MARY HARRISON'S BOOK OF RECIPES. WOMEN AND HOUSEHOLD MEDICINE IN LATE 17TH CENTURY*

Isabel de la Cruz Cabanillas
Universidad de Alcalá

Abstract

The present article traces the history of manuscript production and transmission of medical knowledge practised in the household environment. To this end, a hitherto unexplored compilation of medical recipes by Mary Harrison in Glasgow University Library Manuscript Ferguson 61 was scrutinised. Her manuscript illustrates how early modern women's medical writing was produced and circulated at the time it was written. The recipe compilation is to be seen as a dynamic artefact which expands with time. Likewise, the language and the structure of the medical recipes in her manuscript are explored in context to trace their development since Middle English times as a way to evidence similarities and variations with older and contemporary compilations.

Keywords: Women's writing, recipe books, Early Modern English Medicine, Mary Harrison, MS Ferguson 61.

Resumen

El presente artículo indaga sobre la historia de la producción manuscrita y la transmisión del conocimiento médico en el entorno doméstico. Con este fin, se examina una colección de recetas médicas inexploradas escritas por MaryHarrison y conservadas en la Biblioteca de la Universidad de Glasgow en el Manuscrito Ferguson 61. Su manuscrito ilustra cómo se producía la escritura médica de las mujeres del periodo moderno temprano, así como la circulación de los textos manuscritos en el momento en que se escribieron. La recopilación de recetas debe entenderse como un objeto dinámico que se va expandiendo con el tiempo. Del mismo modo, el lenguaje y la estructura de la colección de recetas médicas se examinan en contexto para estudiar su evolución desde el periodo del inglés medio con el fin de poner de manifiesto semejanzas y divergencias con recopilaciones anteriores, así como con otras contemporáneas.

Palabras clave: Escritura de mujeres, libros de recetas, Medicina en inglés moderno temprano, Mary Harrison, MS Ferguson 61.

Revista Canaria de Estudios Ingleses, 72; April 2016, pp. 79-95; ISSN: 0211-5913

1. WOMEN MANUSCRIPT CULTURE IN EARLY MODERN ENGLAND

The present study discusses the context in which a hitherto unexplored compilation of recipes in Glasgow University Library Manuscript Ferguson 61 was written. It also investigates the structure and linguistic features of the recipes to trace their development by checking continuities and patterns of variation. Glasgow University Library Manuscript Ferguson 61 is from an unspecified date in the seventeenth century. The text is written in English, on paper, in several hands. It measures 20 cm × 16 cm and contains 188 pages, some of which are blank (pages 135 to 169).

Little is known about its owner, but Mary Harrison wrote on a fly-leaf: "Mary Harrison her Book 1692". It is a book of recipes, chiefly medical, but some cooking recipes and other household recipes can also be found. An earlier hand than that of Mary Harrison numbered pages 1 to 40 and wrote the recipes on pages 1 to 39. Mary Harrison wrote the majority of the other recipes, numbering all the recipes from 1 to 330 and providing an index on pages 170 to 175 for recipes numbered 1 to 277. Regarding the date of writing, the date 1699 is given with a recipe for the plague on page 55. The *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* provides four entries for Mary Harrison, none of which agrees with the dates attested in the manuscript.[1]

There are also names of people from whom recipes have been gathered. They include Mr Mathias (recipe number 12), Lady Palgrave (number 21), Lady Lake (number 34), Madam Harrvey (number 112), Lady van de Ants (number 130), Lady Levet (number 139), Mr Knowles (numbers 164, 258), Dr Coxe (numbers 169, 170), Lady van de Ants (number 230), Goodman Dykes (number 231), Lady Sharlowe (number 232), Mrs Atleye (number 256), Dr West (number 316), Mrs Shervill (number 317), Mr Sumers Limner (number 318), Mrs Napps (number 319) and Goody Wesbrook (number 328). Other names appearing in the collection are Mrs Greenhill (page 59) and Nancy East (page 130).

Some references are too vague, such as those to Mr Knowles or Dr Coxe. According to the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, there is a Knowles, Gilbert (1667–1734), Roman Catholic priest and botanist, but it is difficult to establish a relationship with Mary Harrison. Regarding Dr Coxe,one of the references matches the dates: Coxe, Daniel (1640–1730), physician, natural philosopher, and colonial adventurer, but again no indication of acquaintance can be claimed. Likewise, several entries are found for Greenhill, but there is no way to know whose relation Mrs Greenhill is, if any of the following: Greenhill, Henry (1646–1708) and his brother Greenhill, John (1644?–1676), portrait painter;Greenhill, Thomas (*fl.* 1698–1732),

* This work was made possible by a *Salvador de Madariaga* Mobility Grant for Senior Researchers, awarded by the Spanish Ministry of Education and Culture (Ref. PR2015-00248).

[1] The *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, although quite comprehensive, mainly includes the names of well-known public figures. Thus, only if Mary Harrison or her family were prominent in public life are expected to appear in the dictionary.

surgeon and author and Greenhill, William (1597/8–1671), independent minister about whom the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* states "It is not known whether Greenhill ever married", making it unverifiable whether there was a Mrs Greenhill. No information about the other people mentioned can be retrieved from the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Thus, the only data available to date the text is that provided by its author, Mary Harrison, who dates it at the end of the seventeenth century. The analysis of the language in the text is also consistent with that period of time, as will be seen below.

