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Abstract
As a semantic investigation into Anglo-Saxon medicine, this thesis investigates the ways in which the Old English language was adapted to the technical discipline of medicine, with an emphasis on semantic interference between Latin medical terminology and Old English medical terminology. The main purpose of the examination is to determine the extent to which scholarly ideas concerning the nature of the human body and the causes of disease were preserved between the Latin texts and the English texts which were translated and compiled from them. The main way in which this has been carried out is through a comparative analysis of technical vocabulary, excluding botanical terms, in medical prose texts utilising the Dictionary of Old English Web Corpus of texts, and a selection of printed editions of Latin texts which seem to have been the most likely sources of medical knowledge in Anglo-Saxon England.

As a prerequisite to this comparative methodology it has been necessary to assemble a corpus of Latin textual parallels to the single most significant Old English medical text extant, namely Bald’s Leechbook. These parallels have been presented in an appendix alongside a transcript and translation of Bald’s Leechbook.

A single question thus lies at the heart of this thesis: did Old English medical texts preserve any of the classical medical theories of late antiquity? In answering this question, a number of other significant findings have come to light. Most importantly, it is to be noted that modern scholarship is only now beginning to focus on the range of Late Antique and Byzantine medical texts available in Latin translation in the early medieval period, most notably for our present purposes Alexander of Tralles, but also Oribasius, Galen, pseudo-Galen and several Latin recensions of the works of Soranus of Ephesus, including the so-called Liber Esculapii and Liber Aurelii.

The linguistic study further demonstrates that the technical language of these texts was very well understood and closely studied in Anglo-Saxon England, the vernacular material not only providing excellent readings of abstruse Latin technical vocabulary, but also demonstrating a substantial knowledge of technical terms of Greek origin which survive in the Latin texts.
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INTRODUCTION

The following thesis is a linguistic study of the most significant Old English medical texts, with an emphasis on their debt to the Latin medical tradition from which these texts were translated. This study has been undertaken largely to assess the extent to which the medical theories of Antiquity were preserved in vernacular Anglo-Saxon sources, and how technical medical Latin vocabulary was understood and rendered in Old English.

As a linguistic study, the thesis will focus on established corpora where possible. The existence of a searchable online corpus of Old English, produced by the Dictionary of Old English project in Toronto, has been one of the main facilitators of this study. Where possible, the accuracy of the online corpus has been tested against the most modern critical editions, and against manuscript witnesses where critical editions are wanting. The group of texts defined as ‘medical’ by the Dictionary of Old English Web Corpus is discussed in detail in Chapter 2.¹

Assembling a comparable Latin corpus has been much more problematic, as there are few modern printed editions of the relevant Latin texts. It has been necessary to utilise early modern printed works as well as a small number of manuscript witnesses of the Latin materials cited, which are gathered together in an appendix, alongside a transcription and translation of the earliest extant Old English medical text, Bald’s Leechbook. It is only by assembling this text alongside its Latin analogues that an analysis of the influence of Latin on Old English medical language becomes possible. The Latin works which are likely to have been available in Anglo-Saxon England are discussed in detail in Chapter 3.

The comparative study of Old English and Latin medical vocabulary is divided into three sections, corresponding to three of the four major divisions within medicine.² These are anatomy (Chapter 4), physiology (Chapter 5) and pathology (Chapter 6), whilst therapeutics has not been touched upon. Therapeutics, or the study of materia medica, has been omitted from the current study partly because it is the one area of medical lexis which has received extensive scholarly attention in Anglo-Saxon studies, with Bierbaumer’s study of botanical terms.³ In the fields of anatomy and pathology, that is with respect to terms relating to parts of the body, and diseases of the body, only evidence from within the corpus of Old English and Latin medical prose has been considered, while the use of these terms in non-medical prose and in word-lists and glossaries has not been thoroughly

² David Langslow uses this fourfold division in his study of Latin medical terms; however, he tends to deal with anatomy and physiology as a single unit. See, for example, his index and glossary of Greek words in Latin medical texts which is organised along these lines, in Langslow, D., Medical Latin in the Roman Empire (Oxford, 2000), pp. 474–512.
investigated except where such evidence may help to determine the processes by which common terms seem to have been specialised in a medical sense.

In order to proceed with this investigation, it is fitting to sketch briefly a few of the historiographical problems which have prompted this investigation. The first major hurdle is this: the grand narrative of medical progress tells us that some ancient Greek scholars, namely Hippocrates of Kos and Galen of Pergamon, devised a system of medicine that was rational and devoid of magical and superstitious elements, and established an internally consistent system of pathology and disease aetiology, based on the idea that the body was made up of the same basic elements as the rest of the physical world.

According to this narrative, the separation of the Roman empire into East and West resulted in the deterioration of medicine to a barbaric state of superstition and ignorance in the Latin-speaking parts of Europe, due to the lack of knowledge of Greek, the language of medicine, and the West was only rescued from this state of ignorance in the twelfth century when translations of the Hippocratic and Galenic canon from Arabic made rational medicine available once more in the Latin speaking world. Vivian Nutton’s chapter of Roy Porter’s *Illustrated History of Medicine* summarizes this view, illustrating that the narrative has remained the *status quo* at least in textbooks aimed at undergraduates.4

Although this narrative may seem improbably simplistic, its legacy is still visible in late twentieth century histories of medicine. Gerhard Baader suggests that ‘if one surveys the state of medical knowledge in Late Antiquity and the early Middle Ages in Western Europe, it is deplorable.’5 Similarly pessimistic, and even more pejorative, assessments have been made of early medieval medicine, whether Anglo-Saxon or Continental, by Charles Singer, who famously described the entire Anglo-Saxon medical corpus as ‘the last stage of a process that has left no legitimate successor, a final pathological disintegration of the great system of Greek medical thought.’6

Much of the scholarship concerning Anglo-Saxon medicine in the later twentieth century has attempted to refute Singer’s dismissal by exploring the Latin roots of Anglo-Saxon medicine. Peregrine Horden, noting the often prevalent view as expressed by Baader concerning the ‘deplorable’ state of the Latin literature itself states that ‘this validation of the vernacular by reference to the Latin reads ironically in the light of what is said elsewhere about the Latin itself’.7

It is worth mentioning here that the following comparative analysis of Latin and Old English medical sources is not intended as an optimistic reassessment of Old English medical practice. On the

---

other hand, by investigating the relationships between these two technical dialects, Old English and Latin, it will, as a secondary effect, shed light on some existing assessments of the understanding of Late Antique medical theory in Anglo-Saxon England. M. L. Cameron, perhaps the most optimistic apologist for Anglo-Saxon medicine, describes the application of humoral theory in Old English texts as paying ‘lip-service’ to the Classical notion that the balance of four bodily humours governed physical health.\(^8\) In my own study (see Chapter 5 below), I analyse the terminology by which these humours are described, with markedly different conclusions.

**General Trends in Anglo-Saxon Medical History**

Modern scholarship of Anglo-Saxon medicine essentially began with T. O. Cockayne’s enormous collection of *Leechdoms* in three volumes, published by the Rolls Series between 1864 and 1866.\(^9\) This enormous collection draws together almost every extant Old English medical text, with the exception of the *Omont fragment*, discovered over a century later,\(^10\) and the Wellcome fragment.\(^11\) In addition, Cockayne includes other documents pertinent to the history of science, such as Ælfric’s *De temporibus anni*, and a selection of prognostics.

There seems to have been a hiatus of almost a century between the publication of Cockayne’s *magnum opus* and any further serious scholarship on Anglo-Saxon medicine, the exceptions being J. F. Payne’s address to the Royal College of Physicians in 1903.\(^12\) A single 1940 article by Christine Lambert followed in the optimistic vein of Payne, briefly discussing Old English disease terminology in a relatively favourable light.\(^13\) Following this, Charles Singer, a historian of Latin scientific and medical texts, turned his attention to Anglo-Saxon material. Among his works was a re-publication of Cockayne’s *Leechdoms* with a new introduction which was scathingly derisive of the quality of the material within the volumes,\(^14\) and an edition and commentary on the *Lacnunga* together with Henry Grattan.\(^15\)

In the work of Grattan and Singer, and their immediate successors, two forces can be seen to operate which shaped the historiography of Anglo-Saxon medicine for several decades afterwards. The first was Singer’s derisive tone. Not only did he describe the medicine of Anglo-Saxon times as

---

\(^13\) Lambert, C., ‘The Old English Medical Vocabulary’, *Proceedings of the Royal Society of Medicine* 33 (1940), 137–45.
\(^15\) Grattan and Singer, ed., *Lacnunga*. 
the ‘final pathological disintegration of the great system of Greek medical thought,’\(^{16}\) he also stressed the pagan Germanic aspects of the *Lacnunga* in a way that exemplified a process of ‘disintegration’ described by Eric Stanley as ‘a critical attitude which exalts whatever in the Germanic literature of the Dark Ages is primitive (that is, pagan), and belittles or even fails to understand whatever in it is civilized, learned, and cosmopolitan (that is, inspired by Christianity)’.\(^{17}\)

These attitudes were radically, but not completely, toned down in the work of Wilfrid Bonser.\(^{18}\) His work on medical lexicography is one of the areas which will be directly addressed in the thesis. His observation that ‘the diseases of the interior of the body were a complete mystery to the Anglo-Saxons’,\(^{19}\) is one of the existing assumptions which I aim to challenge in this thesis.

It is not surprising then, that much of the following scholarship on Anglo-Saxon medicine was to be a reaction against both of these aspects of Singer’s work. Charles Talbot’s seminal 1965 article was an almost immediate antidote, attempting to demonstrate the quality of the Latinity of the Old English compilation known as Bald’s *Leechbook* by demonstrating its debt to the Latin compilations known as the *Passionarius Galieni* and the *Practica Petrocelli*, concluding that ‘not only does this evidence destroy the myth of Salernitan medicine having been far and away ahead of Anglo-Saxon medical practice and theory, but it shows, contrary to all previously held views, that England was, in the ninth and tenth centuries, in no way inferior to its continental neighbours in the assimilation of classical medicine’.\(^{20}\)

The study of Old English medical texts began to accelerate from the 1970s, with Heather Stuart’s continuation of the theme of medical lexicography\(^{21}\) and Linda Voigts’s refutation of some of Singer’s derisive comments on the textual and pictorial representations of plants in the Old English *Herbal*, concluding that ‘in short, we must grant that Anglo-Saxons valued healing plants, that they valued books about healing plants, and that they dealt with both intelligently’.\(^{22}\) Voigts’s impressive output includes many subsequent works on the *Old English Herbal*,\(^{23}\) as well as a more recent incipit catalogue of Old and Middle English medical texts.\(^{24}\) After Voigts and Talbot, the study of Anglo-

---


\(^{19}\) Bonser, ‘Anglo-Saxon Medical Nomenclature’, p. 15.


\(^{24}\) The project description was published in Voigts, L. E., ‘Catalogue of Incipits of Scientific and Medical Writings in Old and Middle English’, *Manuscripta* 34 (1990), 212–13; the project itself is *Scientific and Medical Writings in Old and Middle English: An Electronic Reference*, ed. L. E. Voigts and P. D. Kurtz http://cctr1.umkc.edu/cgi-bin/search (viewed 15 December, 2010).
Saxon medicine was dominated by the impressive output of Malcolm Cameron, who published a series of articles in the journal *Anglo-Saxon England*, essentially outlining the Latin sources of Bald’s *Leechbook*, which culminated in a 1993 monograph. Interest in the subject seems to have increased greatly in the final decades of the twentieth century and the first decade of the twenty-first, with work by Maria D’Aronco, Audrey Meaney and Debby Banham all contributing to the understanding of the Latinity of Anglo-Saxon medicine, or other aspects of textual compilation, with a special emphasis on Bald’s *Leechbook*. The need for new editions of the texts first presented by Cockayne is slowly being met, though sadly Bald’s *Leechbook* is not among those to have come to press. Edward Pettit has produced an outstanding recent edition of the *Lacnunga* with extensive textual notes and source commentary and the *Old English Herbal* has been published with a parallel text of its direct Latin sources for the Early English Text Society. In addition, facsimiles of two of the most significant Old English medical manuscripts have been published by the Early English Manuscripts in Facsimile series.

As noted above, much of the scholarship regarding Anglo-Saxon medicine still attempts to defend the intellectual calibre of the subject against the spectre of Singer’s pessimistic assessments. One of the most startling ways in which this has been attempted is the scientific optimism of Cameron, who has attempted to suggest that the compound medicine prescribed in Old English texts would have been medically efficacious even by modern standards. This idea was tested, with unsurprisingly disappointing results, by Brennessel, Drout and Gravel.

---


Medical Vocabulary

Studies of medical vocabulary have largely been dominated by plant identification, starting with Bierbaumer’s *Der botanische Wortschatz des Altenglischen*. More recent work on individual plant terms has been carried out by M. L. Cameron, Carol Biggam, and Peter Kitson, whilst a more general survey of plant-name semantics has been carried out by Hans Sauer.

Work on other aspects of medical terminology tend to focus on specific disease terms, such as Cameron’s article on OE *þeor* and Liberman’s work on terms for ‘leprosy’. A more general study has been published by Juhani. James T. McIlwain has recently published on those diseases described in the *Leechbook* which he interprets as relevant to his specialization as a neurologist, whilst Lois Ayoub has briefly described the use of OE *wæta* in humoral theory.

What’s in a Word? Why a Semantic Approach

It has been suggested that Old English, and indeed early medieval Latin, medical texts were essentially literary exercises, or in the words of Wilfred Bonser, ‘sterile formulae, which could be applied without any exercise of reasoning’. Voigts argues against this view that ‘the surviving codices manifest an uncritical copying of classical texts with no real understanding and no thought to their practical use’ by suggesting that the very act of copying such a vast quantity of text is too great an economic undertaking to have been done in vain.

That act could suggest further that the textual nature of the surviving evidence is unnecessarily problematized, since the act of translating and copying a medical text is surely a practical medical activity. The question which is frequently asked at seminars by Anglo-Saxonists is

---

31 Cameron, M. L. ‘What Plant was Attorlothe (atorlaþe)?’, *Parergon* 10 (1992), 27–34.
‘were these texts used?’ My retort is that the act of creating a medical compilation or translation is an engagement with the art of medicine just as much as creating an interlinear gloss of scriptures is an act of scriptural exegesis. This point perhaps requires some elaboration, as it is only recently that Mechthild Gretsch has highlighted this aspect of the interlinear glossed Psalter manuscripts and translations of the Pastoral Care which occurred in the Benedictine reform. For Gretsch, the glossator of the Royal Psalter was ‘a man of ambitiously innovative and scholarly disposition, inasmuch as he set out to produce a fresh interlinear translation of the psalms to be accompanied by an explanatory and exegetical commentary in Latin.’

Gretsch demonstrates that the intellectual ambition of the translation projects associated with the Benedictine reform, namely the Psalter glosses and the Old English Benedictine Rule represent far more than the efforts of ‘the crude forebears of Dr Jonson’s “harmless drudge,” the lexicographer’. The intellectual nature of the glosses indicates to Gretsch that ‘the Glossator might somehow have been aiming at a more ambitious goal than the provision of an elementary understanding aid for beginners in Latin.’ The act of translation and glossing was an act of interpretation and commentary to a greater extent than it was a tool for teaching Latin.

In the following study, I will demonstrate that a number of Anglo-Saxons undertook a very serious campaign of scholarship in the interpretation and explanation of Latin medical texts, texts which were, moreover, often riddled with Greek terminology. The earliest signs of this campaign, that is, the earliest attested medical documents in Old English, date from the mid to late ninth century, whilst the production of medical books in Old English seems to have continued well past the Norman Conquest. Marginal annotations by a famously ‘tremulous’ hand indicate that at least one manuscript (Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 76) was still being used for its original medical purpose in Worcester in the thirteenth century, and the lack of Latin glosses on the Old English would further suggest that the user of this manuscript could understand its contents perfectly well. This was hardly, then, a tradition which ‘left no legitimate successor.’

Medicine is a technical discipline which deals in abstract concepts and requires a special vocabulary to discuss the minutiae of anatomical detail and the complexities of disease, far beyond the scope of quotidian language. A linguistic analysis of Old English medical texts will serve to highlight the ways in which Old English was adapted to this purpose. Since many Old English prose texts are translated from Latin, and most technical European languages are heavily influenced by both

---

43 Ibid.
44 Ibid., p. 28.
46 Grattan and Singer, ed., Lacnunga, p. 15.
Latin and Greek, it is pertinent also to investigate the influence of Latin upon this quite exclusive dialect of Old English.

**Technical Vocabulary**

This thesis is heavily influenced by David Langslow’s seminal work on Medical Latin in the Roman Empire, a text which provided both a template and an invaluable resource in this study of medical Old English.

Technical language, or technical terminology, is essentially a specific lexical set that is mutually comprehensible between a group of speakers with a common profession or occupation within a broader speech community. For our present purposes the most salient feature of technical prose discussed by Langslow is ‘absolute synonymy and total translatability’ where Langslow notes that ‘within a single text … absolute synonymy and especially total translatability can be used as a means of identifying technical terms, above all in a language that is copying the science and therefore mirroring the terminology of another language.’ This criterion is just as useful in our case, where Old English technical works are translated or adapted from Latin sources, as it is for Langslow’s study of medical Latin and its dependence on Greek sources.

In examining the parameters of technical vocabulary outlined by Heller, Langslow highlights three which are potentially useful in isolating terminology. These are:

1) the extent to which a word is generally understood in the linguistic community as a whole;
2) the extent to which a word is related to a particular or specialist or technical discipline;
3) the extent to which a word is normalized or standardized in its usage.

Langslow notes that ‘Criterion (1)… would exclude some other words which one feels a priori should be counted as part of English medical terminology [such as] abscess, recovery, tongue.’ Thus Langslow rejects criterion (1) (Heller’s *Allgemeinverständlichkeit*), but accepts criteria (2) and (3).

Viewing this in terms of the corpus of Old English vocabulary, we can then see that quotidian words such as *heafod*, ‘head’ are understood by the entire speech community, as they occur in a huge range of texts; however it will be demonstrated that they can meet criteria (2) and (3) when the word *heafod* is used only in its concrete sense to mean ‘head’ as an organ of the body, rather than its ubiquitous metaphorical sense, thus being specialised in its medical usage (meeting criterion 3), and that it is furthermore proper to the field of medicine, which must have a term to define this structure, thus meeting criterion (2).

---

47 Langslow, *Medical Latin*.
To show that a term can be understood in different ways between a technical speech community and the general populace, it is perhaps best to use an example from modern English. PDE ‘abortion’ is understood by most speakers to mean the deliberate medical act of terminating a pregnancy. In medical terminology, however, the word does not mean this at all, but refers to what most people would call a ‘miscarriage’.\(^{51}\) We should not be surprised, then, to find similar disparities between the meanings of Old English terms in medical prose and the meanings of the same terms in other genres of text.

To return to the basic components of this thesis, it will be necessary to establish three things. First, a corpus of Old English medical texts needs to be defined. Conveniently, the Dictionary of Old English classifies its online corpus by genre, allowing for selective searches which render this part of the process much easier. Secondly, we need to establish the Latin sources for as much of the Old English material as possible. Unfortunately, we are here embarking upon what K. D. Fischer has termed a terra incognita, as the transmission and re-compilation of medical texts in the early Middle Ages is a little understood phenomenon, with very few usable critical editions of the necessary sources extant.\(^{52}\) Finally, these corpora being defined, it will be possible to examine the relationship between the technical vocabulary in each.

Collation of Source Studies

While the Latin fontes of texts such as the Peri didaxeon and Herbal are well known and published, the sources of Bald’s Leechbook are not as well understood, and what is known is distributed amongst several independent studies. The following section will collate the sources of Bald’s Leechbook which have been demonstrated in existing scholarship, and point out where new sources have been discovered. The essential groundwork for the assembly of the bilingual corpus which is analysed herein was laid by a variety of great scholars including J. N. Adams, Marylin Deegan, M. L. Cameron, C. H. Talbot and Cockayne himself.

Physica Plinii

In their groundbreaking 1992 article ‘Bald’s Leechbook and the Physica Plinii,’\(^{53}\) J. N. Adams and Marilyn Deegan provide a thorough study of two separate published recensions of the Physica Plinii with parallels in Bald’s Leechbook. Their appendix to said article enabled the location of any and all parallels between these two texts. This appendix was collated against the printed text of the two

\(^{51}\) Langslow uses precisely this example in Medical Latin, p. 17.


published recensions to compile all instances where the *Physica Plinii* may have acted as a source for the *Leechbook*.

In the following table (0.1), the complete list of parallels found by Adams and Deegan has been modified to agree with the chapter sub-divisions presented in the appendices. Parallels not noted by Adams and Deegan have been named in bold type.

Table 0.1 Expanded from the Appendix to Adams and Deegan.\(^{54}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leechbook</th>
<th>PPB</th>
<th>PPFP</th>
<th>Parallel Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I.1.4</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>I.1.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.1.14–15</td>
<td>8.9–10</td>
<td>I.8.9–11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.1.16–17</td>
<td>8.16–17</td>
<td>I.8.17–18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.1.24</td>
<td>1.1, I.4</td>
<td>I.1.1, I.1.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.1.27</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>I.1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.1.28–9</td>
<td>1.26–7</td>
<td>I.1.26–7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.1.30</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>I.1.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.2.2</td>
<td>17.27</td>
<td>I.18.25</td>
<td>Herb 90.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.2.5–6</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>I.18.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.2.7</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>I.18.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.2.8–9</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>I.18.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.2.10</td>
<td>17.11</td>
<td>I.18.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.2.12</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>I.14.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.2.13</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>I.18.48</td>
<td>MEA α 3.7, β 3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.2.21</td>
<td>17.10</td>
<td>I.18.9</td>
<td>Herb 35.2, MDM 136.10(^{55})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.2.33(^{56})</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>I.15.5</td>
<td>Herb 116.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.3.4–5</td>
<td>9.7, 9.9</td>
<td>I.10.7, 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.3.8</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>I.12.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.4.5</td>
<td>48.19</td>
<td>I.50.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


\(^{55}\) Parallel suggested in Cameron, Anglo-Saxon Medicine, p. 88.

\(^{56}\) *Leechbook* I.2.2 and I.2.33 differ very little in content, recipe 33 containing goat’s gall where recipe 2 does not. Pettit suggests the *Physica Plinii* recipes and OEH as a potential parallel to chapter 13 of the *Lacnunga*, which he notes is analogous to *Leechbook* I.2.33. See his *Lacnunga* I, 8–9 and II, 11–12.
The Pseudo-Galenic Liber tertius and the Passionarius

Parallels between the Passionarius and the Leechbook were first noted by Charles Talbot. Given the renewed interest in the Passionarius in recent years, it is not surprising to find that our understanding of this text and its compilation has changed. This should not, however, denigrate Talbot’s work. To acknowledge my indebtedness to Talbot in stoking my intuitions, I have included every parallel he suggests in the appendices. I have, however, found that the Liber tertius, and occasionally the Practica Alexandri provide more convincing parallels, and it is difficult to consider the Passionarius as a source for Bald’s Leechbook, for reasons outlined in Chapter 3.

M. L. Cameron first noted the existence of parallels between the Leechbook and the Liber tertius, in many cases overlapping with those parallels noted by Talbot with the Passionarius, although he classifies the text as ‘possibly used’ rather than ‘certainly used’ in his 1983 article. Cameron identifies further parts of the Leechbook (sc. II.59) which ‘[have their] source in the Latin Liber tertius/Petrocellus,’ but does not locate said source in either text.

