her ladies of wild boar meat and Brie cheese in January, 1312; see *The Household Book of Queen Isabella of England*, ed. F.D. Blackley and G. Hermansen (Edmonton: University of Alberta Press, 1971), pp. 132–3; *sub* BRUET DE ALEMAYNE I 15,: *add* II 31; II 22: *change to* III 22.
p. 176 *sub* cawdel: *add after* 'fire': (or it may refer to a hot iron used to heat the wine).
p. 177 *sub* CHEBOLACE: *change* The TC *to* The A TC.
pp. 181–2 *sub* CRAYTOUN: *change* but *to* while *and* dishes. *to* dishes, but lard is called for in at least one of the three Latin recipes for *gratonea* printed by Mulon; see pp. 402, 411, 428.

p. 185 *sub* EMELES: *change* seems to indicate *to* may suggest; *change* that 'Cyvele'. . .113. *to* it more probably means 'almonds': see Grewe, p. 237, *sub ametlla*.

p. 188 *sub* flour of canel: *add before IV*, but it may mean cassia buds, a more expensive spice: see Laurioux, p. 53.

p. 190 FRUMENTY. . .IV 70,: *add* porpeys IV 119.

p. 200 *sub* MAUMENEE: *add after* 139 , and cf. Mulon, p. 429, and Laurioux, p. 69.

p. 202 *sub* MYNCELEEK: *change* The inexplicable. . .recipes). *to*: In origin, a French dish called 'Mistembec,' i.e., *mis en bec* 'put in a funnel' (see Mulon, p. 377); *sub* mosserouns: *correct* I 53 *to I* 55.

p. 210 *sub* reysouns. . .*of coronse add before* II: (dried miniature raisins).

p. 215 *sub* SOBRE SAWSE: *add* , which bears little resemblance to a Latin meat sauce called 'Sobra' but may be a fast-day version; see Mulon, p. 395.

p. 219 *sub* TEST DE TURT: *change* Tourt *to* Tourk; *add at end* The dish appears to be a version of the Arabic *taratir at-turkman* 'Turkeman bonnets'; see Rodinson, p. 139, and Laurioux, p. 69.