When readers come across such a text, some questions may come up to their minds: Who was Mary Harrison? Why did she write the book? Who was the book aimed at? Why medical recipes? Was the book for private use? These are some of the questions that may arise when first encountered with such a text.

The question about Mary Harrison's identity has already been addressed. She was probably a wealthy woman near the top of the social scale, taking the fact that she could not only read but also write, given that just women of a certain status would be able to do it. At the time, women were often educated within the family context, but only when the family's socio-economic situation permitted. According to Gibson ("Renaissance Women's Manuscripts"), unlike reading, "writing tended to be a skill taught to better-off women (often by private writing masters); partly it's because the manuscripts that have survived have tended to do so because they were part of collections belonging to families prominent in public life".

Why did she write the book? It was common for women to write information on notebooks that could be later on bound into books, especially connected with the running of a household. If it was an account book, it would be shared with her husband. Involvement in the planning and cooking of meals may lead women to write down recipes and not just cooking recipes, but also recipes for medicine. This kind of books, where practical information is included, could be a way of gathering their knowledge on the topic to pass it down to their daughters or maybe it was from Mary Harrison's mother from whom she inherited the book and that would explain why a previous hand wrote and numbered the pages before Mary Harrison did. Hunter (2002: 514) states that the writing of such books was common practice. Therefore, the book could be a gift from mother to daughter, but would also be shown to guests, allowing them to copy some recipes and also obtaining some others from them. It is a fact that several people contributed to Mary Harrison's volume, as evidenced by the different hands that can be identified. Thus, in one of the recipes it states: "Mr Sumers Limner told me this when hedrawed spouses Mo: Clerkes & mine". This is the only place where a male voice can be heard.

If we judge Mary Harrison from our 21st century perspective, she cannot be considered a scientist, but she was a medical practitioner. Until the foundation of the Royal Society (1660) and specifically the Royal Society of Medicine (1805), there was lack of institutionalization of science. Most women's scientific writings were of an instructional nature. She does not write a treatise explaining her motivation, or defending the role of women in the house and in the practice of medicine, but surely she may have discussed some of the remedies with her friends and acquaintances and have recorded those that were particularly useful.

Who was the book aimed at? Taavitsainen (2009, 194) claims "texts from one genre, such as recipes, can occur in several traditions" and considers recipes to be written for heterogeneous audiences. She adds that they are self-contained and not dependent on the adjacent recipes. Thus, "recipes are found in multiple contexts, both on their own and embedded within a wide range of texts" (2009, 196). Women, like Mary Harrison, would have gathered all this information from different sources to put it together in a practical household book containing instructions on how to look after their family members and servants, but also other members in the household, domestic animals, as well as other household related issues. This could be passed down from mother to daughters or daughters-in-law, but would also be shared with servants, and probably also shown to visiting friends and relatives, maybe lending it out for copying or even allowing some of these friends and relatives to write on it. It follows from this that texts in seventeenth-century manuscripts were not just for private use but were passed around and copied. Therefore, the recipe collection is not merely a repository, but an active, dynamic compilation that would create new texts. In the same way it could be the origin of other texts, the manuscript could be erased, expunged and altered, as Jones claims (36). Short additions to a given recipe are by no means unusual. Often the author inserts a sentence in the middle or at the end of a recipe to specify a relevant aspect of the preparation phase or the qualities of the ingredients. According to Jones, this fluidity as documents may have led to "their being ignored or downplayed" (36), but "they constitute our primary source for understanding the gathering, circulation and dissemination of medical information among lay people in early modern England" (36).

Why medical recipes? Throughout the seventeenth century the quantity of material written by women is more substantial than before, "ranging from compiled recipes, remedies, and advice of various kinds, as a reflection of their role in running what were often large and complex households" (Salzman). According to Johns, "the ability to treat ailments was also a recommended duty for housewives" (284). Among the responsibilities of the early modern English housewife was the care of her family and household (Hunter 1997, 99), so a book like this surely proved valuable in treating diverse disorders which could affect household members. Leong and Pennell consider "the primary arena for medical treatment in the premodern era was the household"(134) and so did Taavitsainen *et al*. (2011, 20). Therefore, the domestic treatment was used to cure or alleviate conditions before the intervention of any external practitioner. Only when this failed or in cases of extreme situations, commercial paid medical practice was resorted to. Additionally, the duty of a good housewife was not only to care for her family and servants but, as Christians, women also had to help the sick in the locality (Leong 147; Leong and Pennell 135). Thus, Mary Harrison may have practised medicine as part of her charity activity as well. Hunter records a well attested history of health-care work carried out by wealthy aristocratic women, largely in the context of country estates or semi-rural areas (1997, 100).

We now know that manuscript circulation was wider and more public than usually viewed and manuscripts were by no means considered inferior to printed books. Hunter assures us that "many manuscripts written by women in the form of

diaries, novellas, verse, household receipts, as well as science and medicine, circulated among aristocratic and gentry families"(2002, 524). Leong and Pennell (138) also mention this process of dynamic circulation whereby:

> Instructions to make medicaments for all sorts of ailments and illnesses were exchanged during social visits, circulated in letters, and were recorded into bound notebooks. Sometimes they were even merely bundled together as batches of paper. The onward circulation of individually inscribed recipes and prescriptions, indeed of entire manuscripts, provided other compilers with an important source for their own collections.