---

57 This includes parallels for Leechbook I.39.6–9 which are not found in the Physica Plinii.
60 Cameron, Anglo-Saxon Medicine, p. 16.
In his 1993 monograph Cameron concedes that large portions of the Leechbook are translated from the Liber tertius, but does not give any further examples. The following table represents the findings of a systematic manual comparison of Fischer’s edition of the Liber tertius with the transcript of Bald’s Leechbook, as well as those parallels noted by Talbot.

Talbot, Cameron and Banham⁶¹ have also used the Tereoperica, or Practica Petrocelli Salernitani as a potential source for the Leechbook. However all such parallels also overlap with material in the Liber tertius, the Passionarius or both, and are included here for comparison.

Table 0.2 Parallels between the Passionarius, Tereoperica, Liber tertius and the Leechbook

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leechbook</th>
<th>Pass (Talbot)⁶²</th>
<th>Ter</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>where published⁶³</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I.4.8–9⁶⁴</td>
<td>I.21</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>LT 75.1</td>
<td>Cameron 1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.4.18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>LT 76.1</td>
<td>Cameron 1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.35.1⁶⁵</td>
<td>V.34</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Ad Glaconem II.6</td>
<td>Cameron 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.35.2–3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Ad Glaconem II.6</td>
<td>Cameron 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.35.4</td>
<td>V.35</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Ad Glaconem II.7</td>
<td>Cameron 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.2.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>LT 9.2</td>
<td>new</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.2.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>LT 12.1</td>
<td>new</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.3.1–2</td>
<td>II.44</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>LT 14.1–2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.4.1</td>
<td>II.28</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>LT 18.1, 16.1–2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.5.1</td>
<td>II.28</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>LT 18.1–2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


⁶² All parallels in this column are suggested in Talbot, ‘Notes on Anglo-Saxon Medicine’.

⁶³ In tables 2.3–2.6 the abbreviation ‘Cameron 1983’ refers to his article ‘Bald’s Leechbook: Its Sources and their Use in its Compilation’, whereas ‘Cameron 1993’ refers to his book Anglo-Saxon Medicine. If ‘new’ occurs in this column it means that the present author has discovered a parallel not previously documented between a Latin source and Bald’s Leechbook.

⁶⁴ Noted by Cameron in ‘Bald’s Leechbook’, pp. 179–180 (he numbers this section 4.4).

⁶⁵ Cambridge, Peterhouse 251, 133r. ‘De cura erisipile… / …7 plus iuueris quam ledas’. Noted by Cameron in Anglo-Saxon Medicine, pp. 43–4; however, while Cameron gives a manuscript reference to the correct text, he fails to provide a transcription.
| II.6.1 | II.34 | - | LT 20.1 |
| II.7.1–2, 4 | II.49 | - | LT 22.1–2, 21.1 |
| II.9.1 | II.48 | - | LT 23.2 |
| II.16.2, 6 | II.20, | - | PAL II.22, 15 |
| II.16.4–5 | II.31 | - | - |
| II.17.2 | II.52–53, 59, | 88 | LT 36.1–38.1 |
| II.18.1–2 | II.53 | - | LT 40.1–3 |
| II.19.1–2 | II.59 | - | LT 38.1 41.1–2 |
| II.19.3 | - | - | LT 39.1–3 | new |
| II.19.4–5 | II.59 | - | LT 41.1–2 |
| II.20.1–4 | II.63 | - | LT 42.1–6 | Cameron 1983 |
| II.21.1 | II.55 | - | LT 48.1 |
| II.22.1–5 | II.58–59 | 95\(^6\) | LT 44.1–45.1 |
| II.22.6–7 | II.61 | - | LT 46.1, 7 |
| II.22.8–10 | II.61 | - | LT 47.1–4 |
| II.22.12 | - | - | LT 47.4 | new |
| II.26.1 | - | - | LT 28.1 | new |
| II.26.2–4 | - | - | LT 29.1–4 | new |
| II.31.1–4 | - | - | LT 69.1–4 | new |
| II.32.3 | - | - | LT 70.8, 70.11 |
| II.32.4 | - | - | LT 70.13 |
| II.32.5 | - | - | LT 70.16 |
| II.36.1–2 | III.1 | - | LT 49.1–2 |
| II.46.1–8 | II.44–46 | - | LT 34.1–5 |

\(^6\) Noted in Banham and Doyle, ‘An Instrument of Confusion’, p. 34.
Practica Alexandri latine

Parallels between the Practica Alexandri and the Leechbook were first noted by Cockayne; however, Cockayne was referring to the defective Greek recension of the text when he drew the parallels. Cameron pointed out a small number of more concrete correspondences between the Old English text and the Latin recension of Alexander of Tralles, such as a parallel between Leechbook I.87.3 and the PAL I.5. Cameron also makes brief mention of the relationship between the PAL and the Leechbook several times, though he rarely gives more than a sentence of parallel text by way of illustration. Cameron’s most insightful noting of parallels was probably in highlighting the relationship between Leechbook II.1 and PAL II.14, though again, only a single sentence is given to support this. In an attempt to verify Cameron’s claims of the relationship between these two texts, the Latin text of all three books of the PAL was carefully read and compared against the transcription of the Leechbook.

Table 0.3 Parallels between the Practica Alexandri latine and the Leechbook

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leechbook</th>
<th>PAL</th>
<th>Edition</th>
<th>First noted by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I.1.18</td>
<td>1.45–46</td>
<td>Fradin</td>
<td>new</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cameron lists the source for this passage as ‘the Latin Liber Tertius / Petrocellus’ but does not expand on his source attribution in his Anglo-Saxon Medicine, pp. 16–17; J. T. McIlwain, in his discussion of these recipes, provides quotations from the ‘Petrocellus’ transcribed from a microfilm of London, British Library, Sloane 2839 with occasional references to Fischer’s edition of the Liber tertius in his ‘Theory and Practice’, pp. 67–73.

68 See Cameron, Anglo-Saxon Medicine, pp. 22, 66, 69, 83, 98.

69 Ibid, pp. 97–98.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>II.15.1</th>
<th>II.1.1–2</th>
<th>Langslow</th>
<th>Pettit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II.87.3</td>
<td>II.7</td>
<td>Fradin</td>
<td>Cameron 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.1.2–3</td>
<td>II.14</td>
<td>Fradin</td>
<td>Cameron 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.1.4–7</td>
<td>II.36–37</td>
<td>Langslow</td>
<td>*Cameron 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.1.8–11</td>
<td>II.38</td>
<td>Fradin</td>
<td>new</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.15.1</td>
<td>II.48</td>
<td>Fradin</td>
<td>new</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.15.2–3</td>
<td>II.32</td>
<td>Fradin</td>
<td>new</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.16.2</td>
<td>II.22</td>
<td>Fradin</td>
<td>new</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.16.3</td>
<td>II.15</td>
<td>Fradin</td>
<td>new</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.16.4–5</td>
<td>II.31</td>
<td>Fradin</td>
<td>new</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.16.8</td>
<td>II.23</td>
<td>Fradin</td>
<td>new</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.21.2–5</td>
<td>II.57–59</td>
<td>Fradin</td>
<td>new</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.23.1–6</td>
<td>II.61–65</td>
<td>Fradin</td>
<td>new</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.24.2–3</td>
<td>II.67</td>
<td>Fradin</td>
<td>new</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.36.6–10</td>
<td>II.105–106 (Philagrius)</td>
<td>Puschmann</td>
<td>new</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.37.1–2</td>
<td>II.107–108 (Philagrius)</td>
<td>Puschmann</td>
<td>Cameron 1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.38.1–6</td>
<td>II.111 (Philagrius)</td>
<td>Puschmann</td>
<td>new</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.39.1–4</td>
<td>II.115–116 (Philagrius)</td>
<td>Puschmann</td>
<td>new</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.42.1–2</td>
<td>II.121 (Philagrius)</td>
<td>Puschmann</td>
<td>new</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.43.1</td>
<td>II.135 (Philagrius)</td>
<td>Puschmann</td>
<td>new</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.43.2</td>
<td>II.135, 128 (Philagrius)</td>
<td>Puschmann</td>
<td>new</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.44.1</td>
<td>II.142 (Philagrius)</td>
<td>Puschmann</td>
<td>new</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

71 In fact Cameron only prints one sentence in parallel: *Leechbook* II.1.3 in *Anglo-Saxon Medicine*, p. 98. I must also thank Dr Leslie Lockett of Ohio State University, whose private correspondence following a paper at Kalamazoo in May 2009 helped me to identify this particular source and spurred me to find further parallels.

72 Cameron correctly identifies OE *heortcoþu* as a translation of L. *cardiaca passio* but did not actually point out the relationship between *Leechbook* II.1.4–11 (*wip heartcoþe*) and *PAL* II.36–38 *De cardiaca passio*. See his *Anglo-Saxon Medicine*, pp. 97–8.
Oribasius Synopses and Euporistes

Much of the source scholarship on the Synopses and Euporistes has been carried out by Cameron, and merely collated herein. However a small number of new parallels have been found between the Latin versions of Oribasius’ work and the Leechbooks, highlighted in bold in the table below.

Table 0.4 The Leechbook and Oribasius Synopses and Euporistes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leechbook</th>
<th>Oribasius</th>
<th>First Noted by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I.2.3</td>
<td>Syn(^{73}) V.37</td>
<td>Cameron 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.2.22</td>
<td>Eup(^{74}) IV.16</td>
<td>Cameron 1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.4.16</td>
<td>Syn III.175</td>
<td>Cameron 1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.18.1–4</td>
<td>Syn VI.42</td>
<td>new</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.27.1–4</td>
<td>Syn V.47</td>
<td>new</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.27.5–9</td>
<td>Syn V.53</td>
<td>new</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.27.10</td>
<td>Syn V.52</td>
<td>new</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.28.1–2</td>
<td>Syn V.38</td>
<td>new</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.29.1</td>
<td>Syn V.30</td>
<td>new</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.30.1–7</td>
<td>Eup I.9</td>
<td>Cameron 1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.59.1</td>
<td>Syn VIII.14</td>
<td>Cameron 1983</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Miscellaneous Sources and the Herbal Complex

Miscellaneous and minor sources for the Leechbook have been collated by a number of authors including Pettit, Cameron and even Cockayne. The following table (0.5) lists these sources and the author responsible for drawing attention to such parallels.

---


\(^{74}\) Molinier, A., ed., *Euporistes* in *Oeuvres d’Oribase*, VI, 403–626.
Recipes from the *Herbarius* and related texts are listed here because, despite their abundance, they are extracted piecemeal with little influence on the form or structure of Bald’s *Leechbook*.

### Table 0.5 Miscellaneous Sources and the Herbal Complex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><em>Leechbook</em></th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Noted by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I.1.11</td>
<td><em>MDM 1.61</em></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Cameron 1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.1.15</td>
<td><em>MDM 11.18</em></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Cameron 1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.1.20</td>
<td><em>DHVL 1</em></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.1.25</td>
<td><em>MDM 5.7</em></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>new</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.2.1</td>
<td><em>Herb. 74.2</em></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.2.14</td>
<td><em>HN 29.119</em></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Cameron 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.2.15</td>
<td><em>MDM 138.9</em></td>
<td><em>HN 32.69</em></td>
<td>Cameron 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.2.17</td>
<td><em>MDM 136.5</em></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Cameron 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.2.18</td>
<td><em>Herb 35.2</em></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.2.31</td>
<td><em>Herb 74.1</em></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.2.48</td>
<td><em>Herb 31.1</em></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.2.51</td>
<td>Cassius Felix, <em>De medicamina</em> 29.55.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Cameron 1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.3.1</td>
<td><em>DHVL 3</em></td>
<td><em>MDM 9.75</em></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.3.9</td>
<td><em>MDM 9.1</em></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>new</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.3.10</td>
<td><em>MDM 9.66</em></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.3.21</td>
<td>Paulus Aegineta III.125</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>*Cockayne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.4.1</td>
<td><em>MDM 15.53</em></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Cameron 1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.4.2</td>
<td><em>MDM 15.55</em></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Cameron 1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.4.4</td>
<td><em>MDM 15.54</em></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.4.5–6</td>
<td>*MDM 15.50–51</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Cameron 1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.4.15</td>
<td>MDM 15.45</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Cameron 1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.4.17–18</td>
<td>MP I.17.1, 5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Cameron 1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.6.1</td>
<td>DHVL 7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.6.12</td>
<td>Herb 89.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.9.1</td>
<td>MDM 10.65</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>new</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.11.1</td>
<td>MDM 11.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>new</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.15.3</td>
<td>Herb 44.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Pettit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.21.3</td>
<td>DHVL 14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.22.1</td>
<td>DHVL 46</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.26.3</td>
<td>Herb 11.2, 12.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>new*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.27.2</td>
<td>Herb 76.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>new*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.27.4</td>
<td>Herb 11.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>new*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.27.5</td>
<td>Herb 45.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>new*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.29.1</td>
<td>DHVL 40</td>
<td></td>
<td>new*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.29.2</td>
<td>Herb 102.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>new*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.29.3</td>
<td>Herb 122.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>new*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.31.4</td>
<td>Herb 45.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>new*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.31.9</td>
<td>Herb 124.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>new*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.38.1</td>
<td>Herb 1.16</td>
<td></td>
<td>new*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.38.2</td>
<td>Herb 1.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>new*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.39.5–9</td>
<td>MP III.24.1–7</td>
<td>PPFP III.34.4</td>
<td>Cameron, A&amp;D, Pettit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.39.10</td>
<td>HN 28.190</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Pettit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.43.1</td>
<td>DHVL 25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.45.6</td>
<td>Herb 1.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>new*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.45.7</td>
<td>DHVL 42</td>
<td></td>
<td>new*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Noted By</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.45.8</td>
<td>Herb 2.7</td>
<td>new*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.48.3</td>
<td>Herb 93.2</td>
<td>new*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.62.5</td>
<td>DHVL 21</td>
<td>new*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.62.6</td>
<td>Herb 1.12</td>
<td>new*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.62.7</td>
<td>DHVL 20</td>
<td>new*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.69.4</td>
<td>Herb 1.23</td>
<td>new*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.71.1</td>
<td>MEA α 5.3</td>
<td>new*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.78.1</td>
<td>DHVL 37</td>
<td>new*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.79.1</td>
<td>DHVL 36</td>
<td>new*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.80.1</td>
<td>DHVL 31</td>
<td>new*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.82.1</td>
<td>Herb 53.3</td>
<td>new*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.2.4</td>
<td>Herb 1.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.6.3</td>
<td>Herb 93.3</td>
<td>new*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.17.1</td>
<td>VEA 19</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Cameron 1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.25.1</td>
<td>Paulus Aegineta III.189</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>*Cockayne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.30.17</td>
<td>MEA α I.17</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.33.1</td>
<td>Celsus 4.20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>new</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.33.8</td>
<td>Herb 89.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.34.8</td>
<td>Herb 93.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Pettit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.36.3</td>
<td>VEA 20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Cameron 1983</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It should be noted that in the case of Cockayne, his marginal annotations drew attention to parallels with Greek texts. Only a small number of parallels with the Latin version of Paul of Aegina were found to exist where Cockayne had noted parallels with the Greek text of Paul of Aegina. Where an asterisk occurs alone in the ‘noted by’ field, the source text is part of the enlarged Latin *Herbal*, and as such there may be parallels noted elsewhere with the Old English enlarged *Herbal*. Where ‘new*’
occurs in the noted by field, parallels may exist with the Old English enlarged Herbal tradition, but have not been investigated, and may not be documented elsewhere.

Justification of the Identification of New Sources

Where a source in the above tables 0.1–0.5 is described as ‘new,’ i.e. identified in the current work rather than in previous scholarship, it should be noted that the following criteria were taken into consideration. Firstly, such Latin texts were in all cases previously identified as sources for the Leechbooks, as noted above, but this relationship had not been fully explored. Secondly, agreement between materia medica was sought where possible, for a given condition. Thirdly, where a text is aetiological or describes a physiological process, agreement was sought not only in subject matter but also in syntax, under the assumption that the Old English would indicate a ‘gloss-like structure’ indicative of the translation of a Fachtext. This somewhat restrictive approach was adopted in the hope of avoiding circular lexicology, as it was only in the instances where syntactic interference patterns could point to textual relationships that lexical interference patterns could be investigated without bias.
CHAPTER 1: METHODOLOGY

In this thesis, the term ‘semantic’ is used in a broadly pragmatic way, insofar as the ‘semantic approach’ mentioned in the title is intended as a tool subservient to the purposes of intellectual history. It will nevertheless be necessary to define what ‘semantic’ means in this thesis, since the term can have subtly different meanings even within linguistics, let alone in philosophy.

Semantic Methodology

Semantics is generally defined as the study of meaning, by both linguists and philosophers alike. Although distinguishing the usage of the term ‘semantics’ between philosophers of language and linguists may seem artificial at first glance, there is a great difference between the methodologies and preoccupations of these two fields, despite the fruitful ground they have in common.\textsuperscript{75}

It is fitting to begin with the father of modern semantics, Ferdinand de Saussure, whose posthumously published \textit{Course in General Linguistics} formed the basis for much of the linguistic inquiry of the twentieth century.\textsuperscript{76} Saussure’s theory deserves some explication here, as it is fundamental to the understanding of how semantics may be applied to intellectual history. The fundamental part of Saussure’s paradigm is that ‘the linguistic sign unites, not a thing and a name, but a concept and a sound-image’.\textsuperscript{77} Saussure uses three terms, the ‘sign,’ referring to the word and its meaning, the ‘signified’, being the concept which is denoted, and the ‘signifier’ being the sound-image which refers to the concept. The relationship between signifier and signified, moreover, is completely arbitrary.\textsuperscript{78}

When, later in his lectures, Saussure states that the sign is immutable, he means that for a given speaker, the meaning of a word is fixed according to the social conventions of his or her language. A speaker cannot force language change by merely deciding to call all cats ‘dogs’, as this would be contrary to the established norms of the language, and lead to problems in communication. It is perhaps best to define this as the socially constructed nature of the sign, rather than the ‘immutability’ of the sign.\textsuperscript{79}

This same social aspect also leads to what Saussure defines as the ‘mutable’ nature of the sign, as a lexeme can have a markedly different meaning within different social contexts or historical periods. But it is ultimately by the same process of tacit agreement between speakers that signs function. For Saussure, the most important aspect of the function of the sign was its differential characteristic. ‘Signs function … not through their intrinsic value but through their relative

\textsuperscript{75} Ullmann, S., \textit{The Principles of Semantics} (Glasgow, 1957), pp. 4–6.
\textsuperscript{77} \textit{Ibid}., p. 68.
\textsuperscript{78} \textit{Ibid}., pp. 67–70.
\textsuperscript{79} Especially since Saussure also defines the sign as ‘mutable.’
While semantics may have moved on as a field over the last century, the fundamental principles remain unchanged, that the sign represents the relationship between a concept of a thing and the lexeme by which it is referred to, rather than a thing, and that the relationship between the sign and the signifier is completely arbitrary.

**Diachronic and Synchronic Linguistic Approaches**

Broadly speaking, diachronic linguistics is the study of language change over time, what might otherwise be called historical linguistics, whereas synchronic linguistics is the study of the state of a language at a given time. Saussure felt that these two methodologies needed to be thoroughly distinguished, envisaging them as operating on perpendicular planes.

To understand the significance of diachrony and synchrony, it would perhaps be best to illustrate with a number of disease terms. Take *hysteria* for example. The *Oxford English Dictionary* defines it primarily as a pathological term meaning ‘a functional disturbance of the nervous system … and usually attended with emotional disturbances and enfeeblement or perversion of the moral and intellectual faculties.’ The term is more commonly used in its secondary transferred sense, defined as a ‘morbidly excited condition, unhealthy emotion or excitement.’

From a diachronic point of view, we would examine this word’s etymology, namely that it is an abstract noun formed from the adjective *hysteric* which derives from the late Latin *hystericus*, from the Greek ῥυστηρικός which actually means ‘of or relating to the womb.’ In early modern medical English, *hysteric* could have this sense of pertaining to the womb, but it is a sense which is completely lost to the word now.

From a synchronic perspective, the fact that hysteria could be etymologised to indicate a pathology of the uterus is therefore useless, as it is not what the term means in modern English. When dealing with corpus languages it is even more important to bear this aspect of synchronic linguistics in mind, as it is often all too tempting to attempt an etymology of a word to find its meaning, but as we have seen, even where a disease term is the product of derivational morphology from a known anatomical term, the meaning of this disease term does not remain stable. Just as *hysteric* or *hysterical* once denoted a condition of the womb but now denote a psychological condition with no real place in modern medical terminology, the term *hypochondria* has undergone a similar shift from a disease term derived from a concrete Greek anatomical term to a psychological condition in present day English (PDE). If I say ‘Simon is a hypochondriac’ there is no way of reading this sentence as a native speaker of PDE that would assume I meant ‘Simon has an inflammation of the soft part of the body below the costal cartilages,’ but rather we would assume I meant something vaguely synonymous with ‘Simon is deleteriously concerned with his health.’

---

80 Saussure, *Course*, p. 118.
The etymologies of which philologists, and in particular Anglo-Saxonists, are so fond thus lead us down blind alleys from a synchronic perspective more often than not. For an Old English example, take *fienda adl,* literally ‘fiends’ disease.’ It would be tempting to read this as referring to demonic possession and leave it at that, but examining its usage in the corpus, it would seem that it has a more nuanced and specific meaning, without any necessity of actual demonic possession being in question. When we read the term in the second sentence of the first chapter of Bald’s *Leechbook II* it is one of the many conditions which may arise out of the maladies of the stomach, in a passage which directly translates *Practica Alexandri Latina* II.14, where ‘epileptias 7 spasmos 7 casus 7 tristicias sine causa’ is translated as ‘fylle wærc 7 fienda adl. 7 micla murnunga 7 unrotnessa butan þearfe’. *Fienda adl* is not a direct translation of the second Latin term, but rather the first three terms of the Latin all imply roughly the same symptom: lack of control of the body, while the last is lack of control of the mind. The Old English divides the scheme into a binary with two synonyms for epilepsy / falling / spasm and two synonyms for ‘sadness without cause,’ of which *fienda adl* is a member of the former group. In this context, the term certainly does not imply demonic possession, despite the fact that it may appear superficially to do so if we take a diachronic perspective.

Yet diachronic change can give us some insight into the deeper structures of significance. In a seminal article on semantics in philosophy, Hilary Putnam raises a point about the ‘extension’ (φ) of a given term (the thing signified in the Saussurian paradigm) as subject to diachronic change. Putnam constructs a thought experiment in which there is a substance X, a metallic substance which fulfils the operational definition of ‘gold’ (Gr χρυσός) in the time of Archimedes, in that it ‘could not have been determined not to be gold in Archimedes’ day.’ In Putnam’s thought experiment, the substance X could be subjected to modern metallurgical analysis and found to be a different metal. The question, then, is whether we say that this substance is or was ‘gold’, or was Archimedes wrong to label it χρυσός? Putnam resolves the issue by stating that ‘“X is gold (χρυσός)” was warrentedly assertible in Archimedes’ time and is not warrantedly assertible today.’

When we extend this relativistic semantic principle of ‘warranted assertability’ to medical vocabulary we can see just how apt it is, given that the corpus of medical texts we shall be analysing date from the first to eleventh centuries AD. Let us take some concrete examples to illustrate this point in disease terminology. In medical Latin, *parotis, -idis* is refers to a tumour of the neck or throat, and it is defined as two distinct maladies by pseudo-Galen in the *Liber tertius,* one fatal, the other not.

---

81 ‘Epilepsy and convulsions and falling and sorrows without cause.’ Fradin, ed., *Practica Alexandri,* 34v.
82 ‘Falling sickness and fiends’ disease and great grieving and sadness without cause.’
83 I use the (φ) symbol to denote a technical term in philosophical semantics which has a different meaning in historical linguistics.
In modern medicine the cognate term, *parotitis* still exists, but with a much more specialised extension (*φ*), meaning the inflammation of the major salivary glands.