In addition, if a book contained recipes from prestigious well-known people, this would add authoritative value to it legitimising its contents. The way in which women contributed to the spread of knowledge needs reappraisal. In fact, Pennell (253) contends that:

> The ways in which women read, intervened in, and communicated recipes, are certainly as important to understand in the history of early modern cultures of knowledge as the ways in which their natural philosophical contemporaries deployed such texts at the heart of their experimental revisionism.

Hunter remarks that for aristocratic women there was no need to have their books published because "ladies of their status didn't need the receipts: they could afford to buy in the services of physicians, surgeons and apothecaries; they had servants to prepare household goods" (1997, 100). Nonetheless, even if their recipe manuscripts were not published they wrote them down for several reasons (1997, 102-103):

> Aristocratic ladies would have had, therefore, a number of reasons to practise, to write down and discuss receipts and remedies. It passed the time and was a social medium for exchange, a leisure activity. Medicinal and household science is still necessary in terms of country life, both for the women themselves and the community on their estates. Possibly, the responsibility of aristocratic ladies of the sixteenth century for these practices led to emulation of them by the new courtiers and gentry. For some, the responsibilities were part of a devotional exercise in serving the community. In any event, such work allowed women to function in public in the restricted sense of going out to perform a public service; and in doing so offered them a rare opportunity to leave the private sphere of the house.

Regardless of women's motivations, their role in domestic medicine is undeniable. In fact, some scholars also felt the need to revise early modern women's contributions by spearheading the construction of databases of women's manuscript texts, like the *Perdita Project*, which will allow researchers to tell the stories of women, like Mary Harrison, who would have remained in oblivion otherwise.

2. THE RECIPE COLLECTION

The manuscript contains about 330 recipes, although erroneously the author skips numbers 280 to 289 passing from 279 to 290. Likewise, sometimes a number can be repeated, as at the end of the text where 329 is written in ink and then, two other recipes have been added in a different ink. The last two recipes are numbered in pencil as number 329, again, and 330. The recipes in the manuscript are chiefly medical, but recipes for cattle (numbers 223, 231, 254, 260), poultry (numbers 291, 293, 301), calves (number 294), horses (number 180) and pigeons (number 106) are also included. There are also household recipes; for instance, number 279,"Stuff to rub mens shoos & bouts with to prevent soking in water" and number 318,"To clean pictuers when durty". Even if a small number of recipes can be regarded as cooking recipes at first sight, such as numbers 10 and 16 for broths and number 13 for "Pepper Cakes", there is often a therapeutic purpose. In the case of the broth in number 10, it is recommended for strengthening and the recipe for "Pepper Cakes" is followed by a section which specifies "The uses of it", where the cakes are claimed to be good for digestion, as well as for the brain and to restore your memory.

The recipes in MS Ferguson 61 are grouped thematically, inasmuch as the remedies for a specific disease tend to be gathered together. Nonetheless, the organisation does not follow the *de capite ad pedem* order, as the same disease is referred to on different pages. For instance, the compendium begins with a remedy to "knitte a vaineyᵗcauseth one to spit Bloud" and "For Pising A Bed" follows, while later on the reader can find remedies for headache, rheumatism and several other diseases. This confirms the idea present in Taavitsainen, whereby the classical structure from head to toe "applies to a limited extent only, and recipe collections are more heterogeneous than has been anticipated" (2001a,106).

The author included an index at the end of the manuscript to find her way through the compilation, especially due to the fact that the first pages were not written by her. The contents coincide with those included in other contemporary recipe collections, such as remedies for cuts, bruises, burns, colds, coughs, digestive disorders and headache (Leong and Pennell 135). The manuscript may have been subject to expungement and erasure. In fact, after number 200, the index includes the following:

201) Syrup of Mallows
202) a Cauld Head
203) for the Ague
201) for the Scuruy
202) For A Consumption
203) A fine Cordial

The first three recipes numbered 201, 202 and 203 are not present in the collection. They may have been originally there and the page containing them was later removed. Another curiosity is the fact that page 9 is numbered 9 on the recto side and on the verso side as well, which implies from number 10 onwards the pages

on the right side of the book contain the even numbers, while the odd numbers are on the left side pages of the volume. Some other inconsistencies of this kind are found, as when a recipe is not numbered. This is the case of a short recipe between numbers 310 and 311 entitled "To stop Bleeding of a Wound". Indeed, this could be a draft copy, what some scholars term "waste book", given that not much planning seems to have been done before starting writing it. Besides, pages 135 to 169 inclusive are blank, as if the compilation was to be continued.

Although several new medical theories appeared in the last decades of the seventeenth century (Wear 1989; 1992), they did not "produce better cures than the old Galenic ones" (1992, 121). The therapeutic procedures were similar to those used in the Middle Ages. In fact, humoral theory with hot and cold elements, the medical prevailing system in the Middle Ages (Taavitsainen 2006), is still very popular in this period, as attested by Mikkeli and Marttilla (14) and Taavitsainen (2011). Thus, recipes for cold and hot humours are found in Mary Harrison's book (number 219 for a cold humour and numbers 69 and 322 for a hot humour). Following Hippocrates, there are four basic elements (fire,water, air and earth) and four qualities (hot, cold, wet, and dry). This is connected to the four bodily fluids (blood, phlegm, yellow bile and black bile). In addition, there was a correlation between the prevailing fluid or humour in an individual and the temper he or she had. Thus, the abundance of black bile made a person melancholic. On the contrary, if the dominant humour was phlegm, the person was phlegmatic, sanguine if there was too much blood and choleric if his or her body contained too much yellow bile.