Can we say then, that those conditions described by ancient medicine as *parotis* were in some cases the modern *parotitis*, and in some cases not? The fundamental core of my semantic methodology is that we cannot, as these terms satisfy the operational definitions of their time, and it is these operational definitions which must be recovered in the study of ancient medicine, and ancient languages in general. This leaves us with a methodological problem. If we acknowledge the fact that the operational definitions of cognate terms in medicine vary so much between ancient and modern times, how do we translate them? The strategy adopted herein is largely to avoid the translation of a term unless it refers specifically to an easily identifiable symptom. *Heafodece* or *dolor capitis* can easily be translated as ‘headache.’ However it would be a mistake to translate *hemicrania* as ‘migraine’ despite the obvious etymological link, as the operational definitions most likely differ greatly, but a more literal ‘(pain of) half the head’ would suffice, albeit without elegance.

**Bilingualism and Contact Interference**

A fundamental aspect of almost all Anglo-Saxon prose, medical prose being no exception, is that it is heavily influenced by if not directly translated from Latin texts. This situation necessitates an awareness of the ways in which written Latin may have directly or indirectly influenced written Old English. The importance of the attributive *written* is paramount here, as we are limited to viewing written sources only in these two corpus languages.

**Anglo-Saxon Language Contact: Socio-Linguistic Factors**

The situation of language contact in Anglo-Saxon England does not conform to a normal paradigm of bilingualism, as knowledge of Latin was limited to a very small number of individuals. This has been described as a ‘distant but institutional’ language contact setting by Olga Timofeeva, using the classification of Loveday.\(^{86}\)

This kind of contact takes place when the acquisition of a foreign language is not part of community activities, unless in the domain of religion but is promoted through an institution such as school.\(^{87}\)


In Anglo-Saxon England, literacy in general, and Latin literacy in particular, were limited largely to the clergy, with the possible exception of a very small number of Latin-literate noblemen, possibly trained at the school established by Alfred at Winchester. According to estimates based on the Domesday Book, ‘the total of 6,000 would be about the correct number’ of Latinate persons in England at the end of the eleventh century. Timofeeva continues ‘this gives us between 0.25 and 0.55 percent of population or one literate person per 183–375 people.’

The numbers of Latinate individuals in Anglo-Saxon England is thus so low as to cast doubt on whether language contact theory can be employed. Timofeeva states that ‘by the standards of language contact theory, 0.27–0.55 percent of the population is a negligible group of people that cannot affect the language situation to any serious degree.’ Timofeeva counters this argument suggesting that ‘what may really matter in hierarchical language situations is not so much the relative number of bilingual individuals, but the social status and authority of the bilingual group.’

It is important to note, as Timofeeva does, that ‘these same people produced most of the written Old English that we know of.’ When examining the Old English corpus, then, we find ourselves not in a situation of witnessing the vernacular of a multitude, but rather the written idiolect of a small number of (probably) Latinate scholars.

**Forms of Contact Interference: Lexical Interference**

Contact interference phenomena can roughly be broken down into two subsets, lexical interference and syntactic interference, or to put it more simply, the influence of the foreign language on the vocabulary and grammar of the native language respectively. Lexical interference is the manner in which the lexis, that is the total sum of lexemes in the language, of one language has an influence on the lexis of another. This is not restricted merely to borrowing and code switching, where foreign words intrude directly from one language to another, but also includes more subtle mechanisms which will be dealt with below.

Traditionally, borrowings between Latin and Old English have been classified according to three historical periods first proposed by Pogatscher. The first being the pre-migration or continental period, ca 100 BC to 450 AD, in which continental Germanic speakers came into contact with the Roman Empire through trade and as auxiliary units; the second being the early Insular period in which the early Anglo-Saxons may have come into contact with Latin through native Celtic influence, ca 450 to 600 AD; while the third period is the Christian Insular period, from ca 600 AD to 1066.
Helmut Gneuss highlights the many historiographical problems with this tripartite division in his excellent 1992 survey of work in the field of contact interference in Old English. The main problem highlighted by Gneuss with this model is that the historical periods suggested do not correlate in any meaningful way with changes in Vulgar Latin, leading to a confusion of all three historical periods, stating:

Those that have been suggested as belonging to [period 2] show the phonological characteristics of Vulgar Latin, and it does not seem possible to distinguish loans in this form imported from Gaul from the corresponding words that might have been adopted from British speakers. Moreover, a number of words that are clearly part of the vocabulary of the early Anglo-Saxon Church like abboð, antefiñ and cugele – and so could hardly have been borrowed before the seventh century – also show the sound developments of Vulgar Latin and are evidently imports from the Continent.

In opposition to this model, another model may be more fruitful, and has been suggested by Timofeeva. In this model we can trace a binary opposition between passive familiarity and learned borrowing.

Contact-induced change through passive familiarity occurs when a speaker acquires a feature from a language that s/he understands … but has never spoken actively at all. This is a common mechanism of language contact when the majority of the population is not bilingual but nevertheless uses a number of foreign terms that come to the language via the bilingual group. Such terms, as a rule, belong to particular spheres of life or professions … and are borrowed into a language together with the cultural realia that they signify.

Words adopted through passive familiarity ‘follow Old English declension patterns and can be used as parts of compound words as in derivatives,’ whereas ‘more learned words, on the other hand, often retain their Latin forms or do not spread outside professional context.’ Thus we have a binary opposition between words which are integrated into Old English morphological and declensional patterns, and words which are not, indicating that they were far more restricted in use. It remains now to categorise the various forms of lexical interference which may be encountered within the corpus, and to establish their relevance to the field of medicine. In many ways, lexical interference can be seen as a continuum between code switching, where words or phrases are borrowed without modification from one language to another at one end of the extreme, and loan formations and semantic loans at the other extreme. I would thus classify the various types of interference as follows.

---

95 Ibid., pp. 114–15.
i. Code switching: the imported lexeme remains true to the morphological and paradigmatic structures of its original language, often being flagged as a foreign word by a relative clause where employed. Gneuss notes that ‘such a retention of foreign endings usually marks only a temporary stage in the history of a word or is characteristic of certain types of “Fachtexte”’. In the case of medical literature, we are dealing with a Fachtext, or technical text, and the Latin and Latinised Greek terms employed, such as *oxymel*, *paralysis* or *cimosis* should not really be considered part of the Old English vocabulary.

ii. Scholarly loanwords: the imported lexeme retains the principal orthographic features of its original language, but is cursorily inflected with regards to an Old English weak paradigm. This is very commonly found in botany, where terms such as *betonica* -an compete with their Latin forms *betonica* -ae.

iii. Passive loanwords: the imported word undergoes significant orthographic and inflectional change, which may be indicative of Vulgar Latin sound changes. Timofeeva gives the following examples: OE *minster* < vulgar L. *monisterium* < L. *monasterium* (monastery), OE *munuc* < L. *monachus*, (monk) OE *cese* < L. *caseus* (cheese), OE *ynce* < L. *uncia* (ounce).

iv. Calques or loan-translations: a word or phrasal term from Latin may be translated literally, or rendered morpheme for morpheme to create a new term. Examples include *healfes heafdes ece* < vulgar L. *emigranea* < L. *hemicrania* < Gr ἡμικράνιον ([pain of] half the head).

v. Semantic loans: the semantic sense of an existing term is extended to include the sense of a translation equivalent in the foreign language. Examples include *wæta* to mean ‘one of the four humours,’ by extension from L. *humor* in medical prose.

The importance of the inflectional class of a loanword has already been suggested above, in distinguishing instances of passive familiarity, wherein the borrowed term will undergo more significant orthographic and morphological change than learned borrowings. Gneuss summarises the lexical categories of borrowed Latin terms with the intention that the analysis ‘can provide valuable evidence for developments in the receiving language.’ Gneuss’s findings are perhaps best represented in tabular form:

---

99 This particular case is discussed at length in Chapter 5 (below), and also in Lois Ayoub ‘Old English *wæta*’, pp. 332–46.
Table 1.1 Classes of Verbs Borrowed from Latin into Old English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weak I</th>
<th>Weak I &amp; II</th>
<th>Weak II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;25%</td>
<td>&gt;75%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What this means is that most of the borrowed verbs can be inflected as either weak I or weak II.

Table 1.2 Classes of Nouns Borrowed from Latin into Old English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>49%</th>
<th>34%</th>
<th>16.7%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘ā-declension’(^{102}) (m &gt;66 %, n &gt;14%)</td>
<td>weak (mostly feminine)(^{103})</td>
<td>feminine ‘ō-declension’(^{104})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gneuss points out that ‘more than 40 per cent of the borrowed nouns are found in the most common inflexional type of Old English.’\(^{105}\) For Gneuss, this fact, coupled with the reduction of borrowings into the feminine ō-declension, is an indicator of trends towards the levelling of the Old English inflectional system. As a corollary, I would like to suggest that the learned borrowings in Fachtexte are less likely to undergo significant morphological change through spoken usage, and are therefore more likely to be pigeon-holed into the commonest declensional class. Taking an example from modern English, stadium is a word in common usage, to the point that the plural stadia has been replaced by the plural stadiums via analogy with PDE plural formation in -s. By contrast, the terms bacterium and bacillus are neo-Latin terms relating to microbiology, and as such, their plurals retain the nominative plural form of their original Latin declensional category, bacteria and bacilli respectively, in Modern English.

The register of a term, and its relevance to a particular discipline, may then be the most important factors operating upon the rate at which it is orthographically modified. I would argue that it is only with the spread of a borrowed term, outside of the Fachtexte in which it was originally found, that orthographic changes natural to the host language occur. For an Old English example L. ampulla, -ae appears several times in Bald’s Leechbook as ampulle, -an (weak feminine), before it was modified to ampelle, -an (weak feminine, the DOE citation form) by later glossators.

---

\(^{101}\) The weak verb classes I and II are described in Campbell, A., *Old English Grammar* (Oxford, 1959), §§748–61.

\(^{102}\) ā-declension nouns are described in Ibid., §§570–84.

\(^{103}\) Weak nouns are described in Ibid., §§615–19.

\(^{104}\) ō-declension nouns are the primary form of the ‘strong’ feminine declension, described in Ibid., §§585–98

Forms of Contact Interference: Syntactic Interference

Timofeeva uses the phenomenon of ‘negotiation’ outlined by Sarah Thomason in her 2001 monograph on language contact to describe the mechanisms by which syntactic interference is most evident between Latin and Old English.\textsuperscript{106}

[ Negotiation is] a phenomenon which is at work when speakers adapt their native language to what they believe to be the patterns of another language, especially when trying to make sense out of sometimes confusing second language structures. Most often, negotiation takes place in translations from foreign languages and results in gloss-like renderings of the source text.\textsuperscript{107}

A more schematic model for this process is summarised by Timofeeva from Heine and Kuteva:\textsuperscript{108}

a. Speakers of language R notice that in language M there is a grammatical category Mx.

b. They create an equivalent category Rx using material available in their own language (R).

c. To this end they draw on universal strategies of grammaticalization, using construction Ry in order to develop Rx or replicate a grammaticalization process they assume to have taken place in language M using the analogical formula of the kind [My>Mx] = [Ry>Rx]

d. They grammaticalize category Ry to Rx.

Individual aspects of contact-induced grammaticalization have been studied separately, and often remain contentious. Two examples will follow: the use of absolute participle constructions in Old English, and the use of the inflected infinitive in Old English.

i. Absolute Participle Constructions

Timofeeva has attempted to resolve the issue as to whether the dative/instrumental absolute construction in Old English is a native construction, or whether it is a translation-induced negotiation of the Latin ablative absolute construction. She notes that ‘it is very important overall that OE does not generate new phrases with (pro)noun+participle in the dative as a model but uses available Latin-based patterns, such as gewunnenum sige, þissum gewordenum/gedonum, gode fulmiendum, etc.’\textsuperscript{109}

Timofeeva goes further, stating that not only were absolute participle constructions an artefact of contact induced negotiation but that ‘they should perhaps be added to the existing lists of lexical borrowings of the OE period.’\textsuperscript{110}

In our corpus of medical texts, absolute participle constructions are quite rare. Given that such constructions normally only occur in narrative passages, it is unsurprising that they do not occur in medical texts, which tend to comprise mostly instructions and statements of fact.

ii. Periphrastic Constructions with the Inflected Infinitive

\textsuperscript{107} Timofeeva, Non-Finite Constructions in Old English, p. 11.
\textsuperscript{109} Timofeeva, Non-Finite Constructions in Old English, pp. 73–4.
\textsuperscript{110} Ibid., p. 74.
The Old English inflected infinitive is a form of the infinitive which takes the preposition to and ends in -enne, -anne, -ene. Matti Rissanen has traced the grammaticalisation of discourse markers deploying the inflected infinitive over Old and Middle English, specifically is to witanne which translates sciendum / notandum est as well as is to ongietanne and is to understandenne.111 For Rissanen, the important thing about these constructions is that they begin to serve as discourse markers, losing their semantic force, ultimately gaining the sense of PDE ‘to wit.’ His observations can, however, also be used to support a theory regarding the grammaticalization of the Latin passive periphrastic conjugation deploying the gerundive + sum translated into Old English as the inflected infinitive + beon.

In our medical corpora, we can see a direct correspondence between these verbal constructions in phrases such as OE blod is to forlætenne (blod is to be let) from L. phlebotomandus est. See for instance Leechbook II.18.1 ‘him is on fruman blod to forlætenne’ (in the beginning blood is to be let from them) LT. 40.1 ‘Mox ab initio phlebotomandi sunt’ (Soon from the beginning they ought to be bled).

The semantic sense of obligation is carried by the use of the Latin gerundive; however, as there is no gerundive in Old English, the use of the inflected infinitive is being stretched to accommodate a new sense, implying obligation without the use of a verb such as OE. sculan. A clearer example is in instances of prohibition, such as Leechbook II.23.3 ægru sint to forganne from PAL II.61 Oua autem sunt prohibenda. In this case, the syntactic calquing creates a verbatim translation with the exception of the omission of the Latin intensifier autem.

A single passage translated from Philagrios, Leechbook II.43; contains three inflected infinitive + beon constructions where the Latin contains four gerundive + sum constructions: is to sellanne < danda est (he is to be given), sint to þicgenne (are to be consumed), is to forganne < prohibendae sunt (are to be avoided). It would seem therefore that it is not only in the discourse markers highlighted by Rissanen that this negotiation occurs, but rather that the discourse markers arose out of the grammaticalisation of a periphrastic passive infinitive construction which deployed the inflected infinitive with obligatory sense suggested by the Latin gerundive.

**Syntax and Style**

One of the aspects of Latin medical language touched upon by Langslow is the tendency for nominalization of finite verb forms to create a compact technical style. He notes that ‘the … structure behaves syntactically, of course, as a noun, and appears either with a semantically uninteresting verb (est, fit, oritur, nascitur) or in a prepositional phrase (ad neruorum resolutionem).’112 Old English, by

---

contrast, occasionally struggles to maintain this compact style even when attempts are being made to mirror Latin technical language very closely, in part because of the complex technical nature of the language involved. Take for example the following sentence from the Practica Alexandri II.38: ‘Si autem ex humorum acredine fit <sc. nausea et vomitum> cacochimia est.’\footnote{113} This is translated into Old English in Leechbook II.1.9 as ‘Gif hie þonne cumað of oþrum biterum 7 yfelum waetum þa þe wyrcəð oman.’\footnote{114} Here the Greek noun κάκωχημα which is transliterated as cacochimia is not translated by a noun but explained more diffusely with ‘þa þe wyrcəð oman’ which approximates the sense, but changes the syntax considerably.

Other Greek terms are similarly translated by a more diffuse style than is to be found in the Latin, such as apostema (Gr. ἀπόστημα), meaning abscess, translated in the OEH 125 as ‘Wið ealle gegaderunga þæs yfelan waetan of þam lichoman,’\footnote{115} where the Latin simply reads ‘Ad apostema.’ Here the foreign term is translated not with a single term but by an extended noun phrase. It is to be noted nonetheless that even in these explicative glosses there is still an under-representation of ‘semantically interesting’ verbs. In the first example, the finite verb wyrcan is one of the most common verbs in Old English medical texts, meaning to make or do (cf. L facio). In the second example, there is no finite verb, but the single noun, apostema, has been expanded to an eight-word phrase to explicate its meaning.

The appearance of a more diffuse verbal style in Old English medical texts arises not, then, due to a greater proportion of finite verb clauses in and of themselves, but rather from a tendency to explain and expand complex medical terminology while largely retaining the overall syntactic structures imposed by the Latin compact style.

### Clauses Used to Introduce Latin Terms

Langslow notes the prevalence with which Greek medical terms are introduced by a relative clause in Latin texts, dividing the relative term into two categories, namely ‘restrictive’ and ‘non-restrictive’. A restrictive relative clause is one that restricts the meaning of the semantically broad or generic term in L1 (in this case, Latin) to the specific meaning of a term in L2 (in this case, Greek), whereas a non-restrictive relative clause introduces a term in L2 (Greek) as synonymous with a term in L1 (Latin), such that the sense of the text is retained if the relative clause is removed.\footnote{116} It would be best to show how these two classes of relative term operate in Old English. An example of a restrictive clause would be Leechbook II.30.3 ‘nim ða wyrt þe hatte on suþerne

\footnote{113} ‘If (nausea and vomiting) arise from the bitterness of the humours, it is cacochimia (an unhealthy state of the humours).’ Fradin, ed., Practica Alexandri, 38v.
\footnote{114} ‘If (nausea and vomiting) then come from other bitter and harmful humours which create unhealthy mixed humours.’
\footnote{115} ‘For all gatherings of the harmful fluid of the body’; de Vriend, ed. Herbarium, p. 164.
\footnote{116} Langslow, Medical Latin, p. 81.
where terebintina restricts the meaning of the generic wyrt (herb), such that the relative clause ‘þe hatte…’ is indispensable for the sense of the text.

Lists of synonymous plant names are often non-restrictive relative clauses such as II.8.1 ‘Nim centaurian þæt is felterre sume. hatað hyrde wyrt’ where both ‘þæt is felterre’ and ‘sume hatað hyrde wyrt’ are both non-restrictive relative clauses. In the example ‘sume hatað hyrde wyrt’, there is no relative pronoun or conjunction, but it could still be described as a ‘headless free relative’. In essence, the relative conjunction or pronoun must be assumed for the sense of the clause.

**Examples of Loanwords**

The following examples of Latinate vocabulary from Bald’s *Leechbook* should help to illustrate the recurring verbal tags which are used to highlight Latin loanwords in Old English medical prose. These do not always occur in relative clauses, but where they do these have been classified as restrictive (R) and non-restrictive (NR).

Table 1.3 Examples of Loanwords in Bald’s *Leechbook*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Clause Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I.1.1 murra <strong>hatte</strong> wyrt</td>
<td>Simple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.2.51 Wiþ þeoradle on eagum þe mon gefigo <strong>hæt</strong> on læden <strong>hatte</strong> cimosis</td>
<td>R simple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.4.5 galbanum <strong>hatte</strong> suþerne wyrt</td>
<td>simple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.79.1 drince betonican on þam <strong>sudernan</strong> oxumelle. þæt eced drenc</td>
<td>simple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.2.3 gedo on wearrmne ele þa wyrt þe <strong>hatte</strong> fenogrecum</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.8.1 Nim centaurian þæt is felterre sume. hatað hyrde wyrt</td>
<td>NR (headless)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.13.1 Sum pyse cyn <strong>hatte</strong> lenticulas</td>
<td>simple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.14.1 ameos <strong>hatte superne</strong> wyrt oþer asaru</td>
<td>simple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.22.1 fenogrecum <strong>hatte</strong> wyrt</td>
<td>simple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.23.3 eac sceal mon oxumellis sellan</td>
<td>simple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.24.7 on þam monðe gegaderod þe we <strong>hatað ianuarius</strong> on læden. 7 on englisc se æfterra geola</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

117 ‘Take that herb which is called turpentine in the south’.

118 ‘Take centaury, that is earth-gall, some call it *hyrdewyrt*’.
II.30.3 nim ða wyrt þe **hatte** on **superne** terebintina

II.30.6 sio hwite riefþo þe mon on **superne** lepra **hæt**

II.34.2 *Olisatrum* **hatte** wyrt

II.39.3 *gitte* **hatte** **superne** wyrte sio is god on hlæfe to þiegenne

II.39.5 on þam **superman** læcedome þe **hatte** oxumelle

II.40.1 wið oxumeli þone suþernan eced drenc

II.43.1 on hatum wætere 7 oxumelle

From the above data, we see that the Latinity of a term is rarely flagged verbally. The only examples in Bald’s *Leechbook* are I.2.51 and II.24.7. On the other hand, the OE adjective *suþern* (literally ‘southern’) implies foreignness, or a Mediterranean origin, but also marks a loanword as in Bald’s *Leechbook* I.4.5 ‘*galbanum* hatte suþerne wyrt’ (a southern herb is called galbanum). As we can see, Latin terms do not occur frequently in non-restrictive relative clauses; however, such non-restrictive relative clauses do sometimes refine the predicate in which the Latin term occurs, as in ‘sio is god on hlæfe to þiegenne’ at II.39.3. Where the loanword does occur in a non-restrictive relative, this is often a headless free-relative as in II.8.1.

From the above data, it would seem that the use of either the Old English verb *hatan* or the adjective *suþern* seems to be the strongest indicator that the compiler of the *Leechbook* is aware that they are dealing with a foreign term.

**Characteristics of Technical Vocabulary in Brief**

Langslow provides a single-sentence definition of the ‘technical term’ which is invaluable for our present purposes as:

> a referring expression which is recognized and used in a standard conventional way by the relevant community of specialists and which unambiguously (and often uniquely) names an object or a concept of the discipline, and therefore, because of this attachment, lends itself to absolute synonymy and total translation.

This definition leaves us to ponder three things. Firstly, the ‘relevant community of specialists’ is not one that can be said with any confidence to have existed in Anglo-Saxon England. There are no historical records of the practice of medicine by anything that could be considered a professional body in England until after the Norman Conquest. There are scattered references to *medici* and *læcas* in

---

119 "That is good to eat on bread".
120 Langslow, *Medical Latin*, p. 25.
hagiographical literature, but it is generally safe to assume that the ‘relevant community of specialists’ involved was a vanishingly small one in Anglo-Saxon England. Their literary output makes them most likely to have benefited from a clerical or monastic education, suggesting that the Anglo-Saxon physician, if we can call him that, was most likely a priest or monk.\textsuperscript{121}

Secondly, that the technical term refers unambiguously and often uniquely to the named object or concept of the discipline must not be thought to mean that synonymy does not exist in technical terminology. Langslow notes that there is a profusion of synonyms in medical Latin, noting ‘here too, we find synonym-pairs involving both popular and specialist terms and two or more specialist terms, including Greek and Latin words.’\textsuperscript{122}

Yet this existence of synonymy within technical vocabulary brings us to our third point, which is the importance of absolute synonymy and total translatability in technical terminology. Langslow notes that ‘the observation that two words in different texts in the same language are absolutely synonymous will follow, rather than precede, the recognition that both words are technical terms.’\textsuperscript{123} This means that we cannot attempt to diagnose terms from different texts across the corpus of Old English as technical on the basis of absolute synonymy. By contrast, the situation within a single text is reversed in Langslow’s methodology, wherein ‘absolute synonymy and especially total translatability can be used as a means of identifying technical terms, above all in a language that is copying the science and therefore mirroring the terminology of another language.’\textsuperscript{124}

If we find, therefore, that an Old English term, or group of terms, is consistently translating a single Latin technical term, or synonymous Latin terms, within a single text, we can be assured that these terms are technical terms. The fact that Old English medical texts are mirroring the terminology of Latin medical texts is assumed for now, but will become clearer when the relevant corpora and their relationships have been described.