Diseases were the result of imbalance of humours. Thus, medicine in medieval and early modern English times was considered a technique or method of restoring health through the recovery of the lost balance. The different ways of solving the imbalance were by blood-letting, using leeches, or by means of a specific diet which helps to excrete the superfluous fluid, among others. This explains why herbs are included in medical treatises, as the ingestion of some of these herbs made people healthy. There are general remedies that are good for any kind of disorder, while others are quite specific. Ingredients, usually herbs, were considered to have some qualities and classified according to their temperature and moistness.

2.1. Structure of the recipes

In order to analyse the structure of the recipes and their linguistic features, samples from the recipe collection in Mary Harrison's book have been selected. The author's spelling conventions have been fully respected throughout the transcription. We will see that the structure of the recipe has evolved very little since Middle English times. As described by previous scholars (Alonso-Almeida 1998-1999; Eggins 68; Taavitsainen 2001a, 86; Mäkinen160, among others), the structure of recipes tends to follow the general pattern:

1. Title or medical purpose
2. Ingredients

3. Preparation
4. Application
5. Efficacy Phrase

2.1.1. *The title*

The title indicates what the remedy is for. The most usual title found in MS Ferguson 61 is *for* followed by a noun, a part of the body, as in *for ye hands*, an *-ing* form as in *for bleeding* or, usually the name of the disease, as in *for the Cholick* or *For the Stone.* An infinitive phrase as title is also found, as in *To stop Bleeding of a Wound* or *To Make Marygold Water*. Just on two occasions the title appears as *A remedy for* (numbers 3 and 313). In four recipes the title is not present, as the remedy is a continuation of the previous one beginning with *for the same* (numbers 41, 132, 248 and 259). The formula *an other* in the title is attested in several instances, as well (e. g. recipes number 53, 80, 265, 204 and 271).

A typical example of a recipe in MS Ferguson 61 can be seen in recipe number 326:

(1)for a sore mouth
put in-to an Egg shull honey and a bitt
of Allam as big as a small nut beat
to powder, set it to stew in Embers stirring
it all y^{e} while, annoynt the mouth
there wth offten

REVISTA CANARIA DE ESTUDIOS INGLESES, 72; 2016, PP. 79-95

2.1.2. *Ingredients*

As can be seen in the example above, the solution to the problem is offered after the title, providing the ingredients, which are usually plants, combined with the juice of fruits or other liquids, such as wine, vinegar or water which are needed to prepare the recipe. As in example (1), sugar or honey may be added as well. On some occasions, material from animals is used, especially grease or lard. Sometimes ingredients appear in a list without specifying the quantity to be used (number 185 "balme, spermint, worm wode, & barduns"), whereas some other times a vague specification by means of a quantifier as "a little powder of a roch allem" is used or by comparing the size with a well-known ingredient "as big as a nut." Often one or two spoonfuls are recommended, as in number 329, "2 spoonfullsof Blue Courrants", but in the specification of the ingredients some special weights and measures can be used. The old system of Troy weights is still in use in this period, as pounds, ounces and drachms are employed. The system of Troy weights is referred to in Getz (xxxviii):

> This consists of pounds, ounces, drachms, scruples, and grains (1 pound = 12 ounces; 1 ounce = 8 drachms; 1 drachm = 3 scruples; 1 scruple = 20 grains; 5,760 grains = 1 pound).

For liquids, pints are usually mentioned, as in "Take halfe a pint of the oyle of olive" (number 69) as well as quarts, as in "put these into 5 quarts of water". Nonetheless, lack of explicitness and absence of proper quantifications are the rule, as noted by Görlach (1992, 130), even if his statement was meant for cooking recipes, it can also be applied to medical recipes, as Getz notes (xxxviii). Examples of less specific measures, such as "as much as will" (numbers 108 and 328, for instance), are also recorded.

2.1.3. *Preparation*

The preparation section provides instructions in relation to the combination of ingredients. In the preparation phase, specific culinary verbs and other non-specific verbs are often found. Thus, among the culinary verbs *boil*, *beat* and *pound* are recorded with various frequencies. Among the non-culinary verbs the most usual verb is *take*, but others like *mix*, *bruise* and *turn* appear as well.

In the technical aspect one also learns about the different utensils that were used at the time when cooking. Thus, apart from dishes, glasses, plates, pots and pans, other containers, such as *mortars* or *limbecks*, are mentioned.

Other specialised technical terms refer to medicine. Obviously medical compounds are also quite technical. Most of them are decoctions which involved the boiling of the herb in water so as to extract the substance, but often plasters, where a cloth is anointed with a concoction, are used; likewise, oxymels with honey and vinegar and ointments and powders are frequently employed. All these "topical drugs" are commonly used as therapeutic treatment for burns, warts and canker, among others. On the contrary, the "internal drugs", which comprise suppositories, electuaries, laxatives and purgatives constitute therapeutic solutions for eyes, swelling, worms, dropsy, head ache and other diseases (Alonso-Almeida 2014, 36).