Having demonstrated the methodological importance of contact interference between languages in the formation of technical vocabulary we must conclude that a comprehensive study of Old English medical language must be based on a bilingual, rather than a monolingual, corpus of medical texts available in Anglo-Saxon England. While the corpus of Old English is almost entirely digitised, there is no such overarching resource for the study of Anglo-Latin, or Latin texts available in England before 1100. It is therefore a methodological necessity to identify those Latin medical texts which were available in Anglo-Saxon England and to determine their relationship with the Old English corpus.

\textsuperscript{122} Langslow, \textit{Medical Latin}, p. 19.
\textsuperscript{123} Ibid., p. 22.
\textsuperscript{124} Ibid.
CHAPTER 2:

THE CORPUS OF OLD ENGLISH MEDICAL TEXTS

This chapter does not aim to provide a comprehensive list of every single medical item in Old English, but rather to highlight the most important such items for the linguistic study, focusing on those texts which are categorised as medical by the Dictionary of Old English Web Corpus. Since the identification of unedited recipes or charms is not the aim of this corpus, there has been little need to employ the Voigts-Kurz incipit catalogue.\(^{125}\)

The following table provides a brief list of manuscripts containing Old English medical texts and the sigla which will be used to refer to them.

Table 2.1 Shortlist of Old English Manuscripts and Sigla

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Siglum</th>
<th>Manuscript</th>
<th>Ker</th>
<th>Gneuss</th>
<th>saec.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 76</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>633</td>
<td>xi med</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co</td>
<td>Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 41</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>xi(^1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>London, British Library, Cotton Faustina A. X</td>
<td>154</td>
<td></td>
<td>xii(^1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H585</td>
<td>London, British Library, Harley 585</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>x/(!/\text{x})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H55</td>
<td>London, British Library, Harley 55</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>xi(^3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ju</td>
<td>Oxford, Bodleian Library, Junius 85</td>
<td>336</td>
<td></td>
<td>xi med</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>London, British Library, Harley 6258B</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td>xii med</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OF</td>
<td>Louvain-la-Neuve, Université Catholique de Louvain, Centre General de Documentation, Fragmenta H. Omont 3; the ‘Omont Fragment’</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>848</td>
<td>ix(^3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ot</td>
<td>*London, British Library, Cotton Otho B. XI.</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>x med-xi(^1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nw</td>
<td>London, British Library, Additional 43703, the ‘Nowell Transcript’ (copy of lost segments of above)</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>357</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{125}\) Voigts and Kurz, ed., *Scientific and Medical Writings.*
Cameron’s Catalogue and the Dictionary of Old English Web Corpus

The study of Old English vocabulary is greatly facilitated by the existence of a comprehensive electronic corpus of Old English.\textsuperscript{127} This searchable online corpus of ca 3.5 million words is an invaluable tool to Old English lexicography. All of the data for the present study were collected using the search functions of this enormously useful tool, and a description of its classifications is a necessary prerequisite to the following study.

The catalogue permits limitations of search parameters to genres, groups of texts, and specific texts. As such it is necessary to begin by describing how this catalogue establishes ‘medicine’ as a sub-genre of Old English prose text.

The catalogue lists twenty nine separate texts which it classes as medical, under the alphanumeric classification B21; the numbering of these texts seems largely based upon the order in which the texts occur in Cockayne’s Leechdoms. As we shall see, the classification of some of these texts as medical and the exclusion of others can be seen as problematic from the perspective of describing the state of knowledge of medicine in Anglo-Saxon England, but on the other hand, since it was the starting point for all of the Old English data considered in this thesis, its system of classification must be discussed, if briefly. The following list is the entire corpus of Old English prose medical texts as identified within Cameron’s Catalogue and the DOEC.

1) B21.1.1.1 Table of contents to the Old English Herbal (OEH)\textsuperscript{128}
2) B21.1.1.2 The Old English Herbal (OEH)\textsuperscript{129}
3) B21.1.1.3 The Old English Medicina de quadrupedibus (MDQ)\textsuperscript{130}
4) B21.1.2 Plant Names\textsuperscript{131}

\textsuperscript{126} At the time of Ker’s writing, the manuscript was held privately at Lanhydrock, Bodmin, Collection of Lord Clifden, B. 12. 16 fol. 144. The leaf was acquired by the Wellcome Trust in 1956.
\textsuperscript{128} De Vriend, ed., Herbarium, pp. 1–29.
\textsuperscript{129} Ibid., pp. 30–233.
\textsuperscript{130} Ibid., pp. 234–73.
5) B21.1.3 ‘Headache’ or ‘De Beta,’ being a collection of recipes from Harley 6258B, written on a half-folio between Medicina de quadrupedibus and Peri didaxeon.\(^{132}\)

6) B21.2.1.1.1 Table of Contents to Leechbook I (BLB I)\(^{133}\)

7) B21.2.1.1.2 Leechbook I (BLB I)\(^{134}\)

8) B21.2.1.2.1 Table of Contents to Leechbook II (BLB II)\(^{135}\)

9) B21.2.1.2.2 Leechbook II (BLB II)\(^{136}\)

10) B21.2.1.3.1 Table of Contents to Leechbook III (Lch III)\(^{137}\)

11) B21.2.1.3.2 Leechbook III (Lch III)\(^{138}\)

12) B21.2.3 Medical recipes from London, British Library MS. Addit. 43703, 261r.18–262r.1, 262r.2–5, 15–24.\(^{139}\)

13) B21.2.4 ‘Leechbook Fragment,’ Leechbook II.59 as reconstructed from Harley 55.\(^{140}\)

14) B21.3 Lacnunga.\(^{141}\)

15) B21.4 ‘Foetus’ A short extract from a redaction of Vindicianus Gynaecia survives into Old English as a prognostic in British Library, Cotton Tiberius A. III.\(^{142}\)

16) B21.5.1 ‘Wið eah waerce’ A single recipe for an ear salve from Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 41, p. 288. The eleventh-century manuscript contains the Old English version of Bede’s Historia Ecclesiastica.\(^{143}\)

17) B21.5.2 Five medical recipes from a single leaf now held in London, Wellcome Medical Historical Library, Manuscript 46.\(^{144}\)

18) B21.5.3 Single recipe to wensealfe (for a wen-salve) from London, British Library, Cotton Domitian I, 55v.\(^{145}\)

19) B21.5.4.1 Several recipes from Cotton Faustina A. X, 115v (s. xii1), written on a blank space on the lower part of the verso of fol. 115, according to Ker.\(^{146}\)

---

133 Ibid., II, 1–16.
134 Ibid., II, 18–156.
135 Ibid., II, 158–74.
136 Ibid., II, 175–299.
137 Ibid., II, 300–4.
138 Ibid., II, 304–58.
141 Grattan and Singer, ed., Lacnunga. This edition has been superseded by Pettit, ed., Lacnunga.
143 Ker, Catalogue, no. 32.8, pp. 43–5. The text is printed in Cockayne, ed., Leechdoms I, 382.
145 Cockayne, ed., Leechdoms I, 382.
146 Ibid., III, 292.
20) B21.5.4.2 Marginal recipes added in a later-twelfth century hand to London, British Library Cotton Faustina A. X, 115v. 147

21) B21.5.6 Recipes transcribed by Humphrey Wanley. 148

22) B21.5.7 A single eleventh-century recipe *Wiþ þa blegene* (for blains) added in a blank space to London, British Library Cotton Titus D. XXVI, 16v. 149

23) B21.5.8 ‘Flyleaf Recipes’ being a collection of eight Latin and Old English recipes occurring after the Medicina de Quadrupedibus in Cotton Vitellius C.iii, and 82vb–83rb and two recipes from f. 18v (after the table of Contents of the Herbal, on a blank page facing the frontispiece) in multiple hands of s. xi and s.xi/xii. 150

24) B21.5.9.1 A marginal veterinary remedy for lung disease in cattle from Cotton Vitellius E. XVIII. f. 15v. 151

25) B21.5.9.2 A marginal veterinary remedy for sheep from Cotton Vitellius E. XVIII. 15v. 152

26) B21.5.10 The Omont fragment. 153

27) B21.6.1 Medical and botanical Texts in Dresden Sächsische Landesbibliothek, Dc. 187. 154

28) B21.6.2 Medical and botanical Texts in Dresden Sächsische Landesbibliothek, Dc. 185. 155

29) B21.6.2 *Peri didaxeon* (*Peri D*) 156

As we can see, there are a number of potential problems with the above list. One of the problems is that it separates out tables of contents from the texts to which they are appended. This artificially inflates the number of discrete texts by three at least. A more pressing problem in the corpus lies in the human fallibility of those who painstakingly transcribed it. In a corpus of around 3.5 million words, it is not surprising that there is a small, but significant number of errors. One example will serve to show why it is necessary to go beyond the electronic editions.

In the Old English *Herbal*, we find OE *wæt* in an unusual syntactic position but for which the semantic extension of generic fluid > human urine could be inferred. This would be a unique case of extension of the strong neuter substantive *wæt* with this sense:

---

147 Also printed in Cockayne, ed., *Leechdoms* III, 292.
150 D’Aronco and Cameron, *Old English Illustrated Pharmacopoeia*, 82vb–83rb, Old English and Latin recipes are printed Cockayne, ed., *Leechdoms* I, 374–8. Confusingly, the recipes on f. 18v are printed on p. 378 of Cockayne. See also Ker, Catalogue, nos. 219.2 and 219.4.
155 Ibid., 432.
The word is *wæt* in the *DOEC*, either mistranscribed, or based on Cockayne’s reading, but read as *þæt* by de Vriend, according to whose reading the text may be translated as ‘For narrowness of breath and bone-ache and in case (*wið þæt*) one urinates painfully.’ Most conclusively, we may examine the manuscript evidence. The first recipe in the table of contents for *herba abrotanus*, numbered cxxxi in London, British Library, Cotton Vitellius C. III, 16va clearly reads ‘Wiþ nyrwyt 7 banexe 7 wið *þæt* man earfo þlice gemigan mæge.’

If this single error were allowed through unchecked, it would alter our perception of the possible semantic range of the word *wæt*, which is indeed covered extensively in Chapter 5, but that the online corpus can be misleading means that we must check all readings of the text against the best printed sources in the first instance and against manuscript witnesses whenever there is cause for doubt.

Another problem with the corpus is the division between prose and verse, which sees large sections of the texts outlined above removed from their contexts and presented as verse under the heading of ‘metrical charms’ with the alphanumeric designation A43 in Cameron’s *Catalogue*.

There are twelve such charms in the corpus, all taken from the Anglo-Saxon Poetic Records edition. The texts are as follows

A43.1 ‘*For Unfruitful Land*’ (Marginal Charm from London, British Library, Cotton Caligula A. VII)

A43.2 ‘*The Nine Herbs Charm*’ (*Lacnunga* 76)

A43.3 ‘Against a Dwarf’ (*Lacnunga* 86).

A43.4 ‘For a Sudden Stitch’ (*Lacnunga* 127)

A43.5 ‘For Loss of Cattle’ (*Lacnunga* 149)

A43.6 ‘For Delayed Birth’ (*Lacnunga* 161–3)

---

157 ‘For narrowness [of breath] and bone-ache and for urine one may urinate painfully.’
160 D’Aronco and Cameron, *Old English Illustrated Pharmacopoeia*, 16va.
A43.7 ‘For the Water-Elf Disease’ (Leechbook III.63)\textsuperscript{167}  
A43.8 ‘For a Swarm of Bees’ (Marginal Charm from Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 41)\textsuperscript{168}  
A43.9 ‘For Theft of Cattle’ (Marginal Charm from CCCC 41).\textsuperscript{169}  
A43.10 ‘For Loss of Cattle’ (Marginal Charm from CCCC 41).\textsuperscript{170}  
A43.11 ‘A Journey Charm’ (Marginal Charm from CCCC 41).\textsuperscript{171}  
A43.12 ‘Against a Wen’ (Marginal Charm from London, British Library Royal 4. A. XIV)\textsuperscript{172}  

Of these twelve texts, items 2–7 and 12 are specifically medical, in that they are concerned with the preservation of health.\textsuperscript{173}  
Five of the items are taken directly from the medical commonplace book, the Lacnunga, while another item is a remedy found in Leechbook III. The remaining items may or may not be considered medical texts depending on the operative definition of medicine that one chooses to employ, an issue that we will deal with forthwith. The most important issue, however, in the following study, is that those metrical passages which occur within longer prose compilations are referenced by the prose work within which they occur, so the six items which are removed from their original contexts by association with Dobbie’s ‘metrical charms’ are restored to the texts to which they properly belong when the lexical data are analysed.

\textit{Defining Medicine}

The Oxford English Dictionary defines the art of medicine as ‘the science or practice of the diagnosis, treatment, and prevention of disease,’ a definition which may seem self-evident at first. But is this a useful operational definition, and if so, what are its implications for the classification of the texts above?  
Let us take one borderline example. Cameron’s Catalogue number B21.4, the Formation of the Foetus refers to a short text of eighteen lines of continuous Old English prose found in a late eleventh-century manuscript, Cotton Tiberius A. III, 40v–41r. Chardonnens defines the text as a prognostic due to the fact that it finishes with a prediction of calamity on a certain night of the week in the final sentence of the text, which concludes ‘that harms the woman to her death if the child is

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{168}Dobbie, ed., \textit{Minor Poems}, p. 125.
  \item \textsuperscript{169}\textit{Ibid.}, pp. 125–6.
  \item \textsuperscript{170}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 126
  \item \textsuperscript{171}\textit{Ibid.}, pp. 126–8
  \item \textsuperscript{172}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 128.
  \item \textsuperscript{173}On the medical nature of the Dwarf charms see C. Doyle, ‘Dweorg in Old English: Aspects of Disease Terminology’, \textit{Quaestio Insularis} 9 (2009), 99–117.
\end{itemize}
not delivered because it turns into a disease deadly to her in her womb, most often on a Tuesday night.\footnote{174}

In its \textit{fontes}, the text can be classified as medical insofar as it is one of the few surviving extracts of the works of Helvius Vindicianus, a fourth-century North African physician, to survive in Old English, being a rough paraphrase of the twentieth chapter of his \textit{De gynaecia}.\footnote{175} A more immediate Latin source for the Old English text has been located and edited by Prof. Rolf H. Bremmer, wherein the twentieth chapter of the \textit{Gynaecia} has been paraphrased and circulated as an isolated fragment of scholarly interest in an early ninth-century manuscript.\footnote{176}

The text is concerned with the monthly development of the foetus in utero and speculates upon the order of the formation of various anatomical structures, and the effect that this has on the mother. Can it be considered medical within our operational framework above, however? The answer would be a tentative ‘maybe.’ The text tells us that death and disease can follow from a perfectly natural function (pregnancy and childbirth), and it also describes much in the realm of anatomy and physiology. While it prognosticates more than it diagnoses, however, prognostication can be a medical activity if it concerns the health of the body.

Another criterion we can apply is manuscript context. The text describing the formation of the foetus occurs in a manuscript that is most definitely not intended as a medical compendium, but rather the text falls within a group of prognostics in a manuscript containing many texts pertinent to the observation of the rules of a Benedictine foundation. On these grounds alone, we could exclude the \textit{Formation of the Foetus} text as a whimsical note added to a monastic miscellany for the purposes of facilitating scriptural exegesis. Yet if we do this, we are obliged conversely to include in our definition of medical texts all items which occur in manuscripts which were obviously intended as medical compendia, such as London, British Library, Harley 585 which contains the Old English texts of the \textit{Herbal}, \textit{Medicina de quadrupedibus} and the \textit{Lacnunga}. The \textit{Lacnunga} is, however, problematic in that it includes many items of a non-medical nature alongside its many medical prescriptions.

Indeed, even Bald’s \textit{Leechbook}, which forms the basis of the following linguistic analysis, contains a number of prescriptions which are not strictly medical, such as the use of herbal periapts to prevent fatigue on a journey, and a description of the magical properties of jet. Furthermore, many liturgical and religious texts are prescribed to be sung in the context of medical recipes. Does

\footnote{174} A prognostic is defined as ‘a codified means of predicting events in the life-time of an individual or identifiable group of individuals, using observation of signs and times, or mantic divination,’ in Chardonnens, \textit{Anglo-Saxon Prognostics}, 900–1100, p. 8.
this make them medical texts in and of themselves? Of course not: rather texts such as the _Lorica of Gildas_ and quotations from the Bible and patristic authors are used due to the perceived efficacy of prayer in the preservation of the health of the body.

**Major Old English Medical Texts**

Of the twenty-nine texts categorized as medical prose in Cameron’s _Catalogue_, there are only five texts of any substantial length which comprise the majority of the data.

**Bald’s Leechbook and Related Texts**

Bald’s _Leechbook_ is probably the most important text for the current study, but unfortunately no critical edition has been published since Cockayne’s editio princeps.177

**Manuscript Witnesses.**


The principal manuscript for Bald’s _Leechbook_ is the oldest surviving relatively complete Old English medical codex. The manuscript was written in a continuous hand also responsible for Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 173, the Parker Chronicle annals for the years 925–55, fols. 26–7. Ker suggests that this scribe was operating in Winchester.178

The hand is generally clear and easy to read, and the text has been rubricated, possibly by the same scribe, mostly producing large coloured initials at the start of each new recipe, but reducing in frequency shortly after the end of the first chapter. There is a missing gathering between f. 104v and f. 105r where eight chapters mentioned in the Table of Contents to _Leechbook_ II are wanting.

H55: London, British Library, Harley 55 ff. 1–4 contains medical recipes used by Cockayne to fill in for a chapter from a missing gathering in R alluded to in its Table of Contents, forming Bald’s _Leechbook_ II.59. The agreement between the wording of the Table of Contents in R and the wording of the recipes in H55 is uncanny, and both were most certainly copied from related exemplars. Ker dates the relevant part of the manuscript to the first quarter of the eleventh century.179

---


178 Ker, _Catalogue_, p. 333.

179 Ibid., pp. 301–2.
Structure

At the widest level, the division of Bald’s *Leechbook* into two books, one dealing with internal and one external medicine is significant. There is very little recapitulation of material between the two books, but a significant degree of cross-referencing, especially to the recipe for *oxymel* which occurs at II.59.17 (that is, within the *Leechbook Fragment*), but is referenced at I.79.1, II.40.1 and II.43.1.

Book I follows a clear *a capite ad calcem* structure from Chapters 1–30, dealing with the head, eyes, ears, throat, face, nose and lips, coughs, thoracic organs, hiccup (being caused by the stomach), nausea, shoulders, lumbar spine, thighs, knees, shins, feet and genitals. With the exception of chapter 37 on dysuria, chapter 56 on ‘sleeping’ limbs and chapter 59 on paralysis, chapters 31–60 all deal with cutaneous disorders, if we consider jaundice, wherein the skin is yellow, and dropsy, wherein water is retained beneath the skin, to be categorisable as cutaneous. Chapter 61 deals with joints, while chapters 62–6 all deal with fevers and disorders of the mind which are all grouped together due to the similarity in the mode of cure which is prescribed for them, being largely exorcistic. Chapter 67 deals with the purification of spoiled foodstuffs, chapter 68 dealing with the bites of toxic spiders and rabid hounds respectively, and chapter 70 gives herbal prescriptions to either boost or reduce a man’s libido.

After this, the order seems to break down, and recipes appear which should rightly have appeared earlier in the book, such as chapter 71 on the foreshortened foot, which would surely have been better place at the end of the section on individual limbs (1–30). Chapter 72 on bloodletting is perhaps well placed here, but the following chapters on cutaneous disorders (73–7) and lack of appetite (78) have more in common with earlier material, and could be considered misplaced. Chapters 79 and 86 are both magical acts to avoid fatigue on a long journey, and chapter 85 is a magical charm for victory in battle, while the remaining chapters are more traditionally ‘medical,’ giving remedies for drunkenness, coldness, insomnia, generic antidotes for poison, loss of voice, and equine medicine. After this very general survey of remedies for easily identifiable complaints, Book II devotes a much greater amount of space to individual structures, following a roughly downward trajectory through the alimentary canal, first dealing with the stomach (1–16), then the liver (17–24), the intestines (25–33) and the spleen (34–45). After this, more external structures, such as the lungs are dealt with, so pleurisy, or pain of the sides, and lung diseases are dealt with in chapters 46–51, then follow emetics and purgatives (52–5), dysentery (56), the colon and bladder (lost), apoplexy or paralysis (59), gynaecology (lost), other lost recipes, a fragmentary letter from the Patriarch of Jerusalem to King Alfred (64), miscellaneous recipes (65) and a list of the magical properties of jet (66). The book concludes with a note on the relative densities of fluids (67).
Sources

Taking an overarching view of the compilation, it would seem that the primary sources for Book II were the pseudo-Galenic Liber tertius and the Latin Practica Alexandri. The compiler seems to have arranged the material primarily to include differential diagnostics found in the Liber tertius, and then augmented this with relevant material from the Practica Alexandri.

The other main source for Leechbooks I and II is the Physica Plinii, while individual recipes and entire chapters scattered throughout the compilation can be traced to Oribasius, Pseudo-Antonius Musa, Celsus, and the late Latin translations of Soranus of Ephesus known as the Liber Esculapii and Liber Aurelii. The sources which have been traced so far have been presented alongside the transcription and translation of Bald’s Leechbook. It should be noted that the Salernitan compilation known as the Passionarius has often been described as a source for the Leechbooks, especially by Talbot, but also by Cameron, although this text was probably compiled too late to have been available to the translators of Bald’s Leechbook. The fact remains that the Passionarius does contain some very useful parallels with Bald’s Leechbook. I would posit that these parallels should be considered secondary witnesses to shared sources, some of which may be lost, that were used in the compilation of both the Latin and vernacular compendia which were composed as far apart as Salerno and England between the ninth and eleventh centuries.

Characteristics

Although Bald’s Leechbook contains some of the most sophisticated aetiological and diagnostic passages drawn from antique medicine, it is nonetheless pertinent to note that these coincide with the same kind of liturgical and magical charms, prayers and magical activities which have been derided in the Lacnunga (below).

In the present study, the existence of the aetiological and diagnostic passages in Bald’s Leechbook is of the utmost importance, giving one of the clearest insights into the assimilation of antique medical concepts into Anglo-Saxon intellectual culture, and the translation of abstract technical vocabulary into the Old English language. It is because of this feature of Bald’s Leechbook that it has become the most important text in the corpus for the current project.

Where a pharmacopoeia will simply list a term, such as ‘ad struma’ or ‘de parotidis’ and follow it with a recipe from a given plant or animal, Bald’s Leechbook will often contain theoretical information on the cause of the disease and differential criteria to better inform diagnosis and treatment of the translation equivalent ‘healsgund.’ In this specific case, a disease of the neck, the recipes given generally agree with those from the pharmacopoeia (see Leechbook I.4.1–7) such as

---

181 See Chapter 3 below.
the Old English Herbal, but the differential diagnosis is unique to the Leechbook, and is drawn from the pseudo-Galenic Liber tertius or other such sources (see Leechbook I.4.8–11). In Leechbook II, this factor is even more pronounced, and the attention to anatomical and pathological detail means that individual structures such as the liver, spleen, stomach and intestines extend over groups of up to ten consecutive chapters each.

The other characteristic of the Leechbook is its reliance on regimen in both therapy and prophylaxis, assimilating the theories of health transmitted to western Europe through the Latin translations of Alexander of Tralles, Oribasius, and to a lesser extent, Soranus of Ephesus. This recourse to regimen is not limited to diet, but includes advice on exercise, sleep patterns and even the advisability of coitus for individuals of a given humoral temperament.

Secondary Manuscript Witnesses to the Bald’s Leechbook

Audrey Meaney has collated a large number of parallels between Bald’s Leechbook and other independently circulating medical compilations.182 This work could form the platform for future work on the transmission of vernacular medical collections in Anglo-Saxon England, but has not been taken into account in the edition in Appendix I. The secondary manuscript witnesses are as follows:

Ot: London, British Library, Cotton Otho B XI, s. xi 1, Ker 180, Gneuss 357.

Nw: London, British Library, Add. 43703, the ‘Nowell Transcript.’

Cotton Otho B. XI, dated by Meaney to the early eleventh century and copied ‘certainly at Winchester,’183 was badly damaged in the Ashburnham House fire of 1731. Luckily a transcript was made by Laurence Nowell in 1562. While fifty-two leaves of the original manuscript now survive, the Nowell transcript preserves the original manuscript as it was described by Humphrey Wanley’s Catalogus, although according to Ker there already seems to have been some re-arrangement of leaves by this time.184

In addition to laws, the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, historical fragments and the Burghal Hidage, the manuscript also contains medical recipes on ff. 261–4 of the Nowell transcript. Ker describes seventeen recipes parallel with recipes in the Leechbook, and notes four recipes which are not, while Meaney describes it as a collection of ‘more than fifty’ recipes.185 The difference between fifty and twenty-one seems to be a difference in opinion regarding what constitutes a single recipe, and

---

183 Ibid., Ker rather loosely dates the fragment to s. x med.–xi1.
Meaney presumably counts every syntactic unit beginning in OE *eft* as a separate remedy, while Ker may have based his numbering on more explicit scribal notations. Meaney suggests that ‘this may have been the Alfredian fair copy of Bald’s *Leechbook*.’

OF: Louvain-la-Neuve, Université Catholique de Louvain, Centre Général de Documentation, Fragmenta H. Omont 3, The ‘Omont Fragment,’ s. ix med–x in, Gneuss 848.

The Omont Fragment is the most recently discovered piece of medical literature in Old English. It was first described by Schauman and Cameron in 1977. The fragment is difficult to date and its provenance is a complete mystery. Cameron uses dialectal, orthographic, palaeographic and codicological features of the fragment to date it to ‘between 850 and 900 A. D.,’ while he locates its production at ‘a scriptorium where Mercian conventions of writing were observed.’ The fragment contains eleven medical recipes, six of which are parallel to *Leechbook* chapters I.38, and I.33. The further five recipes in Omont lines 11–14 ‘are grouped together in the same order in both manuscripts, forming the bulk of Bald’s *Leechbook* I.23.’

**Bald’s *Leechbook* and the *Lacnunga***

There are significant textual parallels between the *Lacnunga* and Bald’s *Leechbook*. These parallels were first identified by Audrey Meaney, but the following summary is taken from Pettit’s Edition.

**Table 2.2: Textual Parallels between Bald’s *Leechbook* and the *Lacnunga***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bald’s <em>Leechbook</em></th>
<th>Variant</th>
<th>Latin Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I.1.4</td>
<td><em>Lacn 3</em></td>
<td><em>PPB 1.23, PPFP 1.1.23</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.1.5</td>
<td><em>Lacn 1</em></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.1.6</td>
<td><em>Lacn 2</em></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.2.33</td>
<td>*Lacn 13</td>
<td><em>PPB 17.5, PPFP 1.15.5</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.2.34</td>
<td><em>Lacn 105</em></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.2.42</td>
<td><em>Lacn 6</em></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.4.1</td>
<td><em>Lacn 108</em></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description 1</th>
<th>Description 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I.7.1</td>
<td>*Lacn 102</td>
<td>DHVL 30 (OEH 1.13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.15.1</td>
<td>Lacn 173</td>
<td>PAL 2.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.15.2</td>
<td>Lacn 173</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.15.3</td>
<td>Lacn 174</td>
<td>Herb. 45.1 (OEH 46.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.15.4</td>
<td>Lacn 175</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.17.1</td>
<td>Lacn 177</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.17.2–3</td>
<td>Lacn 178</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.17.4</td>
<td>Lacn 179</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.17.5</td>
<td>Lacn 180</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.21.3</td>
<td>*Lacn 116</td>
<td>DHVL 14 (OEH 1.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.22.1</td>
<td>*Lacn 109</td>
<td>DHVL 46 (OEH 1.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.24.1</td>
<td>Lacn 37</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.32.6</td>
<td>Lacn 36</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.34.1</td>
<td>Lacn 140</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.39.1–1</td>
<td>Lacn 87</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.39.2</td>
<td>Lacn 89</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.39.3</td>
<td>Lacn 90</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.39.4</td>
<td>Lacn 91</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.39.5</td>
<td>Lacn 92</td>
<td>MP III.24.1, PPFP III 34.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.39.6</td>
<td>Lacn 93</td>
<td>MP 24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.39.7</td>
<td>Lacn 94</td>
<td>MP 24.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.39.8</td>
<td>Lacn 95</td>
<td>MP 24.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.39.9</td>
<td>Lacn 96</td>
<td>MP 24.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.39.10</td>
<td>Lacn 97</td>
<td>HN 28.190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.39.11</td>
<td>Lacn 98</td>
<td>HN 30.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This list of similarities between these two texts suggests that parts of Bald’s *Leechbook* may have circulated independently in the vernacular to ultimately be included in the Lacnunga. This means that, although Harley 585 was copied in the eleventh century, parts of the text in question date back to the mid-tenth or even late-ninth century, making it a useful secondary witness to the oldest Anglo-Saxon vernacular medical literature.

**Leechbook III**

The standard edition of *Leechbook* III is still that of Cockayne, despite the version of Leonhardi and Olds’ unpublished doctoral dissertation.  

**Manuscript Witness**

*Leechbook* III occurs in MS R after the colophon naming Bald as the owner of *Leechbooks* I and II. The overlap of recipes between *Leechbook* III and Bald’s *Leechbook* suggests that they were originally separate compilations copied together by the scribe of R.

**Structure**

*Leechbook* III contains 73 numbered chapters, roughly structured *a capite ad calcem*. The ordering of the chapters is initially identical to that of *Leechbook* I, beginning with the head, eyes, ears, mouth and teeth, then moving onto the neck (chapter 7), but then breaking with the standard order by dealing with *bite* (*cancer*) before coughs and bloody sputum (chapters 9–10). Chapters 11–23 deal with what could be considered ‘internal’ complaints, occurring in a similar order to the subject

---

groupings of Leechbook II, namely the stomach, spleen, loin, intestines, kidney, bladder and bowel movements, while chapters 24–36 return to the external, dealing with joint pain, burns, injuries and skin disorders, with the exception of chapters 27–8, which would appear to belong to the previous group of ‘internal’ problems. The following chapters deal with gynaecology and obstetrics before moving onto mental disorders, ‘the temptation of fiends,’ parasitic infections, purgatives, paralysis and various other complaints.

The a capite ad calcem structure is somewhat disjointed, given that chapter 46 deals with eyes, and should therefore have followed chapter 2. Likewise, chapter 60 deals with complaints of the ear and should occur after the group of eye remedies.

Relevance

This text is a rich source of lexical evidence for disease terms, seemingly compiled in a slightly different dialect to the other Leechbooks, but copied alongside them. As such it offers a useful comparandum for competing terms. Unfortunately, the Latin sources for Leechbook III have not been investigated at all, and as such the comparative methodology preferred in the following analysis is largely impossible with respect to this text.

The Herbal and Medicina de quadrupedibus

The Old English Herbal and Medicina de quadrupedibus travel together in all of the manuscripts in which they occur, and are thus considered as a coherent unit, sometimes considered in toto as the Herbal Complex. The definitive edition is that of De Vriend.191

Manuscript Witnesses

There are four manuscript witnesses for the Herbal Complex:

V: London, British Library Cotton Vitellius C. III (Ker 212, Gneuss 402)

V is a deluxe illuminated manuscript dated to the first quarter of the eleventh century by Ker. The manuscript has been published in facsimile by D’Aronco and Cameron.192 This is generally considered the best manuscript of the text, although the corrosive green dye used to illuminate many of the plants has eaten through the parchment in places, creating textual lacunae. In addition to the Old English Herbal and Medicina de quadrupedibus, the manuscript contains some medical recipes in Latin and Old English added by multiple later hands.

191 De Vriend, ed., Herbarium.
192 D’Aronco and Cameron, Old English Illustrated Pharmacopoeia.
B: Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 76, fols 68–130ra (Ker 328, Gneuss 633)

B is dated by Ker to the mid eleventh century. It is very close to MS V in readings, and space had been left for illuminations in similar places, which had never been executed. In addition to the catalogue entries, the manuscript has been described by Hecht, and de Vriend.\(^\text{193}\) The manuscript was originally in two parts which were evidently both at Winchester in the early thirteenth century, as both sections of the manuscript bear the markings of the ‘Tremulous Hand.’ Ker defines them as A and B, ff. 1–67 (s. xi1) and ff. 68–139 (s. xi med) respectively, bound together ‘as early as 1200,’\(^\text{194}\) while Gneuss separately numbers the first and second sections, nos. 632 and 633 respectively. While the Worcester provenance of the manuscript is unanimously agreed upon, the origin is not discussed by any of the standard authorities.

In addition to the Old English *Herbal* and *Medicina de quadrupedibus*, the second part of the manuscript contains a Latin lapidary on ff. 131–9.

Christine Franzen notes that the ‘Tremulous Hand of Worcester’ made two Latin glosses in the Old English *Herbal*, and made a number of ‘Middle English respellings of the Old English names of the herbs,’ completed the chapter numbering in Roman numerals where the rubricator had left off and a ‘large number of *nota* signs,’ all suggesting that the manuscript was of practical interest to the ‘Tremulous Hand’ and his community.\(^\text{195}\)

H: London, British Library, Harley 585 (Ker 231, Gneuss 421)

This manuscript is the oldest witness to the Old English Herbal according to Ker’s dating (s. x/xi), and also contains a separate compilation of medical recipes, charms and prayers that has accrued the editorial title ‘*Lacnunga*.’ The manuscript has been described by de Vriend and Pettit.\(^\text{196}\) The MS contains the OE version of the enlarged *Herbarium* and *Medicina de quadrupedibus* on ff. 1–129. No space has been left in the text for illustrations, and Ker describes the script of the manuscript as ‘a rather rough and debased square Anglo-Saxon minuscule.’ It could be argued that this manuscript was thus produced as a practical working compilation. The Herbal begins imperfectly on f. 1 on ‘genim ða ylcan wyrte,’ suggesting that a gathering has been lost from the beginning of the manuscript. The table of contents is found after the *Herbal* on fols. 115–29v, in a later hand to that of the *Herbal*.


\(^{194}\) Ker, *Catalogue*, pp. xx–xxiii.
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Although it has subsequently been dated to the mid-twelfth century, Ker excluded this manuscript from his catalogue on the grounds that he considered it to date from after 1200.\(^{197}\) It has also been omitted from Helmut Gneuss’s catalogue, which only list manuscripts produced before 1100. The description by de Vriend will be sufficient for the present purposes, however.\(^{198}\)

The *Herbal* has been rearranged to follow the alphabetical order of the Latin names of the plants on fol. 1–41r. While de Vriend states that it is ‘based on the enlarged *Herbarium*’ it may well be a re-translation from a new recension of the *Herbarius*. It is considerably different from the other Old English witnesses of the *Herbarius*, to the point that de Vriend prints it in parallel rather than attempting to collate it as part of the same recension.\(^{199}\) The *Medicina de quadrupedibus* occurs on fol. 44r–51r. The manuscript also contains the sole witness of the Old English *Peri didaxeon*.

### Structure

The *Herbal* comprises 185 chapters, each treating the medical properties of an individual plant. It is normally preceded in manuscripts by a table of contents. The *Medicina de quadrupedibus* follows the *Herbal* and contains fourteen chapters, thirteen of which relate to the use of animal parts in medicine, one of which (chapter 2) actually pertains to the mulberry tree.

### Sources

The Herbal Complex in Old English is a conflation of a number of related Latin texts which often circulated together in manuscript. The *Herbal* is drawn from three separate sources. Chapter 1 is a translation of pseudo Antonius Musa *De herba vettonica liber*. Chapters 2–132 are a translation of the *Herbarius* attributed to Apuleius Platonicus, while the remaining fifty-nine chapters are translated from the *Liber medicinae ex herbis femininis*, attributed to Pedanius Dioscorides of Anaxarbas. Of these three Latin texts, two are printed by Howald and Sigerist,\(^ {200}\) while the pseudo-Dioscorides remains unedited, with the exception of those parallels identified by De Vriend with the Old English *Herbal*.\(^{201}\)

The *Medicina de Quadrupedibus* is similarly a complex of multiple texts with a shared transmission history, chapter 1 being a translation of the epistolary *Liber de taxone* attributed to Idpartus rex Aegyptiorum, chapter 2 being a translation of a Latin treatise on the medical properties
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197 Ker, *Catalogue*, p. xix.
199 Ibid., pp. xxxviii–xliv.
of the Mulberry tree ‘inserted out of place’ in Lucca, Biblioteca Governativa, 296 (s. vii–x), which de Vriend uses as a source parallel in his edition.\textsuperscript{202} The remaining twelve chapters are a translation of the shorter $\alpha$-recension of the Liber medicinae ex animalibus as found in Howald and Sigerist.\textsuperscript{203}

**Characteristics**

The Old English *Herbal* and *Medicina de quadrupedibus* are by nature pharmacopoeia, that is, lists of medically efficacious substances and how to use them. Each chapter lists the pertinent facts of how to harvest a plant or animal substance, and then goes on to list the medical uses. Diagnostic criteria and aetiological information concerning named diseases are sparse at best; however, the existence of a parallel text edition in Latin and Old English makes this an ideal text for the study of the relationship between medical vocabulary in the two languages.

The most important historiographical contribution to our understanding of the *Herbal* was made by Linda Voigts, who noted that the departures between the Latin and Old English materials often helped in the disambiguation between foreign and native plants of the same name, as well as suggesting that the most unobtainable plants were edited out, making the *Herbal* a useful guide to the preparation of medicine for a practitioner with little or no training in medicine.\textsuperscript{204} The *Medicina de quadrupedibus* with its frequent prescription of animal faeces typifies the kind of medieval *Dreckapothek* which tends to revolt modern sensibilities, and this text still awaits an optimistic reassessment of the kind made for the *Herbal* by Voigts.

**The Lacnunga**

The *Lacnunga* has been edited several times since Cockayne’s *editio princeps*, and has been the linchpin of the historiographical debate regarding the nature of Old English medical texts.

**Manuscript Witness**

The *Lacnunga* survives uniquely in MS H fols 130–93. Ker divides the text into two sections, compiled at different times on the basis of the script: i. ff. 130–179 Old English and Latin s. x/xi recipes Pettit nos. i–xxx, including the *Lorica of Gildas* in Latin with continuous Old English gloss. ii. ff. 179–93 Old English and Latin s. xi\textsuperscript{1}: continuation of the charms, which, according to Ker, were not part of the original manuscript.

\textsuperscript{202} De Vriend, ed., *Herbarium*, p. lxiv.

\textsuperscript{203} Howald and Sigerist, ed., *Herbarius*, pp. 235–86.

Structure

The text is arranged roughly *a capite ad calcem* although the system is nowhere near as coherently followed through as in Bald’s *Leechbook*. Since there are no chapter divisions in the manuscript itself all chapter divisions are editorial, which makes referencing difficult, since the *DOEC* uses the edition of Grattan and Singer which has been superseded by that of Pettit.

Sources

Pettit lists ten separate Latin texts which he has found to have analogous passages with the *Lacnunga*. Many of these are the same as those for Bald’s *Leechbook*, which is unsurprising, given that the two texts may share a transmission history, albeit a convoluted one that is not easily disentangled.\(^\text{205}\)

i. Pliny, *Historia naturalis*

ii. *Medicina Plinii*

iii. *Physica Plinii*

iv. Marcellus, *De medicamentis liber*

v. Pseudo Apuleius, *Herbarium*

vi. Sextus Placitus, *Medicina ex animalibus*\(^\text{206}\)

vii. *Practica Alexandri Latine*

viii. *De minutione sanguinis, sive de phlebotomia*

ix. *Virtutes Iohannis*

x. Isidore of Seville, *Etymologiae*

These sources will be described in the following chapter.

Characteristics

Pettit notes that ‘there seems to be at least one remedy for most of the complaints an Anglo-Saxon might reasonably expect to suffer from – with the exception of bleeding (except bleeding from the mouth), wounds, burns and constipation.’\(^\text{207}\) Yet the characteristic of the collection which has drawn most critical attention is its recourse to what Pettit describes as ‘“folk” medicine.’ This aspect of the text is what lead Grattan and Singer to add the suffix ‘Semi-Pagan’ to the title of the *Lacnunga* in their edition, although Pettit rightly notes that the ‘numerous incantations and amulets [are] adapted for use in a Christian era.’\(^\text{208}\) In contrast with the previous scholarship, which stresses the


\(^{(206)}\) Referred to as the *Medicina de quadrupedibus* by Pettit.

\(^{(207)}\) Pettit, ed., *Lacnunga I*, 27.

\(^{(208)}\) Ibid.
superstitious, magical or folkloric elements of the text, Pettit notes that ‘if we exclude prayers then the thirty-one charms in [the Lacnunga] amount to less than a sixth of the total number of entries.’

The text is not completely Old English, but contains significant passages in Latin, as well as some corrupt Old Irish charms.

The Peri didaxeon

Since the editio princeps of Cockayne, a critical edition of the text with parallel Latin has been published by Max Löweneck. A new edition and translation by Danielle Maion is eagerly awaited.

Manuscript Witnesses

The Peri didaxeon exists uniquely in MS O ff. 51v–66v, ending imperfectly with the loss of an unknown number of folios.

Structure

Although the chapters are not numbered, there is a consistent system of rubrication in Latin at the beginning of each recipe or topic.

Sources

The Peri didaxeon is a partial translation of an early medieval Latin medical compilation attributed to Petrocellus of Salerno. The structure of this compilation is highly complex, so it is best perhaps simply to refer the reader to the excellent description of the compilation by Danielle Maion.

Characteristics

The Peri didaxeon is almost macaronic in style, frequently code-switching, and giving every chapter title in Latin before continuing in (late) Old English. The style alternates between the didactic and the practical, being drawn from a complex of texts which arose through gradual accretion around the Peri heresion, being a commentary on the Galenic De sectiis compiled in Ravenna, published by Glaze as an appendix to her PhD.

---

209 Ibid., 96–97.
210 Ibid., 29–32.
In its approach to diagnostics and aetiology, the text represents the early beginnings of Western Galenism, fully integrating what was known about anatomy, physiology and pathology to determine the correct course of treatment, and it is self consciously Galenic in its attribution of remedies and theories to named classical authors such as Hippocrates and Aristotle. The vernacular text is too late to be considered pre-Salernitan, and virtually too late to be considered Old English. Maion suggests that the translation of the Practica Petrocelli from which the Peri didaxeon in O was copied ‘was translated into Old English very probably between the end of the eleventh and the beginning of the twelfth century.’

**Minor Texts**

The remaining medical texts from Anglo-Saxon England fall into three categories based on their magnitude and manuscript transmission. The first class is fragments, being incomplete sections of medical texts bound in with other material. The second class is marginalia in medical compendia, being recipes recorded on blank spaces in vernacular medical manuscripts such as Vitellius C. III or Harley 6258B, and the third class is miscellaneous marginalia, such as the recipes and charms copied into the margins and blank spaces of texts unrelated to medicine, such as the recipe for an eye-salve copied into CCCC 41, in the margins of the Old English translation of Bede’s *Historia ecclesiastica*.

Of these three classes, the first two are the most significant for our present purpose, being a small but significant record of extant vernacular medical knowledge, while the corpus of the second class of marginalia amounts to such a small word count as to be virtually negligible for a broad language survey.

**The Wellcome Fragment**

In addition to the Omont fragment, the Nowell transcript, and Harley 55, all described above as pertinent to the transmission of Bald’s *Leechbook*, five medical recipes survive on a single leaf now in London, Wellcome Library 46. The medical recipes have been published by Napier, and a translation into modern English as well as a bibliography of relevant literature is available in the comprehensive Wellcome catalogue description.

**Marginalia in Medical Manuscripts**

Medical items added to Vitellius C. III are described above in relation to the *DOEC* B21.5.8 ‘Flyleaf Recipes.’ These recipes were added in various hands in blank spaces left by the original scribe. They

---

215 See B21.5.2 in the description of the *DOEC*, item 17 on p. 43 above.
are catalogued by Voigts and Kurz as three separate items: 0105.00, 0167.00 and 0032.00.217 The miscellaneous recipes added to Harley 6258B are catalogued in the DOEC as B21.1.3, ‘Headache’ or ‘De Beta.’ Voigts and Kurtz list two separate items: 0215.00 and 0217.00.

Marginalia and Isolated Items in Non-medical Manuscripts

A huge number of individual recipes have been copied into the margins of various non-medical Anglo-Saxon manuscripts. These fragmentary texts do not, however, form a substantial corpus, and have not generally occurred in the data analysed herein.

Citation Principles

In the following linguistic survey, citations will be to texts, based on the most current editions available, with the exception of Bald’s Leechbook, in which case citations are to the appended edition.

In all cases, Roman numerals are used to denote book number and Arabic numerals to denote chapter and sub-division thereof, even where the editions in question use Roman numerals for chapter divisions.

‘Lacnunga 85’ therefore, would denote Chapter LXXXV in Pettit’s edition: ‘Gif þin heort ace, nim ribban 7 wyl on meolce; drinc nygon morgenas, þe bið soma sel.’218

Tables of contents are denoted by the capital letter ‘H.’ Leechbook I.H.25 would therefore denote the table of contents entry to Chapter 25 of Leechbook I: ‘Læcedomas wiþ scancena sare 7 gif scancan forade synd ofþe ofþer lim feower cræftas 7 hu mon spelcean scyle.’219

Leechbook I.25.2 would be the second remedy in Chapter 25 of Leechbook I: ‘Gif scancan synd forode nim banwyrt gecnuwa geot æges þæt hwite meng tosomne scancoredum men.’220

217 Voigts and Kurtz, ed., ‘Scientific and Medical Writings in Old and Middle English.’
218 ‘If your heart hurts: take ribbe and boil in milk; drink for nine mornings; you will soon be better.’ Text and translation from Pettit, ed., Lacnunga, I, 72–3.
219 ‘Treatments for pain of the shins and if the shins or another limb are broken, and how one should splint it.’
220 ‘If the shins are broken take bone-wort, grind, pour the white of an egg, mix together for the man with the broken shin.’
CHAPTER 3: THE LATIN MEDICAL CORPUS

The sheer bulk of extant Latin medical texts from the early medieval period renders it impossible to give a comprehensive list here. The aims of this chapter are therefore to detail those texts which were demonstrably available in Anglo-Saxon England; primarily those which served as sources for Old English translation, but also a selection of those texts whose existence in Anglo-Saxon England may be inferred for other reasons, such as manuscript witnesses.

An excellent survey of medical Latin texts, with a bias towards the Imperial period, has been compiled by Langslow in the introduction to his study of Latin medical vocabulary. Of great utility are Beccaria’s catalogue of pre-Salernitan manuscripts and Corsetti, Sabbah and Fischer’s bibliography of medieval Latin medical texts.