2.1.4. *Application*

This section presents a less well-defined organisation of information. It describes how the remedy is to be used. It often includes its use, dosage and duration. The expression of duration is omitted when the effects of the medicines are immediate; otherwise it is indicated by means of days and nights or the times the procedure is to be repeated, as in "clenese y^{e} childs mouth wth it twice or 3times a day"(number 329a), "take3 days and rest 3 days" (number 329b). Often it also specifies the time of the day when it must be applied. If this is present, the most frequently mentioned periods are mornings and nights, as in "20 drops on suger night & morning" (number 324).

2.1.5. *Efficacy Phrase*

A further element that is optional in the structure of recipes is the efficacy phrase or evaluation of the treatment. This final phrase offers a validation for the proposed remedy. Very often this is present in medieval recipes either by means of a future tense or with the general formula *he will be healed* or in Latin *sanabitur*. It can also be present in Early Modern English medical recipes as set phrases or by means of free formulation (Mäkinen). A usual set phrase is "proved by me" or *probatum est* (Jones 36). In Mary Harrison's collection, the efficacy phrase is not usually present at the end of the recipe, although it does sometimes appear, as in recipe number 329 for a child's sore mouth where the efficacy is evidenced by the final verb phrase that specifies the nature of the ailment: "it will wath the mouth". Occasionally, the effect is introduced within the text or, as in recipe number 13, after it with a heading that specifies "The uses of it":[2]

(2)This Decoction is good to eatte allwayes beefoore and
after meatte for it will cause disgestion and turne
your meatte to pure bloud beesides this isdooth expell
all windinesse and all groose humors cold and Raw
that are in the belly or stoomake it will Dissolve
them without paine and keepe vapers from the braine
and restoowe your memory, tho Lost beefore

To sum up, in this section we have examined the structure of the recipe in Mary Harrison's book, which may be represented following Eggins (40) in a linear diagram:

Title ^ Ingredients ^ (Quantities) ^ Preparation ^ (Application) ^ (Efficacy), where ^ indicates fixed order and () optional stage.

2.2. Linguistic features

In terms of the linguistic characteristics of recipes, Görlach ("Text-types and Language History" 746 and "Text Types and the History of English", 125) lists eight grammatical features examined to define the text types:[3] the form of the head-

[2] This stage, where the qualities of a particular product are mentioned, is labelled as *virtues* by Alonso-Almeida (2013). Unlike Alonso-Almeida's corpus where this stage is recurrent, in Mary Harrison's book is exceptional.

[3] The concepts of genre and text type have been used indistinctively by different scholars so that a recipe is often labelled as a genre and as text type. For this reason several authors have tried to distinguish them according to specific criteria (e.g. Görlach 1992 & 2004; Taavitsainen 2001a & 2001b; Alonso-Almeida 2008, among others). Alonso-Almeida establishes the difference between the two claiming that "genre is differentiated from text type in the sense that genre is externally defined, whereas text type is characterized according to internal linguistic criteria" (2008, 10).

ings, sentence length, the use of imperative or other verbal forms, use of possessive pronouns with nouns referring to ingredients and implements, deletion of objects, the temporal sequenceand possible adverbs used, sentence complexity, marked use of loan words and of genteel diction. We have already dealt with some of these features when referring to the structure of the recipe, so now other linguistic characteristics, which have not been covered above, will be mentioned.

2.2.1. *Use of verbal forms and possessive pronouns*

In the ingredients and preparation sections, the opening element is often a verb in the imperative form, such as *take*, *mix*, *put*or *turn*, followed by a number of noun phrases or other verbal forms connected by *and*. In the preparation phase other verbs in imperative are also found, such as *bruise* or *smash*. Some other significant verbal structures are introduced by *let*, which in late Middle English recipes present a coercive meaning and is considered to be similar to an auxiliary verb in Present Day English (Alonso-Almeida 2014, 44). The syntactical pattern of these verbs is summarized in as *let* + object + infinitive, as seen in the following instances:

(3) then let it bee cold a little (number 13)
(4a) let these bee beaten into A fine pouder [...]
(4b) let it boyle a little [...]
(4c) let two take it out (number 69)
(5) let it coul (number 327)

In recipes the addressee is usually a second person singular, so it is also common to see the use of possessive pronouns with ingredients, implements or to refer to the part of the body to which the remedy must be applied. Thus, recipe number 13, where how to prepare pepper cakes is explained, is addressed to a second person singular and the possessive *your* in an abbreviated form is used:

(6) beate y^{r} long pepper time ginger annyseedes
and licerish into fine pouder and search them
through A peere of Laird and bruse y^{r} other pepper

Görlach mentions that the use of possessive pronouns with ingredients is not frequent, while the alternation of the article, either definite or indefinite, is common (1992, 749). In recipe 69 we find the alternation of both procedures "put them into

Likewise, Taavitsainen states that "Recipes are a well-defined procedural genre with a clear writing purpose.They give instructions on how to prepare medicine, a dish, or some household utility like ink" (2001a, 86). In turn, Görlach characterises the recipes according to some specific linguistic criteria, and subsequently refers to *recipes* as a text type (2004 & 1992). Thus, when referring to these linguistic characteristics, Görlach's denomination is used.

the oyle and set it upon A temperatt fire and when you have boyled it moore halfe an hour ad to it one ounce of y^{r} oyle".