Latin Medical Texts Attested in Old English Translation and Anglo-Latin

There are essentially two kinds of translated medical text in Old English, those which are translated more or less intact from Latin into Old English, and those which appear in fragmentary extracts as part of compilations from various sources. For methodological purposes, a great deal of attention will be paid to the sources of Bald’s Leechbook, since it is the text for which the smallest proportion of available source study has been published, relative to the amount of the text which can be seen to be translated from Latin. It is a regrettable omission from the current work that the sources for Leechbook III have not been investigated.

The Latin Herbal Complex

As mentioned above, the Old English Herbarium and Medicina de quadrupedibus are translated directly from a complex of Latin texts which often travels together, known collectively as the Herbal Complex. These sources have also been discussed above in Chapter 2. The standard edition of the complex is the Corpus Medicorum Latinorum edition by Howald and Sigerist. Three distinct

221 Langslow, Medical Latin, pp. 60–75. The four authors analysed in his linguistic study are described in greater detail on pp. 41–60.
223 Howald and Sigerist, eds., Herbarius.
recensions of the complex, α, β and γ, have been identified by Howald and Sigerist, who posit a shared archetype for β and γ given the similarity between them, while they describe the witnesses of class α as preserving the text in ‘pristinam formam’.

Recension β is described as having ‘innumerable’ witnesses which tend to have tituli morborum at the start of both pseudo-Apuleius and Sextus Placitus. By contrast, there are very few witnesses to the related γ recension.

Beccaria notes twenty-one manuscripts of the Latin Herbal Complex; four of these are also described by Howald and Sigerist and assigned to the α recension, including London, British Library Harley 4986 (s. xi/xii) [77], Montecassino, Archivio della Badia cod. V. 97 (s. x) [95] and St Gall Stiftsbibliothek, 751 (s. ix) [133]. Beccaria describes seven manuscripts which are categorised among the β recension by Howald and Sigerist, including Paris, BN Fonds latin cod. 6862 (s. ix/x) [24], Oxford, Bodleian 130 (s. xi) [86], Florence, Bibl. Medicea Laurenziana pl. LXXIII 41 (s. ix) [89], Vatican City, Bibl. Apostolica cod. Barberiniano lat. 160 (s. xi) [108], Breslau, Bibl. di Stato e dell’Università cod. III. F 19 (s. ix) [116], London, BL Additional 8928 (s. x) [84] St Gall Stiftsbibliothek 44 (s. ix) [129] and St Gall Stiftsbibliothek 217 [131]. Only two manuscripts of the γ recension are described by both Howald and Sigerist and Beccaria, namely: Paris, BN Fonds latin cod 13955 (s. ix) [39] and Kassel, Landesbibliothek 2nd cod. phys. et hist. nat. 10 (s. ix) [58].

There are nine further manuscripts of the Herbal Complex catalogued by Beccaria but not included in Howald and Sigerist’s edition, whilst several manuscripts of the complex are excluded by Beccaria on the grounds of being too early, such as Vossianus Latina Q 9, (s. vii), or too late, such as Vatican lat. 6337 (s. xv). The eleventh-century Old English Herbal is considered part of the α recension by Howald and Sigerist.

In all, there are about thirty manuscripts of this complex produced between 800 AD and 1100 AD, meaning that this text is found in about a quarter of all medical manuscripts produced in the period covered by Beccaria.

The full version of Pseudo-Antonius Musa’s De herba uettonica liber contains forty-seven herbal recipes in its α recension with interpolations, arranged a capite ad calcem from headache to gout, followed by a list of Nomina herbae, an invocation to Aesculapius and Chiron and an interpolation from Dioscorides’ Materia medica. The truncated β and γ readings tend to be treated as part of the pseudo-Apuleius in manuscript capitulary lists, similar to the tables of contents in the Old English tradition. De Vriend notes that ‘the phraseology of the cures in De herba uettonnica

224 *Quarum classium β et γ inter se magis coniunctae sunt ita ut earum communem archetypum existisse nobis credendum sit’, ‘Of which classes β and γ are so greatly connected between themselves that we ought to understand that a common archetype exists.’ Howald and Sigerist, eds., *Herbarius*, p. v.

225 Numbers in square brackets refer to catalogue numbers in Beccaria, *I codici di medicina del periodo presalernitano*.

*liber* is very similar to that in the *Herbarium Apulei* and both he and Howald and Sigerist assume the attribution to Antonius Musa to be false.\(^227\) This is the only text for which Howald and Sigerist used an Old English reading to improve their Latin text.\(^228\) It is worth noting that recipes from the full α recension which do not occur in the Old English Herbal are nonetheless employed in other Old English medical compilations, most notably the *Leechbooks* and the *Lacnunga*.

The text of Pseudo-Apuleius’ *Herbarius* as presented by Howald and Sigerist contains 131 chapters, each of which comprises a list of medical treatments derived from a given plant species, followed by a range of synonyms and vernacular appellations for the plant. The botanical information about the plants in each chapter of the printed edition occurs at the end of the chapter, in contrast to the arrangement of the Old English text, and is deemed an ‘Interpolatio ex Dioscoride,’ by Howald and Sigerist.\(^229\)

Pseudo-Dioscorides’ *Liber medicinae ex herbis femininis* is an illustrated herbal describing seventy-one plants, loosely based on the Greek works of Dioscorides and translated in the fifth or sixth century. Despite the large number of extant manuscripts, it has never received a full critical edition.\(^230\) Just as an example of its popularity, seven of the sixteen tenth- and eleventh-century manuscripts containing other parts of the Pseudo-Apuleius complex as catalogued by Beccaria also contain pseudo-Dioscorides.\(^231\) Two single-manuscript editions are extant by Hans Zotter and Heinrich Kästner respectively.\(^232\)

The *Liber de taxone* is an epistle purportedly from Idpartus ‘rex Aegyptiorum’ to the emperor ‘Octauus Augusto’ concerning the medicinal uses of the various parts of the badger. Howald and Sigerist present the α and β recensions in parallel. The α recension is that presented as the first chapter of the Old English *Medicina de quadrupedibus*, while the β recension contains additional recipes.\(^233\)

The *Liber medicinae Sexti Placiti Papyriensis ex animalibus, pecoribus et bestiis vel auibus* circulates in two recensions of remarkably differing length, the α recension comprising twelve chapters treating the medicinal uses of various animal species,\(^234\) whereas the β recension contains a further twenty animal species.\(^235\) An anonymous treatise on the mulberry tree only occurs in one

---


\(^{228}\) Howald and Sigerist, ed., *Herbarius*, p. ix.


\(^{231}\) Beccaria, *I codici di medicina del periodo presalernitano*.


\(^{233}\) Howald and Sigerist, ed., *Herbarius*, pp. 229–32.


manuscript of Sextus Placitus noted by De Vriend as ‘inserted out of place’ in Lucca, Biblioteca Governativa, 296 (s. vii–x). 236

**Pliny**

Pliny the Elder’s *Historia Naturalis* contained a significant amount of information of medical interest. It is no surprise that the various recipes and information from his enormous encyclopedia were excerpted and collected together, while a corpus of similar recipes aggregated around them, forming two distinct textual traditions with multiple recensions.

i. **Historia naturalis**

The *Historia naturalis* or ‘natural history’ was composed in the last quarter of the first century AD by the Roman statesman Pliny the Elder. Among the many parts of the compendious encyclopaedia which are relevant to the study of medicine, book vii concerns human physiology, books viii–xi concern zoology, books xii–xxvii concern botany and books xxviii–xxxii concern pharmacology. The medical sections arose due to his wish to include the medical properties of the substances he was describing in a wider encyclopaedic framework. The work was so large and cumbersome that in the Middle Ages it is unlikely to have been available in its entirety to any but the users of the most well stocked monastic and cathedral libraries. Helmut Gneuss notes four manuscripts containing extracts from the text, but no full copy from Anglo-Saxon England. The manuscripts in question are London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius B.v. (Gneuss 373, s. xi2/4), London, British Library, Harley 647 (Gneuss 423, s ix2/4), London, British Library, Harley 2506 (Gneuss 428.4, s. xii) and Leiden, Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit Vossianus Latina F. 4 ff.4–33 (Gneuss 838, s.viii1/3).

ii. **Medicina Plinii**

The *Medicina Plinii* was redacted from the *Historia naturalis* around AD 300. 237 The prologue to the work cites the reason for its compilation as to protect the author and other travellers from the various deceptions of medics. The text is extant in eight of the pre-Salernitan medical manuscripts catalogued by Beccaria. 238

iii. **Physica Plinii**

The *Physica Plinii* was extended from the *Medicina Plinii* in four extant recensions: *Bambergensis*, 239 *Eporediensis*, *Sangallensis*, *Florento-Pragensis*, 240 and an Anglo-Saxon recension

---

240 Schmitz, G., ed., *Physicae quae fertur Plinii Florentino-Pragensis liber tertius*, Lateinische Sprache und Literatur de Mittelalters 24 (Frankfurt am Main, 1988); Wachtmeister, W., ed., *Physica Plinii quae fertur*
which is no-longer extant, but was evidently used in the compilation of Bald’s *Leechbook*. Of these four extant recensions, only the *Florentino-Pragensis* and *Bambergensis* have been the subject of critical editions.

It is sometimes difficult to discern whether a given recipe can be identified as belonging to the original *Historia naturalis*, the *Medicina Plinii* or the *Physica Plinii*, especially if that recipe occurs in translation, not least because of the shared material between all three texts. As pointed out by Adams and Deegan, Bald’s *Leechbook* makes extensive use of the *Physica Plinii*, but in a section of twelve recipes common to both the *Lacnunga* 87–99 and *Leechbook* 1.39.1–12 the majority of the recipes can be traced to the *Medicina Plinii*, and other recipes, such as the burning of a swallow’s nest, can be traced to the *Historia naturalis*. Does this mean that our compiler was utilising the *Medicina Plinii*, and then switched to the *Historia Naturalis*, or does it rather imply that the compiler was translating from a lost recension of the *Physica Plinii* which contained remedies from the *Medicina Plinii* which the extant recensions do not? It is ultimately impossible to tell, but the second possibility cannot be ruled out.

**Isidore of Seville**

The *Etymologiae* or *Origines* of Isidore of Seville were an encyclopaedic collection of knowledge that attempted to fully assimilate natural-historical and etymological knowledge into Christian doctrine. Although the whole collection is not concerned with medicine, Books IV and XI contained information about medicine and medical science, Book IV, for instance, giving a brief account of the genres of medical text, and a short exposition of Galenic humoralsim. The whole of the *Etymologiae* has been published several times, and the books of medical relevance have also been excerpted and subjected to separate medical-historical scrutiny. Isidore drew freely on such sources as Caelius Aurelianus and Vindicianus, while interference from his work also played an important role in the transmission and recompilation of such authors, as his influence can clearly be seen in some recensions of Vindicianus *Gynaecia*.
Of the medical manuscripts catalogued by Beccaria, two manuscripts contain excerpts from multiple books of the *Etymologiae*.246 A further eleven manuscripts contain extracts from Book IV,247 and five further manuscripts contain extracts from Book XVI,248 whilst chapter 2 of Book XV is recorded in a single Parisian medical manuscript.249 It would seem, therefore that Book XI was not frequently excerpted into medical manuscripts of the period in question.

**Known Medical Authors**

A surprising number of Late Antique and Byzantine authors’ works survive, to a greater or lesser degree, in Old English translation, incorporated into Bald’s *Leechbook* and the related fragments and the *Lacnunga*. The following list will differentiate between authors working in Latin and translations of originally Greek works.

**Imperial and Late Latin Authors**

i. **Aulus Cornelius Celsus, *Artes 6–13 = De medicina.***

The eight books of Celsus’ *De medicina* formed part of a larger encyclopaedic work entitled *Artes*, much of which is no longer extant.

*De medicina* is clearly divided into three main sections: dietetics (Books 1–4), pharmaceutics (Books 5–6) and surgery (Books 7–8).250 Langslow dates the composition of *De medicina* to ca. 14–39 AD.251 Although there are few manuscript survivals of *De medicina* from the pre-Salernitan period,252 there are echoes of Celsus’ work in Bald’s *Leechbook* I.35.10, in the procedure for amputation of a gangrenous limb, as well as the description of the disease ‘in which a man vomits faeces’ in II.33.1. It is quite likely that these have been transmitted through an intermediate source.

ii. **Quentus Serenus, *Liber medicinalis***

The *Liber medicinalis* was composed some time between the second and fourth centuries AD. Langslow notes that it is ‘essentially undatable,’ and that it ‘offers remedies to about 80 diseases in 1,107 hexameters divided into 64 chapters.’253 Eliza Glaze notes that annotated copies of the text may

---

246 Vienna, Nationalbibliothek cod. 9 & 10 [Beccaria 2] contains multiple extracts from Book IV, as well as Book XVII chapters 9-11, while Paris, Bibliotheque National, Fonds latin 11219 [Beccaria 35] contains extracts from Books XVI and XX.
247 Beccaria numbers 6, 16, 50, 73, 78, 84, 95, 96, 108 and 134.
248 Beccaria numbers 26, 51, 66, 94 and 120.
249 Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale fonds latin 11218, Beccaria 34.
252 Beccaria notes one manuscript containing excerpts, no. 29 and only two manuscripts of the entire text, nos. 88 and 102.
have been used to teach metrics, rather than medicine.\textsuperscript{254} It is unclear whether or not the text had any vernacular fortunes in Anglo-Saxon England, but it does survive in at least one Anglo-Saxon manuscript according to Gneuss’s \textit{Catalogue}: Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale lat. 4839 (Gneuss 884), copied at the turn of the eleventh century.

\textbf{iii. Heluius Vindicianus}

Heluius Vindicianus was proconsul of the province of Africa during the reign of Theodosius I (379–95AD), and also held the office of \textit{Comes archiatrorum}, a type of medical professorship. He is mentioned several times in writing by Augustine of Hippo. Langslow further notes that ‘his short works … are among the best known and most widely excerpted medical texts throughout the Middle Ages in the West.’\textsuperscript{255} Medical works ascribed to him include:

\begin{itemize}
  \item[a)] \textit{Epistula Vindiciani comitis archiatrorum ad Valentinianum imperatorem}, being a collection of pharmaceutical recipes often transmitted with the works of Marcellus.\textsuperscript{256}
  \item[b)] \textit{Epistula ad Pentadium nepotem}, being an elementary account of physiology based on the theory of the four humours.\textsuperscript{257} The text survives, either partially or completely, in a staggering twenty manuscripts in Beccaria’s Catalogue, suggesting that it was indeed quite popular in the period in question.\textsuperscript{258}
  \item[c)] A complex of shorter works on anatomy and physiology, \textit{De natura generis humani},\textsuperscript{259} \textit{Gynaecia}\textsuperscript{260} and \textit{Epitome altera}\textsuperscript{261} which ‘must be reckoned as the standard text(s) on anatomy and physiology in the pre-Salernitan period.’\textsuperscript{262} The \textit{Gynaecia} survives in twelve of Beccaria’s manuscripts,\textsuperscript{263} whilst the \textit{Epitome altera} survives in only four from the period in question.\textsuperscript{264} Beccaria does not catalogue any witnesses of \textit{De natura generis humani}.
\end{itemize}

The fortunes of Vindicianus in Anglo-Saxon England are limited, but enough to warrant mention. Chapters 19 and 20 of the \textit{Epitome altera}, on the liver and spleen respectively, are found in Bald’s \textit{Leechbook} II.17.1 and II.36.3–4. Furthermore, an independently circulating version of Chapter 20 of

\begin{footnotesize}
\addcontentsline{toc}{section}{References}
\textsuperscript{255} Langslow, \textit{Medical Latin}, pp. 64–5.
\textsuperscript{256} Niedermann, M., ed., \textit{Marcelli De medicamentis liber}, 2nd ed. by E., Liechtenhan, CML 5 (Berlin, 1968), pp., 46–53.
\textsuperscript{257} Rose, ed., \textit{Theodorus Priscianus}, pp. 484–92.
\textsuperscript{258} Beccaria numbers 2, 6, 16, 34, 40, 41, 48, 55, 70, 73, 84, 95, 96, 101, 106, 108, 117, 129, 133 and 137.
\textsuperscript{261} \textit{Ibid.}, pp. 467–83.
\textsuperscript{262} Langslow, \textit{Medical Latin}, p. 65.
\textsuperscript{263} Beccaria numbers 5, 16, 21, 34, 73, 84, 88, 94, 95, 96, 108 and 133.
\textsuperscript{264} Beccaria numbers 29, 103, 117 and 129.
\end{footnotesize}
his *Gynaecia* occurs in an eleventh-century Anglo-Saxon manuscript, London, Cotton Tiberius A. iii, in an Old English translation of an intermediary Latin version identified by Bremmer.  

As noted by Cameron, Bede paraphrases a chapter of Vindicianus’ *Epistula ad Pentadium nepotem* in chapter 35 of his *De temporum racione*, dealing with the relationship between the four elements and the four humours, and the psychological characteristic engendered by each temperament.

iv. **Cassius Felix, De medicina**

*De medicina* is a short handbook of practical medicine of the Logical school datable to 447 AD due to its dedication. The order of chapters is roughly *a capite ad calcem*, Chapters 1–32 covering the head, but with interpolations to the scheme in Chapters 8–27 on diseases of the skin. The further progression is relatively standard, covering the throat and neck (chapter 33–8), the lungs (39–41) the stomach (42), the spleen (43), the liver (44), the kidneys (45), the bladder (46) the intestines (47–51) and the extremities (52–4). The remaining chapters cover fevers (55–66), animal and insect bites (67–70) and gynaecology (77–82).

Chapter 48 of *De medicina* (*Ad dysenteriam*) is quoted by Bede in the *Retractio in Actus apostolorum*, according to Cameron. Whether the text was known in later Anglo-Saxon England is unclear, but extracts of the text survive in four manuscripts catalogued by Beccaria, suggesting that it was known at the time more generally in European medicine.

v. **Marcellus, De medicamentis liber**

The late fourth- or early fifth-century *De medicamentis liber* of Marcellus is described by Langslow as ‘A massive collection of remedies in 36 very long chapters, ordered *a capite ad calcem* and including some magic and folk medicine.’

A number of parallels have been found between Marcellus and Bald’s *Leechbook* as well as the *Lacnunga*, some of which are also to be found in the *Physica Plinii*, while some seem unique to Marcellus. Furthermore, Cameron has noted that Chapters 8–9 of the *Epistula Hippocratis ad Antiochum regem* from Marcellus is quoted directly by Bede in the thirtieth chapter of his *De

---


268 Cameron, ‘Sources of Medical Knowledge’, p. 146.

269 Beccaria numbers 47, 50, 64 and 130.

temporum ratione on equinoxes and solstices, describing the dominance of each humour in turn over the course of the seasons. Beccaria notes only four manuscripts of Marcellus from the period in question, two of which are relatively complete.

Greek Authors in Latin Translation

i. Galen of Pergamum

Of the massive Greek corpus which can faithfully be attributed to Galen, only two early Latin translations are extant, although there is reason to believe that a wider range of Galen’s canon was available in Latin in the sixth century, according to Langslow.

a) De sectis, which inspired later commentaries and was highly influential in the late pre-Salernitan period. The text has been edited from a single manuscript by Nicoletta Palmieri.

b) Ad Glaucnonem de medendi methodo in two books. Except for the editio princeps of 1490, there is no definitive edition of this text, but fragments have been edited, such as the text of the first chapter of Book I by Sigerist, and fragments of Book II by Alois Fauser. As noted by Fischer, nineteen of the manuscripts catalogued by Beccaria transmit Galen’s Ad Glaucnonem, suggesting that it was a very popular medical text at the time. While De sectis seems not to have been influential in England, either directly or indirectly until the eleventh-century introduction of the Practica Petrocelli, Ad Glaucnonem libri duo and the pseudo-Galenic Liber tertius were certainly in circulation in the Anglo-Saxon period. It is unfortunately difficult to determine the extent of vernacular assimilation of the Latin Ad Glaucnonem due to the lack of a full critical edition. Given the extent of Bald’s Leechbook’s reliance on the Liber tertius, it would be surprising if Ad Glaucnonem were not also a source, but this is difficult to verify at present.


272 Beccaria no. 13, 25, 78 and 83. Nos. 13 (Laon 420) and 25 (Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, Fonds latin 6880) contain mutilated and complete copies respectively, whilst the other two codices contain extracts.

273 Langslow, Medical Latin, p. 71.


ii. Pseudo-Galen, Liber tertius

The pseudo-Galenic Liber tertius was composed ‘of apparently ancient but as yet unidentified material’ according to Langslow.\(^{278}\) It takes its title and attribution to Galen from its accretion to the two books of the Latin recension of *Ad Glauconem de medendi methodo*. Fischer describes the Liber tertius as ‘an anonymous, probably incomplete, collection of chapters from an unknown Greek work translated into Latin in Late Antiquity,’\(^{279}\) although the earliest manuscripts of the text noted by Fischer are of the late eighth or early ninth century.\(^{280}\) The text is of great significance in the early Middle Ages, and was later incorporated into the Salernitan canon as part of the *Passionarius* of Gariopontus, who gives full credence to the purported Galenic authority of the texts he compiles, in saying that his compilation is a reorganisation of Galen’s canon.\(^{281}\) The Liber tertius has been edited by Fischer, who uses the eleventh century manuscript Vendôme, Bibliothèque Municipale, 109 as his base text.\(^{282}\) The book consists of eighty numbered chapters which, according to Fischer, progress from head to foot four times over the course of the compilation. The popularity of the text is stressed by Fischer who, noting its frequency in Beccaria’s Catalogue (fourteen items in 144 manuscripts) sees fit even to use an exclamation mark to stress the ubiquity of the text, saying: ‘in jeder zehnten frümittelalterlichen bzw. vorsalernitanischen medizinischen Handschrift finden wir den Liber tertius!’\(^{283}\)

iii. Epistula de febribus and other Pseudogalenic texts

Another text attributed to Galen concerning fevers also appears in Anglo-Saxon manuscripts, notably London, British Library, Sloane 475 (Beccaria 78). It is unclear whether this short text has any vernacular fortunes in Anglo-Saxon England; however, the *Epistula de febribus* seems relatively common in the early Middle Ages, occurring in five further manuscripts catalogued by Beccaria, most of which also contain the Liber tertius or *Ad glauconem*.\(^{284}\)

\(^{278}\) Langslow, *Medical Latin*, p. 71.


\(^{282}\) Fischer, ed. *Liber tertius*; Beccaria no. 45.

\(^{283}\) ‘In every tenth specifically pre-Salernitan early-medieval medical manuscript we find the Liber tertius.’ Fischer, ‘Der Pseudogalenische “Liber tertius”’, p. 102.

\(^{284}\) Beccaria nos. 34, 50, 81, 133 and 135.
A further text deserves mention due to its association with the pseudo-Galenic corpus, namely *De pulsibus et urinis*, a manual of prognostication based on uroscopy and pulse-lore. The text is catalogued in twelve manuscripts by Beccaria.\textsuperscript{285}

iv. Oribasius of Pergamum

Oribasius was a successful fourth-century Greek physician who flourished ca. 320–400 AD and made a number of significant anthologies based upon the Hippocratico Galenic canon. Of his massive Greek output, Latin translations of two works have survived.

a) *Synopsis*

The *Synopsis* survives in two Latin recensions probably made between the middle of the fifth century AD and the end of the sixth. Both recensions have been published in parallel by Molinier as part of the collected works of Oribasius.\textsuperscript{286} The nine books of the *Synopsis* often duplicate material from book to book, so it is possible they were intended for independent circulation. The text is catalogued by Beccaria as the ‘Conspectus ad Eustathium filium.’ Despite the massive size of the compilation, large portions of the entire nine-book leviathan are to be found in seven manuscripts catalogued by Beccaria.\textsuperscript{287}

b) *Euporistes*

The Euporistes is a shorter compilation in 4 books. The title comes from the Greek εὐπόριστος, meaning ‘easy to procure’ suggesting that the *Euporistes* were ‘easily procurable [remedies]’. Beccaria catalogues three witnesses of the Latin ‘Ad Eunapium’ in three books and three fragmentary witnesses or extracts.\textsuperscript{288} Both texts have a strong emphasis on regimen, and tend towards the Methodist school of thought which predominated in the Byzantine Empire, but also frequently quote from Galen. The surviving witnesses to the text demonstrate that it found use in the period in question. Furthermore, several significant extracts from both the *Euporistes* and *Synopsis* survive in Old English translation in Bald’s *Leechbook*. Molinier published the two separate recensions of the text in parallel.\textsuperscript{289}

\textsuperscript{285} Beccaria nos. 9, 10, 16, 36, 63, 94, 95, 100, 103, 108, 117 and 129.


\textsuperscript{287} Beccaria nos. 8, 14, 31, 59, 66 and 108. Fragments and extracts are to be found in nos. 118 and 136. Further extracts from books I–II are found in a further manuscript, Beccaria 129.

\textsuperscript{288} The complete witnesses are Beccaria nos. 14, 59 and 66, whilst the fragmentary witnesses are 6, 118 and 136.

\textsuperscript{289} Molinier, ed., *Euporistes* in Bussemaker and Daremberg, ed., *Oeuvres d’Oribase*, VI, 403–626.
v. Alexander Trallianus

The Byzantine author of the *Therapeutica* or *Alexandri Tralliani medici libri duodecim* can be confidently identified with a successful physician practising in the late sixth century. Alexander’s *Therapeutica*, also known as the *Practica Alexandri* and the *Libri duodecim*, is a thoroughgoing compendium of medical theory and practice, containing aetiological and nosological discussions of all of the diseases it then goes on to prescribe treatments in the standard *capitem ad calcem* order, terminating in a final section on fevers. While some of Alexander’s prescriptions are of a magical nature, employing ligatures, periapts and charms, the majority of the prescriptions are dietetic or pharmacological therapies which conform to the norms of elite Hippocratic medicine. While the Latin text contains fewer such magical recipes, Langslow rejects Lynn Thorndike’s suggestion that the magical recipes were deliberately purged by the Latin translator.

De podagra

A redaction of the chapters of the *Practica Alexandri latine* on gout also circulated independently. According to Langslow it “represents a selection with some rearrangement of part or all of twenty-seven of the thirty-seven chapters on gout at the end of Book II.” This part of the text has no vernacular fortunes in Anglo-Saxon England.

vi. Soranus of Ephesus

Soranus of Ephesus was a medical author almost reaching the canonical status of Galen of Pergamum. Aspects of his Greek corpus were translated into Latin in several versions. The first such translator was Caelius Aurelianus, aMethodist physician of the late fourth and early fifth century whose translations of Soranus include materials no longer extant in Greek.

a) *Celeres siue acutae passiones* together with *Tardae siue chronicae passiones* translate the *Περὶ ὀξέων καὶ χρονίων παθῶν* of Soranus of Ephesus.

b) *Gynaecia* is a translation of Soranus’ Ἔμφασις which survives only in fragments. It has also been edited and translated by Drabkin and Drabkin.

---


291 Langslow, *The Latin Alexander*, pp. 29–30. Langslow’s text presents only select chapters, whilst, excepting those parts of the text attributed to Philumenus and Philagrios, the editio princeps of 1504 is the only extant edition: Fradin, ed., *Practica Alexandri*; The sections by Philumenus and Philagrios have been edited by T. Puschmann, ed., *Nachträge zu Alexander Trallianus*.


c) Medicinales responsiones is a didactic work only extant in fragments. So disparate are the few surviving manuscript readings that Rose prints them separately, one after another.296

Later Translations of Soranus

a) Mustio / Muscio Gynaecia and Cateperotiana
The Γυναικεία of Soranus of Ephesus informed two further Latin translations in addition to the Gynaecia of Caelius Aurelianus, only one of which survives, by a sixth-century African doctor whose name is variously recorded as Mustio, Muscio or Musio in the manuscript tradition. The Cateperotiana was a catechetical redaction for midwives in two books, now lost.297

b) Liber Aurelii de acutis passionibus and Liber Esclapii de chronicis passionibus
Essentially these two compilations are based upon the lost Περὶ ὀξέων καὶ χρονίων παθῶν of Soranus. They are independent of the translations of Caelius Aurelianus, as proven by Schmid, though Cameron perpetuates the old fallacy they were mere redactions of Aurelianus.298

Schmid notes that there is ‘une concordance générale’299 between the Liber Aurelii and Caelius Aurelianus in the topics covered but ‘quelques interventions dans l’ordre des chapitres.’300 Schmid describes the Liber Esclapii, stating that it ‘est composé de 47 chapitres consacrés au diagnostic et au traitement des maladies chroniques’301 and that it roughly follows the plan of Caelius Aurelius but that ‘l’analyse des divers chapitres révèle de profondes divergences.’302

Partly due to Cameron’s conflation of the translations of Caelius Aurelianus and the Aurelius-Esculapius complex, it has been difficult to determine which Soranic translation had the greater impact in Anglo-Saxon England, and indeed, which was more widely, or even exclusively, used in the compilation of Bald’s Leechbook.

vii. Pseudo-Soranus

a) Quaestiones medicinales
The Quaestiones medicinales, falsely attributed to Soranus is ‘a series of medical definitions

297 Langslow, Medical Latin, p. 73.
298 Schmid, Contributions, pp. 42–66; Cameron, ‘Sources of Medical Knowledge,’ p. 141; Only the Liber Aurelius has been published in full: Daremberg, C., ‘Liber Aurelius’, Janus 2 (1847), 468–99, 690–731.
299 ‘A general agreement’ Schmid, Contributions, p. 60.
300 ‘Some changes to the order of the chapters’ Schmid, Contributions, p. 60.
301 ‘It is composed of 47 chapters dedicated to the diagnosis and treatment of chronic diseases.’ Schmid, Contributions, p. 60.
302 ‘The analysis of the various chapters reveals profound differences,’ Schmid, Contributions, p. 60.
presented in question and answer form,’ according to Langslow.\textsuperscript{303} Some of the more difficult vocabulary in the text was selected and versified in an \textit{aenigma} falsely attributed to Aldhelm of Malmesbury, demonstrating that it may have been used in monastic medical education in Anglo-Saxon England.\textsuperscript{304}

b) \textit{De pulsibus} or \textit{Peri sfignmon}

\textit{De pulsibus} is a tract on diagnosis and prognostication from the pulse. It has been edited by Rose.\textsuperscript{305}

c) \textit{Isagoge}.

The text is described by Langslow as ‘an elementary introduction to the theory and practice of medicine in the form of a catechism.’\textsuperscript{306} By the time of the compilation of Corsetti, Fischer and Sabbah’s bibliography in 1987, only extracts had been published.\textsuperscript{307}

\section*{Medical Compilations}

\subsection*{Liber passionalis}

The \textit{Liber passionalis}, given the whimsical byname ‘Dr Monk’s Medical Digest’ by K. D. Fischer, is the earliest of the compilations based on the \textit{Ad Glaucnonem-Aurelius-Esculapius} complex, the oldest manuscript of which dates ‘to the first half of the ninth century’ according to Fischer.\textsuperscript{308} It follows a structure very similar to that of the \textit{Liber tertius}, from which it borrows heavily. According to Fischer’s summary table, only twelve of the eighty chapters of the \textit{Liber tertius} are not contained within the \textit{Liber passionalis}.\textsuperscript{309} There are also significant parallels between the \textit{Liber passionalis} and the \textit{Practica Alexandri Latine}.\textsuperscript{310} Beccaria does not index the text under the title \textit{Liber passionalis}, but rather under the manuscript title \textit{Oxea et chronia passiones Yppocratis, Gallieni et Urani}.\textsuperscript{311} It is possible that this text will be found to have parallels with vernacular Anglo-Saxon compilations, but it is uncertain whether or not it actually circulated in England.

\textsuperscript{303} Langslow, \textit{Medical Latin}, p. 73.


\textsuperscript{306} Langslow, \textit{Medical Latin}, p. 73.

\textsuperscript{307} Corsetti, Fischer and Sabbah, ed., \textit{Bibliographie des textes médicaux latins: Antiquité et haut moyen âge}, p. 145.

\textsuperscript{308} Fischer, ‘Dr Monk’s Medical Digest’ p. 240.

\textsuperscript{309} Table 1 in Fischer, ‘Dr Monk’s Medical Digest’, p. 250.

\textsuperscript{310} Langslow, ed., \textit{The Latin Alexander}, pp. 54–7.

\textsuperscript{311} Beccaria, \textit{I codici di medicina del periodo presalernitano}, p. 476. The two manuscript witnesses noted are numbers 50 (Berlin, Phillipps lat. 1790) and 134 (St Gall 752). These are the same witnesses used in Langslow, ed., \textit{The Latin Alexander}, p. 39.
ii. The *Tereoperica* or *Practica Petrocelli*

The *Practica Petrocelli* is a complex of texts beginning with the *Peri heresion*. The earliest manuscripts of the compilation are ninth century, and the attribution of the compilation to Petrocellus, an eleventh-century Salernitan physician, by Salvator de Renzi must therefore be erroneous. The structure of the compilation is quite complex, comprising three books of medical recipes, two theoretical *Epistolae* and four short tracts on venesection, but is well described by Danielle Maion. At its head is a version of the *Peri heresion*, being a commentary on the Galenic *De sectiis*, which has been edited by Glaze as an appendix to her doctoral dissertation.

Helmut Gneuss has identified two extracts from the *Tereoperica* in Cambridge, University Library G.g.5.35 (Gneuss 12, Beccaria 70) and London, British Library, Sloane 2839 (Gneuss 498.9, Beccaria 81). In the case of Sloane 2839, the text in question is the *Peri heresion*, rather than the full *Tereoperica*. Cambridge, University Library G. g. 5. 35 contains a short dialogue on the four humours which may also predate the full *Tereoperica*.

The vernacular fortunes of the *Tereoperica* in England are strange indeed, as the text was translated into late Old or early Middle English and copied into London, British Library, Harley 6258B as the *Peri didaxeon*. It is unclear whether the *Tereoperica* also had a role in the compilation of Bald’s *Leechbook*, although Danielle Maion believes that it did.

iii. Gariopontus of Salerno

The *Passionarius* or *Liber nasematon* of Gariopontus is an eleventh-century compilation based upon the *Ad Glauconem* complex, that is, the Latin *Ad Glauconem*, the *Liber tertius*, the *Liber Aurelii*, the *Liber Esculapii* and extracts from Alexander Trallianus and Theodorus Priscianus. Unlike the other so-called Salernitan compilations, this compilation can genuinely be associated with the named individual, Gariopontus. Documentary evidence for the existence of a man named Gariopontus who

---

312 Beccaria has noted two manuscripts containing the Tereoperica, namely Paris BN lat 11219 [no. 35] and Munich, Staatsbibliothek 29137 [no. 65]. See also Langslow, *The Latin Alexander*, p. 39. The standard edition of the text is still de Renzi, S., G. E. T. Henschel, C. Daremberg, ed., *Collectio Salernitana* IV (Naples 1852), pp. 185–286.

313 Maion, ‘Fortune of the *Practica Petrocelli*’, pp. 496–8.


317 Maion, ‘Fortune of the *Practica Petrocelli*’, p. 495.

may have written the *Passionarius Galieni* was first noted by Pietro Capparoni in 1923. It is perhaps best to quote Eliza Glaze directly on this matter:

> The *Liber confratrum* of the Cathedral of S. Mattheus in Salerno contains six separate listings for ‘Guarimpotus,’ charting his progression from *clericus* to *subdiaconus* to *presbyter*. The entries containing his name were written in a Beneventan script of the eleventh century, leading Pietro Capparoni, who first noted their existence, to consider these a sure reference to our medical author. The name is an extremely rare one of Lombard origin, and all of the entries appear to date from approximately the same era.\(^{319}\)

Eliza Glaze has collected together further documentary evidence about Gariopontus. He was described by Peter Damian in a letter to Landulf of Milan as ‘a most upright gentleman and scholarly physician outstandingly learned in letters.’\(^{320}\) Given the fact that we have documentary evidence for the existence of an individual of the name Gariopontus, and that he was considered a medical expert in his time, it is almost certain that we can take the prologue of the *Passionarius* at face value and identify Gariopontus as the compiler of the *Passionarius Galieni*. This suggests, therefore, that the *Passionarius* was compiled in the eleventh century. Even if we reject this rather compelling evidence, we retain the problematic fact that manuscripts of the *Passionarius* only begin to appear in our records around the year 1050,\(^{321}\) as opposed to the manuscripts of the *Liber tertius*, the oldest of which used by Fischer date to the end of the eighth, or beginning of the ninth century, making it unlikely to have been available in Anglo-Saxon England, and even less likely to have been a source for the Bald’s *Leechbook*.\(^{322}\) Nevertheless, the usage of the *Passionarius* as a source for Bald’s *Leechbook* was first proposed by Charles Talbot.\(^{323}\) To this day, his attribution has largely still held weight, although Cameron has demonstrated that in places the *Liber tertius* offers better readings than those suggested by Talbot as sources for the *Leechbook*.\(^{324}\) While it is entirely plausible that some of the sources for Bald’s *Leechbook* did not arrive in England until the early to mid-tenth century, and could even have been imported from continental Benedictine houses with the first wave of monastic reformers, the fact remains that the *Leechbook* survives in a manuscript copied around the year 950, while the *Passionarius* was most likely compiled by a man who had not yet been born at that time. Even if we reject the identification of Gariopontus as the author of the *Passionarius*, we

---


\(^{321}\) See Glaze’s appendix of manuscripts of the Passionarius copied ca. 1050–1225 in ‘Gariopontus and the Salernitans’, pp. 185–90.

\(^{322}\) Specifically Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, lat. 11218, see Fischer, ed., *Liber tertius*, p. 289.


\(^{324}\) Cameron, ‘Bald’s *Leechbook*’, pp. 164–6.
still have the fact that the *Passionarius* only survives in eleventh-century manuscripts, while its parent texts were available in Western Europe centuries beforehand.

**Latin Medical Texts Surviving in Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts**

This section does not aim to be an exhaustive list of medical manuscripts owned in Britain before 1100, but rather a small selection illustrative of the transmission of medical knowledge in manuscript form. The principal resource in the compilation of this section has been Helmut Gneuss’s invaluable *Handlist of Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts* as well as Augusto Beccaria’s *Catalogue*. It is notable that there are essentially three manuscript contexts in which medical texts are transmitted. The first is the medical codex, a codex made up principally or uniquely of medical items. The second is the medical section, wherein medical texts or fragments are copied alongside unrelated texts. The third is marginalia, wherein charms, recipes and prognostics may be recorded in the blank margins and flyleaves of codices whose content is unrelated.

**Exclusively Medical Codices**

The only surviving medical manuscripts catalogued by Gneuss are eleventh-century or later, making it difficult to ascertain what Latin medical texts were available when the vernacular material was being compiled in the ninth to eleventh centuries. The one earlier Latin medical manuscript in Gneuss’s *Handlist* is a ninth-century copy of the extended herbal which was destroyed in the Second World War. The Latin medical codex is perhaps best represented by Cambridge, Peterhouse 251 fols. 106–191. Gneuss 145, dated by Gneuss to the end of the eleventh or turn of the twelfth century, and said to originate at St Augustine’s Canterbury. This manuscript contains:

i. Galen, *Ad Glauconem de medendi methodo libri duo*

ii. Pseudo-Galen, *Liber tertius*

iii. *Liber Aurelii de acutis passionibus*

iv. *Liber Esculapii de chronicis passionibus*

v. *De podagra*

---


326 Beccaria, *I codici di medicina del periodo presalernitano*.

327 Where a medical text or compilation makes up a codicological unit in a composite manuscript it has been considered a single manuscript source. This definition assumes the deliberate juxtaposition of medical and non-medical items within a codicological unit.

328 These manuscripts include Cambridge, Trinity College R. 14. 5 (Gneuss 184); Durham, Cathedral Library A. III. 31 (Gneuss 222.3); London, British Library, Sloane 475 (Gneuss 498.1, Beccaria 78); and Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 130 (Gneuss 549).

329 Herrnstein near Siegburg, Bibliothek des Grafen Nesselrode 192 (Gneuss 831.4).
The manuscript is arguably too late to be considered Anglo-Saxon, but is nevertheless one of the first witnesses of the Latin texts which must have been in circulation for some centuries beforehand for the vernacular material to have been possible.

This manuscript is very similar in contents to Vendôme 109 (Beccaria 45), the base manuscript used by Fischer for his edition of the Liber tertius, and represents a very ancient collection of texts indeed. There is no reason why earlier Anglo-Saxon medical manuscripts may not have resembled this later one in contents, given the similarities between the contents of this codex, and the vernacular text, Bald’s Leechbook.

London, British Library Sloane 475 fols. 125–231 (s. xi ex or xi/xii, Gneuss 498.1, Beccaria 78), represents another sort of medical manuscript which may have existed prior to the Norman Conquest, despite its late date. The manuscript was bound together with a later compendium of medical texts from the twelfth century which comprises folios 1–124. Beccaria dates fols. 1–124 to the twelfth century, while he dates fols. 125–231 to the eleventh century. Eleven separate items are noted in the eleventh-century part of the manuscript:

i. 125r–30v Isidore, Etymologiae IV.5–7
ii. 131r–v Galen, Epistola de febribus
iii. 131v–142v Medical recipes
iv. 143r–60r Medical glossary
v. 160v–165v Uroscopy tract
vi. 166r–209r Gynaecological recipes
vii. 211r–216v Lunarium
viii. 216v–17r Dies Aegyptiaci
ix. 217r–v Natal prognostics
x. 217v–18r Alphabetical prognostics
xi. 219r–231v Antidoary.

This miscellany perhaps best demonstrates that it has not been possible to identify all of the texts which may have been circulating at the time, many of which are short distillations of prognostic advice or seasonal regimen.

**Manuscripts containing medical sections**

Cambridge, University Library, G. g. 5. 35 (Gneuss 12, Beccaria 70) is a huge manuscript dating from the mid-eleventh century and has a substantial section at the end, at 422v–446v. Beccaria catalogues nine medical texts in this section, Cameron notes 21, although he breaks down many of Beccaria’s items into smaller units. The following table describes the contents, and reconciles
Beccaria’s and Cameron’s descriptions. That it contains the ‘Dialogus Platonis et Aristotilis’ on the four humours has already been noted with reference to the *Tereoperica* above.

Oxford, St John’s College 17 appears in neither Beccaria nor Gneuss, as it is generally thought to be an early twelfth-century production. The manuscript primarily contains a handbook of computus, that is, the reckoning and calculation of time, which ultimately derives from the works of Bede, although the influence of Byrhtferth of Ramsay has been suggested. The entire codex is described as a ‘computistical commonplace book,’ by Cameron, who dates the manuscript to ca. 1086. N. R. Ker dates the manuscript to the beginning of the twelfth century, some several decades later than Cameron. Faith Wallis dates the manuscript to ‘ca. A.D. 1110’. The manuscript contains two medical sections at the beginning on fols. 1v–2v, and end on fols. 175v–7v.

For Wallis, the medical materials were deliberately selected and copied alongside the calendrical materials in a form which lends symmetry to the entire codex. She notes that:

‘At each extremity of the codex we find, mirror-fashion, a group of computus related materials, and a medical anthology. Within these medical anthologies, the chosen texts echo one another: a text on humoral physiology and pathology, a herb list, and recipes.’

It is also interesting to note, as Wallis does, that the text on humoral physiology, namely an extract from Vindicianus *Ad Pentadium nepotem* ‘is also the basis for Chapter 35 of Bede’s *De temporum ratione*,’ a text which occupies the central part of the manuscript on fols. 65v–123r. Thus there is a symmetry to the entire codex, a deliberate inclusion of medicine within the sphere of monastic learning.

**Overlapping Genres**

Essentially, the manuscript transmission of medical texts highlights three overlapping textual genres associated with medicine; these are encyclopaedic notes, prognostics and computus. Encyclopaedic notes are short notes giving brief gobbets of information, often only connected by numerological significance, but often contain anatomical information. Computus, being the correct reckoning of time, often contains information on temporal aspects of medicine, such as the seasonal predominance of one humour over the others in physiological theory, and the correct times for the administration of phlebotomy and medicine. Prognostics, while initially defined as a medical genre

---

330 Cyril Roy Hart ascribes the work to Byrhtferth of Ramsey, although Wallis maintains that it is essentially Bedan.
331 Cameron, ‘Sources of Medical Knowledge’, p. 150.
by Isidore of Seville, often contain means of predicting the future through the interpretation of various astrological and physical signs.\textsuperscript{335}

i. Encyclopaedic Notes

Physiological and anatomical notes occur in Anglo-Latin manuscripts with a varying degree of complexity. The most obvious case is the independent circulation of Vindicianus’ Gynaecia 20 in a redacted form in Leiden, Vossianus Lat. Q. 69, which will shortly be published by Bremmer.\textsuperscript{336} Kees Dekker has published a series of encyclopaedic notes which occur in five extant manuscripts describing fourteen numerological phenomena. Two of these are of specific interest, namely the six ages of man and the number of bones, teeth and veins in the human body.\textsuperscript{337}

ii. Computus

From Bede’s \textit{De temporum ratione} in the eighth century to Byrhtferth’s \textit{Enchiridion} in the eleventh, Anglo-Latin computistical authors have occasionally seen fit to include sections on the microcosm of man, explicating the physical relationship between man and the environment as understood under the theory of the four humours and their relationship to the four elements. In addition to human physiology as a microcosm, or miniature model of the entire universe, with its balance of four opposed qualities and temperaments, both Bede and Byrhtferth are keen to illustrate the fourfold relationship of time and the human body, as differing humours predominate in the four ages of man, as well as the four seasons of the year.

Alongside such cosmological schemes, computus, essentially being based on the calendar, naturally accrued texts pertaining to the seasonal aspects of regimen and medicine. The complex interaction between calendars, computus and medicine is too complex an issue to fully explore here, however the issue has been dealt with in great detail by Faith Wallis.\textsuperscript{338}

iii. Prognostics

Prognostics are not specifically an Anglo-Latin genre per se, but are nonetheless an important overlapping genre for the dissemination of medical information through non-medical contexts from as early as the eighth century, when Bede attributes lunarial prognostics prohibiting phlebotomy to

\textsuperscript{335} Isidore of Seville defines a prognostic thus: ‘Prognostica praevisione aegritudinum, vocata a praenoscendo. Oportet enim medicum et praeterita agnoscere, et praesentia scire, et futura praevidere,’ that is ‘a treatise on the foreseeing of the progression of diseases, so called from “fore-knowing,”’ for a physician should recognise the past, know the present, and foresee the future.’ Isidore of Seville, \textit{Etymologies} IV.x.2. Barney, S., W. Lewis, J. Beach and O. Berghof, ed., \textit{The Etymologies of Isidore of Seville} (Cambridge, 2006), p. 114.

\textsuperscript{336} Bremmer, ‘Leiden, Vossianus Lat. Q. 69’.


\textsuperscript{338} Wallis, ‘Medicine in Medieval Calendar Manuscripts’, pp. 105–44.
the authority of Theodore of Canterbury in his *Historia ecclesiastica* v.3, placing the words ‘Memini enim beatae memoriae Theodorum archiepiscopum dicere, quia periculosa sit satis illius temporis flebotomia, quando et lumen lunae, et reuma oceani in cremento est’ in the mouth of John of Beverley.  