2.2.2. *The temporal sequence*

Very often the process must be carried out following specific steps in a given order, so there is a temporal structure marking what must be done first, as in the example below with *first*. Some other times the writer uses linking particles, such as*and*, *before*, *till*, *when* and *then*, and *after*. In recipe 153, several of these linking particles are used:

(7) Dissolve it first in Cold Balm Water and then mixe alltogether
when you drinke itt sweeten it wth sugar

When the conjunction *and* is employed, it often has a temporal meaning similar to *then* (Taavitsainen, "Middle English Recipes" 98; Alonso-Almeida,"A Middle English Medical Remedy" 45), rather than implying the simultaneity of actions, as in recipe number 69:

(8) put them into the oyle and set it upon A
temperatte fire and when you have boyled it neere
halfe an houre ad to it one ounce of y^{r} oyle off it er if
the soare bee inflamed or impostumd other wife Leave
out the oyle and let it boyle a little space after that
oyle is in then take it of from the fire and put into
it one quorter of an ell of three quorter Cloth

2.2.3. *Use of specialised terminology*

The lexicon of MS Ferguson 61 does not differ from the lexicon in other remedy books of the period, as can be seen in the number of Latin and French terms in the collection. The presence of these words suggests that the background is of a continental origin.

In terms of denominations for medical conditions and disorders, according to their etymology in the *Oxford English Dictionary* (OED), the terms can be grouped as coming from:

1) Latin or French with various degrees of anglicisation: *gout* < OF. *goute*; *dropsy*, shortened form of *idropesie* < OF. *idro-*, *ydropisie*; *palsey* < OF. *paralisie*, *-lysie*; *consumption*, partly from French *consumpcion* and partly from Latin *consumptiōn-*, *consumptiō*.
2) Latin via Old English: *feuer* < OE *fefer*, *feofor* from L. *febris*;*canker* < OE *cancer*, L. *cancer*.
3) Old English: *ache*, *burn,cough,web*, *wart*.

REVISTA CANARIA DE ESTUDIOS INGLESES, 72; 2016, PP. 79-95

As can be seen, the majority of the names of diseases in MS Ferguson 61 are of French and Latin origin, but there are other sources as seen in the examples above.Likewise, other areas of meaning on which Latin and French exerted a great influence are medicinal ingredients and compounds. Thus, the following items are from French or Latin:

Medicinal products: *lard* < OF. *lard*; *oyle* < ONF.*olie*, OF. 12th c. *oile*, *oille*; *suger*< OF. çucre; *vinegar* < OF. *vyn egre*; *wine* < L. *vinum*. Although this item was already present in OE, it is mentioned as one of those terms that Germanic tribes brought with them from the Continent when they settled in Britain.

Plant names which are given in an anglicised form: *betayne* < F. *bétoine*, ad. late L. **betonia*; *centorye* < L. *centaurium; cinnamon* <French *cinnamome*, also in 16th cent. *cinamonde* < Latin *cinnamōmum*; *clove* <Middle English *clow(e* < French *clou*, Latin *clāvus*; *coriander* < French *coriandre* < Latin *coriandrum*; *egremony* < OF. and L. *agrimōnia*; *peese* < L. *Pisum* (*sativum*); *rosemary*, apparently a folk-etymological alteration of *rosmarine*, after*rose* and the female forename *Mary*; *sage* < Middle English *sauge* < French *sauge* < Latin *salvia.*

Medicinal compounds: *glister/clyster*< French *clystère*, or Latin *clyster*; *medycyn* <Anglo-Norman and Old French, Middle French *medicine*; *ointment* < Anglo-Norman *oinement*; *plaster* < in Old English, probably < post-classical Latin *plastrum*; in later use reinforced by Anglo-Norman *plaistre*, *plastre* medical plaster (second half of the 13th cent.), Anglo-Norman and Old French *plastre*, *plaistre*, Middle French *plastre* building plaster (French *plâtre*); *powder* < Anglo-Norman *pudre*, *podre*, *poudre.*

Implements also may also have a French or Latin origin: *mortar*< In Old English < classical Latin *mortārium*; in later use probably largely re-borrowed < Anglo-Norman *mortier*, *morter* , *mortir* , *mortor* and Middle French *mortier* receptacle for pounding; *limbeck* < ME *lambyke*, aphetic formof alembic, of multiple origins. It is partly a borrowing from French *alembic* and partly a borrowing from Latin *alembicus*.

Some other terms regarding the fields mentioned above come from Old English: Ingredients such as *honey*, *wax* and *water*; plants like *barly* < OE *bærlic*; *fennel* < Old English *finugl*, *finule; wheaten* (adj.) < OE *hwæte* and implements, such as *glass* < Old English *glæs; pan* < OE *panne* and *pot* < OE *pot(e*.

2.3. Some other linguistic notes

Other language features documented in the compilation are typical traits of the period. For instance, the way in which possession is conveyed. In Early Modern English, possession could be expressed by means of an *-of phrase*, the so called *possessive dative* or by means of the *possessive case*. In Manuscript Ferguson 61 the three of them coexist. The most frequent one is the *-of phrase*, but the *possessive dative* is found in "Mary Harrison her book". Finally, when the *possessive case* is used, as in "for a childs sore mouth" (number 329), no apostrophe is present.

Likewise, some contractions are used. The most common one is *yᵉ* with superscript <e> for the definite article, but yʳ or yoʳ for *your* and yᵗ for *that* are often

found. *With* and *which* are also usually abbreviated as wth andw^{ch} , respectively. Occasionally *them* will appear as y$^{m.}$

Similarly, omissions and practitioner's argot are common, as in Pennell's opinion "the user must respond from the basis of common sense and knowledge"(238). This is particularly evidenced in the index, where many remedies appear in an abbreviated form. Abbreviations are marked by means of semicolon as in *Sy:* for "Syrup", "A str: Broth" for "A strengthening Broth", *Bol:* for "Balsam", "a fine lo:" for "a fine loung water"; "for y^{e} G: Sickness" for "For the Greene Sickness" or "for a ch: rupter" where *ch:* stands for "childs" and finally, "Syrup of B: horne Bew" for "Syrup of Buckthorne & Berries".

Spelling is by no means fixed, inasmuch as several spelling variants can be found for the same item. The spelling alternation is found in the writing of one single author, and in the preferences shown by the initial writer of recipes 1 to 102 and Mary Harrison's own index. In this way, in recipe number 9 the title reads "For the Hed Ake", while in the index the title for this recipe appears as "for the head Ack" and in other recipe as "Head ach" (number 65). Thus, spelling variants are found profusely. For instance, *syrup* is written as, *syrup*, *serurip* and *surrup*. One term that also shows variability is *ointment* that is recorded usually as *ointement*, but also as *oyntement* and *oyntment*.

3. CONCLUSIONS

Considering some of the implications of the story being told in the previous pages, several conclusions can be drawn. On the one hand, the possibility of approaching early modern women's writing from a different perspective must be considered. Early modern women's manuscript writing was not viewed at the time as less prestigious than printed books and was proven to have a wide range of projected and actual readers. Likewise, the manuscript is not a static compilation but one that interacts with the author and with many other contributors; an artefact that is capable of being constantly changed and which would be the crib for other texts.

In addition, Mary Harrison's book highlights the role played by women in the preservation of medical knowledge. Seventeenth century women have been shown to gather the relevant information in collections that were passed down from generation to generation. Women were responsible for practising medicine within their own household, but also within their localities as part of their duties as housewives and devoted Christians. The story of these women is worth being told. Mary Harrison's book is just an example of a woman practitioner, like many others, whose task bears witness to the relevance of women in the practice of medicine in the early modern period.

On the other hand, the inspection of Mary Harrison's recipes has revealed some facts; namely that the old tenets on medicine, such a humoral theory, were still in use. It has also been confirmed that the recipe structure remains unaltered showing the same constituents that were already present in medieval recipes; namely, title, ingredients, preparation, application and efficacy phrase. Nonetheless, the ef-

ficacy phrase is less frequently found in her book than in other recipe compilations of the period. Regarding the linguistic features of the recipes, the traits found in the collection demonstrate that it contains the characteristics which are mentioned by other scholars for recipes, such as prevalence of imperative forms, use of second person pronouns with ingredients and implements, sequencing of the time by means of temporal adverbials and specific terminology with a marked use of loanwords.

Finally, despite recent efforts, there is still considerable misrepresentation of early modern women's writing. Thus, some reconsideration is necessary in order to regard early modern women's writing as a body of knowledge and an object of academic scrutiny. As the *Perdita Project* is doing, academia should engage in a conscious recovery of a series of buried and neglected writers and genres, which deserve recognition, to assess their individual worth and their collective value as women authors.

Recibido: 27-1-2016
Aceptado: 28-2-2016

WORKS CITED

Alonso-Almeida, Francisco. "*Gyf hir þis medycin*: Analysing the Middle-English Recipe Medical Discourse." *Revista de Lenguas para Fines Específicos* 5-6 (1998-99): 47-81. Print.

—— "The Middle English Medical Charm: Register, Genre and Text Type Variables." *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen* 100 (2008): 27-42. Print.

—— "Genre Conventions in English Recipes, 1600-1800." *Reading and Writing Recipe Books 1550-1800*. Eds. Michelle Di Meo, and Sarah Pennell. Manchester: Manchester UP, 2013. 68-92. Print.

—— *A Middle English Medical Remedy Book from Glasgow University Library MS Hunter 185*. Middle English Texts 50. Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 2014. Print.

Eggins, Suzanne. *An Introduction to Systemic Functional Linguistics.* London: Pinter,1994. Print.

Getz, M. Faye. *Healing and Society in Medieval English. A Middle English Translation of Pharmaceutical Writings of Gilbertus Anglicus*. Wisconsin: U of Wisconsin P, 1991. Print.

Gibson, Jonathan. "Renaissance Women's Manuscripts: A Beginner's Guide." *Perdita Manuscripts, 1500-1700*. (December 17, 2015). Web. <http://www.perditamanuscripts.amdigital.co.uk.ezproxy.lib.gla.ac.uk/Introduction/Content/GibsonIntro1.aspx>.

Görlach, Manfred. "Text-Types and Language History: The Cookery Recipe."*History of Englishes. New Methods and Interpretations in Historical Linguistics*. Eds. Matti Rissanen, et al. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 1992. 736-761. Print.

—— *Text Types and the History of English*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2004. Print.

Hunter, Lynette. "Women and Domestic Medicine: Lady Experimenters, 1570-1620." *Women, Science and Medicine 1500-1700*. Ed. Lynette Hunter, and Sarah Hutton. Phoenix Mill Trupp, Gloucestershire: Sutton, 1997. 89-107. Print.

—— "Books for Daily Life: Household, Husbandry, Behaviour." *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain*. Eds. John Barnard, D. F. McKenzie, and Maureen Bell. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, vol. 4, 2002. 514-532. (December 17, 2015). Web. <http://dx.doi.org/10.107/CHOL9780521661829.026>.

Jones, Peter Murray. "Medical Literacies and Medical Culture in Early Modern England." *Medical Writing in Early Modern English*. Eds. Irma Taavitsainen, and Päivi Pahta. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2011. 30-43. Print.

Johns, Adrian. "Science and the Book." *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain*. Eds. John Barnard, D.F. McKenzi, and Maureen Bell. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, vol. 4, 2002. 274-303. (December 17, 2015). Web. <http://dx.doi.org/10. 107/CHOL9780521661829.014>.

Leong, Elaine. "Making Medicines in the Early Modern Household." *Bulletin of the History of Medicine*, 82. 1 (2008): 168. Print.

—— and Pennell, Sara. "Recipe Collections and the Currency of Medical Knowledge in the Early Modern 'Medical Marketplace'." *Medicine and the the Market in England and Its Colonies, c. 1450-c. 1850*. Eds. Mark S.R. Jenner, and Patrick Wallis. Chippenham/Eastbourne: Palgrave McMillan, 2007. 133-152. Print.

Mäkinen, Martti. "Efficacy Phrases in Early Modern English Medical Recipes."*Medical Writing in Early Modern English*. Eds. Irma Taavitsainen, and Päivi Pahta. Cambridge: Cambridge UP. 2011. 158-179. Print.

Mikkeli, Heikki and Marttila, Ville. "Change and Continuity in Early Modern Medicine (1500-1700)."*Early Modern English Medical Texts. Corpus Description and Studies.* Eds. Irma Taavitsainen, Päivi Pahta, Turo Hiltunen, Martti Mäkinen, Ville Marttila, Maura Ratia, Carla Suhr, and Jukka Tyrkkö. Amsterdam/Philadephia: John Benjamins, 2010. 13-27. Print.

Oxford Dictionary of National Biography. Oxford: Oxford UP. 2004-05. (December 17, 2015). Web. <http://www.oxforddnb.com/>

Oxford English Dictionary. Oxford: Oxford UP. (December 30, 2015). Web. <http://www.oed.com>.

Pennell, Sara. "Perfecting Practice? Women, Manuscript Recipes and Knowledge in Modern England." *Early Modern Women's Manuscript Writing*. Eds. Victoria E. Burke, and Jonathan Gibson. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004. 236-258. Print.

The Perdita Project. (December 18, 2015) Web. <http://www.perditamanuscripts.amdigital.co.uk/Default.aspx>.

Salzman, Paul. "Reading Early Modern Women's Writing." Oxford: Oxford UP, 2006/2010. (December 17, 2015). Web. <http://10.1093/acprof: oso/9780199261048.001.0001>.

Taavitsainen, Irma. "Middle English Recipes. Genre Characteristics, Text Type Features and Underlying Traditions of Writing." *Journal of Historical Pragmatics* 2. 1 (2001a): 85-113. Print.

—— "Changing Conventions of Writing: The Dynamics of Genres, Text Types, and Text Traditions." *European Journal of English Studies* 5.2 (2001b): 139-150. Print.

—— "Key Word in Context: Semantic and Pragmatic Meaning of *humour*." *The Power of Words. Essays in Lexicography, Lexicology and Semantics*. Eds. Graham D. Caie, Carole Hough, and Irene Wotherspoon. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2006. 209-219. Print.

—— "Early English Scientific Writing: New Corpora, New Approaches." *Textual Healing: Studies in Medieval English Medical, Scientific and Technical Texts*. Eds. Javier E. Diaz Vera, and Rosario Caballero. Bern: Peter Lang, 2009. 177-206. Print.

—— "Dissemination and Appropriation of Medical Knowledge: Humoral Theory in Early Modern English Medical Writing and Lay Texts." *Medical Writing in Early Modern English*. Eds. Irma Taavitsainen, Irma, and Päivi Pahta. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2011. 94-114. Print.

Taavitsainen, Irma and Pahta, Päivi, eds. *Medical Writing in Early Modern English*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2011. Print.

Taavitsainen, Irma, Pahta, Päivi, Hiltunen, Turo, Mäkinen, Martti, Marttila, Ville, Ratia, Maura, Suhr, Carla and Tyrkkö, Jukka, eds. *Early Modern English Medical Texts. Corpus Description and Studies.* Amsterdam/Philadephia: John Benjamins, 2010. Print.

Taavitsainen, Irma, Jones, Peter Murray, Pahta, Päivi, Hiltunen, Turo, Marttila, Ville, Ratia, Maura, Surh, Carla and Tyrkkö, Jukka. "Medical Texts in 1500-1700 and the Corpus of *Early Modern English Medical Texts*." *Medical Writing in Early Modern English*. Eds. Taavitsainen, Irma, and Päivi Pahta. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2011. 9-25. Print.

Wear, Andrew. "Medical Practice in Late Seventeenth and Early Eighteenth-Century England." *The Medical Revolution of the Seventeenth Century*. Eds. Roger French, and Andrew Wear. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1989. 294-320. Print.

—— "Making Sense of Health and the Environment in Early Modern England." *Medicine in Society: Historical Essays*. Ed. Andrew Wear. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1992. 119-147. Print.