Sandor Chardonnens notes that prognostics that have been considered medical in genre frequently occur in prognostic sections in non medical manuscripts, and indeed that they do not frequently occur in medical manuscripts. While individual prognostics concerning the correct times of year to administer phlebotomy do occur in the *Leechooks*, the *Lacnunga* and the *Peri didaxeon*, these are but a small selection of the types of prognostics which cover a vast range of topics such as weather, the interpretation of dreams, horoscopes and various forms of divination.

These three overlapping genres illustrate to us that medicine was indeed a subject which was deemed useful for study, not only for its ability to heal the body, but for its ability to shed light upon divine mystery, illuminating such hidden or occult things as the gestation of an unborn child, the numerological relationship between the veins of the body and the days of the year, or the ordered balance of elements in the cosmos as a parallel to the ordered balance of elements in the human body.

**The State of Medical Knowledge in Anglo-Saxon England**

The above survey has hopefully highlighted the range of Late Antique and Byzantine medical texts which can be positively identified as circulating in Anglo-Saxon England.

The Latin medical literature available in pre-conquest England comprises, as Cameron suggests ‘the same texts as were available elsewhere in Europe.’ The characteristics of this literature vary greatly. On the one hand, the pharmacopoeia offers a set of texts with minimal theoretical basis which offer a range of practical cures from animal, mineral and vegetable sources for a vast range of physical and psychological ailments. On the other hand, the corpus of texts translated from Greek into Latin in the sixth century brought to Western Europe, and England in particular, a sophisticated system of pathology based on Galenic Dogmatism and Soranic Methodism, and introduced into the arsenal of treatments of Western medics a fuller understanding of diagnosis as well as a relatively holistic approach to treatment involving regimental control of

---

339 ‘Indeed, I remember that Archbishop Theodore of blessed memory said that because phlebotomy is dangerous enough in those times when the light of the moon and the swell of the ocean are on the increase.’ *Bede, Historia ecclesiastica* v.3 ed. Colgrave, B. and R. A. B. Mynors, *Bede’s Ecclesiastical History of the English People* (Oxford, 1969).


341 The main resource for the study of prognostics is Chardonnens, *Anglo-Saxon Prognostics*, 900–1100.

342 As in the Old English ‘Formation of the Foetus,’ see above pp. 46–7.


344 Cameron, ‘Sources of Medical Knowledge’, p. 150.
diet, exercise, sleep and sexual activity. Anatomical knowledge was essentially limited to the
Vindicianus, and was perhaps therefore the most impoverished aspect of pre-Salernitan medical
knowledge in the west.

There are some conspicuous gaps in the vernacular material, however, insofar as some of the
most popular topics found in continental medical manuscripts of the early medieval period do not
necessarily occur in the extant Old English corpus. These gaps can be considered threefold. Firstly
there is very little extensive treatment of fevers in the vernacular material, compared to the Latin
sources from which they are drawn. While fevers are the subject of almost the entirety of Book III of
the Practica Alexandri Latine, and much of the Liber Aurelii de acutis passionibus, and a short tract
attributed to Galen, fevers are only given one chapter to themselves in Bald’s Leechbook I.62.

Another seeming omission is that relatively little attention is paid in the Old English tradition to
uroscopy and pulse-lore, that is, the taking of the pulse, and the inspection of urine to diagnose and
prognosticate. While the colour of urine or its contamination with blood is used as a diagnostic sign,
these tend to be derived from texts such as the Liber tertius, rather than specific uroscopy tracts. This
makes us wonder whether texts such as the pseudo-Galenic De pulsibus et urinis were available
in Anglo-Saxon England before the eleventh century, or if they were, were they not considered meet
for translation? Other than these omissions, Cameron’s suggestion that pre-conquest Anglo-Saxons
had access to ‘the same texts as were available elsewhere in Europe’ is probably fair, given the range
of texts which have been translated into Old English. Unfortunately, the survival of Latin medical
manuscripts from before the eleventh century is so sparse as to lead some scholars to the opposite
conclusion, namely that texts such as the Liber tertius, the Liber Aurelii and the Liber Esculapii did
not arrive in England until the eleventh century. The startling verbal similarity between substantial
portions of the Old English text known as Bald’s Leechbook, and Latin texts such as the Liber
tertius, the Practica Alexandri Latine, the works of Oribasius and the Physica Plinii surely illustrate
to us that these texts were indeed available to at least a small number of Anglo-Saxons at least a
century before the oldest surviving English manuscripts of the text were copied. On the other hand,
careful historical inquiry into the compilation of some of the intermediate sources, such as the
Passionarius, suggests that they were probably not compiled in time to have been available in

345 The Epistula de febribus survives in six manuscripts in Beccaria’s Catalogue, Book I in nos. 34, 50, 78,
133, 135 and Book II in no. 81.
346 Blood or pus in the urine is given as diagnostic sign at Leechbook II.17.3, translating Liber tertius 37.1 and
at II.17.4. Oribasius’ instruction that both faeces and urine are to be regularly inspected to determine health is
carried over into Leechbook II.30.1; cf. Euporistes I.9 ‘De his quibus expedit ut sanis uenter semper secundus
sit.’ Finally, the colour of urine is a diagnostic condition of splenetic disorder in II.36.1, translating Liber
tertius 42.9, and II.46.3 from Liber tertius 34.2.
England much before the earliest manuscript witnesses in which they survive, and were furthermore too late to have been direct sources for the vernacular material.
CHAPTER 4: ANATOMICAL VOCABULARY

Old English is quite rich in anatomical vocabulary; however, many of the terms are only found in glosses and similar word lists, making it unclear what role these terms may have played in medical terminology. In the following chapter, only those terms which are actively used in medical prose will be considered.

There is a great deal of overlap between the anatomical vocabulary utilised in Bald’s *Leechbook* and other specifically medical texts, and that used in other genres of prose and verse. As noted above, the existence of a word within the wider speech community does not necessitate its exclusion from technical lexis; the determining feature that defines a technical term is rather its total translatability with a given (Latin or Greek) technical term, and its specificity of meaning, making it absolutely, rather than generally synonymous with similar terms. On the other hand, a number of the terms discussed below appear only in medical prose, and as such would seem to conform to Heller’s criterion of *Allgemeinverständlichkeit*, or general understanding, in being technical terms not generally understood by the non-specialist speech community.\(^{348}\)

Due to the propensity with which Old English tends to form compounds in all lexical areas, it will be necessary to consider disease compounds twice in this thesis. Firstly, Old English disease compounds containing anatomical terms, such as *heafodece* or *healsgund* will be treated here, while the semantics of the ‘disease’ element in the compound will be examined later in Chapter 6. As noted by Bonser, there are five productive determinants which can occur in collocation or compound with anatomical substantives in Old English: -*adl*, archaic ‘adle,’ denoting disease; -*cope*, denoting pain or disease; -*ece*, PDE ‘ache’ denoting pain; -*werc* also denoting pain; and *seocness*, which survives as modern ‘sickness’, denoting an illness, which can occasionally be found in compounds such as *deofolseocness*. Old English also uses the adjective -*seoc* in collocations denoting the sufferer where Latin simply uses an adjectival form of a disease term. Bonser terms these compounding elements more simply, stating that ‘there are five words which signify disease in general.’\(^{349}\) It should be noted that not all of these terms occur outside of compounds in medical prose.

It will not be possible to describe all anatomical terms used even within Bald’s *Leechbook*, for the sake of brevity, so the following study represents merely a representative sample of terms in order to highlight the forms of semantic extension and term formation which apply in Old English anatomical vocabulary.

---


Anatomy of the Head

i.  *heafod* (head, L. *caput*)

The Old English term *heafod*, ‘head’, is ubiquitous in Old English, occurring 1,425 times in the *DOEC* when variant declensional endings are searched for. The term not only means ‘head’ in a concrete sense, but also has an array of metaphorical senses both as a simplex and in compounds, such as *heafodman*,\(^{350}\) where it can mean ‘source’, ‘ruler’, ‘leader’, ‘beginning’ or ‘top’. The word is normally declined as a strong neuter a-noun with nominative and accusative plural in –u.\(^{351}\)

In medical texts, the term would seem to translate L. *caput* relatively straightforwardly, and tends to be used in its purely concrete sense referring to the head of a human or animal. The term occurs as a simplex forty-two times in thirty-four recipes in Bald’s *Leechbook*.\(^{352}\) The term is also used once to refer to cloves of garlic at *Leechbook* II.32.8.

The term is highly productive in compound formation. Only those compounds occurring in medical texts will be considered here. In Bald’s *Leechbook* alone there are two anatomical compounds on *heafod*-, four disease compounds, two disease collocations and two therapeutic terms. The two anatomical compounds are *heafodædre* ‘principal-vein’ and *heafodban* ‘skull.’ OE *heafodædre* would appear to be a *hapax legomenon* probably referring to one of the veins in the arm in *Leechbook* II.42.2 where it seems to translate L. *capitalis*.\(^{353}\) OE *heafodban* occurs twice in the Bald’s *Leechbook*, both times referring to the skull (both human and animal) as a potential *materia medica* when burned to ashes.\(^{354}\)

The four disease compounds are *heafodece*, *heafodhriefðo*, *heafodsar* and *heafodwærc*. Three of these terms are roughly synonymous, *heafodece*, -sar and -wærc, all meaning roughly ‘headache,’ and will be discussed in greater detail in Chapter 6. OE *heafodhriefðo*, literally meaning ‘head-scab’ indicates some form of dermatological condition of the head or scalp.\(^{355}\) It is presumably synonymous with the collocation *heafdes hriefðo* ‘scab of the head.’\(^{356}\) The phrasal term *healfes heafdes ece* is frequent in the Bald’s *Leechbook* and translates *emigranea*. This calque can be seen to directly correspond in items I.1.14–18, sources for all of which recipes have been found, including

---

\(^{350}\) For example, Ælfric’s *Passio Sancti Eadmundi* ‘Gif þu eart to *heafodmen* geset, ne ahefe þu ðe, ac beo betwux mannum swa swa an man of him.’ (if you are appointed as leader, do not raise yourself up, but be between men just like one of them).


\(^{352}\) I.H.1 (x3), I.H.38, I.1.t, I.1.1, I.1.2, I.1.4 (x2), I.1.5, I.1.8 (x2), I.1.20 (x2) I.1.21, I.1.23, I.1.24, I.1.27, I.1.31 (x3), I.1.32, I.2.22, I.2.50, I.4.9, I.38.5, I.38.6, I.61.2, I.61.6, I.64.3, I.84.1, I.87.2, II.H.34, II.24.3, II.25.4, II.34.1, II.59.10, II.64.3 (x2), II.65.1, II.65.9, II.65.18.

\(^{353}\) ‘Gif þu þa findan ne mæge læt of þære *heafodædre*’, ‘If you cannot find that, let [blood] from the head vein’. This seems to be translated from *PÄL* II.121 ‘si nec ipsa inventur, *capitalis* tangenda est,’ ‘if that is not found, the *capitalis* ought to be cut.’ Puschmann, ed., *Nachträge zu Alexander Trallianus*, p. 92

\(^{354}\) It occurs at *Leechbook* I.53.2 and I.61.1.

\(^{355}\) It occurs at *Leechbook* II.30.6 where it translates ‘*acoras in capite* from *Euporistes* I.9.

\(^{356}\) It occurs at *Leechbook* II.35.2.
an aetiological description of the origin of the condition from the PAL I.45 (I.1.18). This term and other pathological terms will be discussed further in Chapter 6.

Comparison of the recipe titles in the Old English Herbal reveals that both wið heafodece (2.1, 85.1, 119.1, 132.1, 139.2) and wið heafdes sare (158.4, 169.2) translate ad capitis dolorem or dolorem capitis. It would seem therefore that in general, OE heafod was used almost exclusively in its concrete sense of the head of a human or animal in medical texts and occasionally applied by semantic extension to the bulb of a plant. Its disease compounds, similarly use the concrete semantic sense of heafod, rather than its metaphorical extensions in Old English medical texts, and the term would seem to be the standard way of translating L. caput, although the anatomical compound heafodædre would seem to utilise the metaphorical sense of head to mean ‘principal.’

Semantic extension of heafod ‘head’ to ‘skull’ appears to occur in several instances in Bald’s Leechbook, especially in the part of the first chapter of Book I concerned with ‘hu mon sceal gebrocenes heafdes tiligean.’ In the table of contents for I.38, there is more specificity in stating ‘gif ban bryce on heafode sie.’ While in I.H.38 it is unnecessary to read heafod as specifically extended to ‘skull,’ we should nonetheless investigate specifically how the bones of the head are treated in the main text itself.

Recipes ‘wiþ tobrocenum heafde’ (for a broken head) occur at I.1.20–23 and another two recipes for the same occur at I.1.31–2. The source for I.1.20 is DHVL 1 ‘Ad capitis fracturam.’ The very same Latin recipe is treated by the eleventh-century Herbal translator slightly more verbosely, but with the same basic structure at its heart at OEH 1.2: ‘gif mannes heafod tobrocens sy.’

It is clear that a fracture of the bone is understood here from I.1.23, which ends ‘do on þæt heafod þonne gangaþ þa bann ut’ (put [a bandage] on the head when the bone goes out.) It is also clear that the meaning of heafod is switching freely within these recipes between head and skull. This form of weak semantic extension is still current in modern idiomatic quotidian English, where in layman’s terms we frequently refer to ‘a broken arm,’ as opposed to ‘a fractured radius / ulna / humerus.’ Langslow notes that this kind of semantic extension is frequent in medical Latin, wherein a body part and bone alternate freely in meaning.

357 Leechbook I.H.1 ‘how one should treat a broken head.’
358 I.H.38 ‘if a bone is broken in the head.’
359 For the semantic extension of bone < body-part and vice versa, see Langslow, Medical Latin, pp. 151-2. Unfortunately, the extension of L. caput to mean ‘skull’ is not attested in the four authors surveyed by Langslow, but is obviously in evidence in DHVL 1 above.
360 Howald and Sigersit, ed., Herbarius, p. 4.
362 Langslow, Medical Latin, pp. 151–2.
The compound *heafodban* is not attested with relation to the skull of a living organism, only to the skull of a dead organism burned and used as *materia medica*.

ii. *braegen* (brain, L. *cerebrum*)

The term *braegen*, ‘brain’ occurs once in the table of contents for I.1, and once in I.1.22. J. T. McIlwain has suggested that this may mean ‘top of the head’ in this instance, though the source for I.1.22 has not been identified, making it harder to refute or substantiate this claim. OE *braegen* also occurs in II.1.3, where it clearly translates L. *cerebrum* from *PAL* II.14 with the meaning of ‘brain’ in the modern sense. Furthermore *braegenes adl* in II.27.4 clearly translates *cerebri alienatio* in Oribasius, *Synopsis* V.47, giving us a total of three instances of *braegen* in the Leechbooks, two of which directly translate L. *cerebrum*, which could be taken for an example of an established translational norm.

McIlwain’s claim that *braegen* could mean ‘top of the head’ is not backed up by the *Dictionary of Old English*, which traces the only usage of *braegen* for anything other than the brain of a human or animal to be from the Paris Psalter (P), where *braegen* translates *vertex* in Psalm VII.16. The *DOE* also notes the consistent glossing of *cerebrum* with *braegen* in both medical and non-medical contexts.

iii. *andwlita*, ‘face’

The term appears twenty-nine times in medical prose, ten times in the *Old English Herbal*, eleven times in the *Medicina de Quadrupedibus*, seven times in Bald’s *Leechbook* and once in the *Peri didaxeon*. In the *Old English Herbal* the term consistently translates L. *frons* as used in pseudo-Musa’s *De herba uettonica liber* and pseudo-Apuleius’ *Herbarius*, but *facies* once from the *Liber medicinae ex herbis femininis* while in the *Medicina de quadrupedibus* OE *andwlatan* consistently translates L. *facies* in the α-recension of Sextus Placitus *Liber medicinae ex animalibus*, but *frons* once in *De moro*. Bald’s *Leechbook* consistently presents the form *andwltan*, while the Old English *Herbal* has a marked preference for the form *andwlitan*, with nine instances to a single instance of *andwlitan* at 184.3, while the *Medicina de quadrupedibus* exhibits

---

364 ‘*Braegen*’ in *DOE: A to H* online ed., Cameron, et al.
365 Although a number of Latin anatomical terms may refer to both bones and the adjacent organs, L. *cerebrum* does not seem to function in this way in the corpus described in Langslow, *Medical Latin*, pp. 151–3, 324.
366 *OEH* 1.3 (DHVL 2).
367 *OEH* 54.2 (Herb 53.3), *OEH* 75.4 (Herb 74.6), *OEH* 91.5 (Herb 90.9), *OEH* 100.2 (Herb 99.2), *OEH* 101.2 (Herb 99.2), *OEH* 100.8 (Herb 99.8), *OEH* 119.1 (Herb 118.1), *OEH* 132.1 (Herb 131.1).
369 *MDQ* 3.10 (MEA 1.10), *MDQ* 6.6 (MEA 4.9), *MDQ* 6.7 (MEA 4.10), ibidem, *MDQ* 12.2 (MEA 11.2), *MDQ* 12.6 (MEA 11.6), *MDQ* 12.13 (MEA 12.2), ibidem.
370 De Vriend, ed., *Herbarium*, p. 239.
both forms. The *Peri didaxeon* contains the form *andwliita*. Unfortunately, no parallels have been found for the seven instances of the word in Bald’s *Leechbook*.  

The term seems to be used exclusively with the concrete sense of the human face (or forehead) in Old English medical texts, either as the potential locus of disfiguring disease, or the point of application for a topical remedy. An interesting case of metonymy in Old English seems to be the extension of the term *neb* meaning ‘nose,’ to refer to the whole visage, as the symptoms of an internal wound to the viscera in *Leechbook* II.19.3 ‘7 biþ his neb read 7 aswollen’ translating ‘Color in facie rubeus et subtumens’ from *LT* 39.2. Similarly, the term ‘neb’ is extended to mean the direction of gaze in instructions to make a man suffering from hemiplegia (seo *healfdeade adl*) gaze at pine-wood embers in the *Leechbook Fragment* ‘7 þonne he ma ne mæge onwende his neb aweg.’ However, the OE term *neb* takes its concrete sense meaning the nose, or nostril as in *Leechbook* I.1.4 ‘do þæt seaw on neb’ translating the *PPB* 1.23 ‘donec iniecta res naribus.’

**Anatomy of the Neck and Throat**

There are several words for neck and throat in Old English, which leads to confusion and a suspicion of polyvalence in the terminology. The terms *heals* and *ḥrotu* would seem, by relationship with surviving modern cognates PDE *throat* and Ger. *Hals*, ‘throat’, both to mean ‘throat’ and ‘neck’, while *sweora* is more normally translated as ‘neck.’ We must be careful not to assume that there is any such binary differentiation between the concepts of neck and throat in our source texts.

The medical texts concerned with diseases of the throat will also describe symptoms in the mouth as well, so this is as good a place as any to list the terminology which occurs here. Such related terms include OE *geagl*, which is etymologically related to the somewhat archaic word ‘jowl’, *tunga* meaning ‘tongue’ and *ceaca*, which although etymologically related to PDE ‘cheek’ could have a wider semantic range.

The fourth chapter of *Leechbook* I gives us remedies and diagnostic criteria for two different disease compounds, *healsgund* (I.4.1–14) and *sweorcoþe* (I.4.15–19). OE *sweor-* *wærc* occurs in I.4.5 which would seem to relate to *healsgund*, due to its ‘wiþ þon ilcan’ opening formula. The

---

371 In one instance, at BLB I.82.1, the term appears in a prescription for opium very similar to *Herb* 53.3, however the Old English ‘smire þinne andwlitan mid 7 þone lichoman ealne’ is a rather verbose imperative verbal clause compared to pseudo-Apuleius’ pithy subjunctive *perungas*.

372 ‘And his face is red and swollen.’

373 ‘There is a red colour in his face, and slight swelling.’ Fischer, ed., *Liber tertius*, p. 312.

374 ‘And when he cannot [look] any longer, turn his face away.’ Included in the appendices as Bald’s *Leechbook* II.59.13.

375 ‘Put the juice in the nose.’

simplexes regarding the throat, jaws and face only occur in items I.4.8–12, which take diagnostic
criteria from the Liber tertius, and I.4.16 which is a treatment from Oribasius.

Examining I.4.8–9, we can track the equivalent anatomical terminology used in the
diagnosis of two forms of synanches, or healsgund between Latin and Old English, wherein ‘Ober is
on þam geagle… Ober is þonne on þære þrotan’ translates ‘Una est, quae in faucibus nascitur.
Alia est, quae in gula nascitur.’ This gives us much more specific information on the highly
ambiguous geagl which is defined by the DOE as ‘jaw, jowl, cheek,’ but can be seen to translate
Latin fauces, meaning ‘pharynx’ in this instance. The fact that the form of healsgund (here
synanches) which appears in the geagl / fauces can be seen at the back of the mouth would lead us to
conclude that the upper part of the throat is intended.

Unfortunately, for the purposes of establishing direct 1:1 translation equivalents, the
passages in question do not quite match between Leechbook I.4.9 and Liber tertius 75.2. L. gula is
first translated by þrotu then by sweor, while collum seems to be mistranslated as tung. If we look at
the parallel reading in the Passionarius however, we see that the second gula of the Liber tertius is
the collum of the Passionarius, which has ‘tumor in ipsa lingua uel collo nascitur’ for the Liber
tertius reading ‘tumor etiam in ipsa gula uel collo nascitur.’ If we assume that the translator had a
version of the Liber tertius closer to that used by Gariopontu in the compilation of the Passionarius
than Fischer’s edition then we can happily restore faith in our translator’s word selection procedures,
and indeed, facility with Latin. In I.4.11, more problematically, a passage from the Tereoperica ch.
34 ‘si una pars faucium fuerit tumida’ seems to inform the Old English ‘Gif þon
sweora geagl þrotu’ which undoes our established relationship
between fauces and geagl, unless further alternative readings may be uncovered which would give a
more direct source.

In attempting to see if the semantic ranges of the words sweora, geagl and þrotu have been
narrowed specifically by interference from Latin technical terminology, we are hindered by two

---

377 ‘One is in the pharynx… the other is in the throat.’
378 ‘One is that which develops in the pharynx. The other is that which develops in the throat.’ Fischer, ed.,
Liber tertius, p. 334.
379 ‘Geagl’ in Dictionary of Old English: A to H online, ed., A. Cameron, A. C. Amos, A. di Paulo Healey et
al., http://tapor.library.utoronto.ca/doe/ (viewed 12 September, 2017).
380 Langslow notes that fauces, in some Latin authors, can be synonymous with gula, meaning the outside of
the neck, but that other authors, such as Scribonius Largus preserve ‘a distinction between fauces “the throat”
(inside) and collum “the neck” (outside).’ Langslow, Medical Latin, p. 151 n. 26. I have used ‘pharynx’ to
denote the top of the inside of the throat, as this seems to be the sense intended in the Latin texts of the Pseudo-
Galenic tradition involved here.
381 ‘Swelling develops in the tongue itself or in the neck,’ Talbot, ‘Notes on Anglo-Saxon Medicine’, p. 167.
382 ‘Swelling develops, moreover, in the throat or neck,’ Fischer, ed., Liber tertius, p. 134.
383 ‘If one part of the pharynx becomes swollen’ Tereoperica or Practica Petrocelli 34, London, British
384 ‘If, then, the cheeks or the pharynx are swollen on either side.’
factors, firstly the evident fact that the *Leechbook* was compiled from a source that does not agree completely with an established recension of the *Liber tertius* and also that the Latin vocabulary for this area, *collum*, *gula*, and especially *fauces*, is itself highly polyvalent even in medical texts to the point that it may not be appropriate to define it as part of a technical lexis.

There seems to be no operative distinction between the terms *healsgund* and *sweorcoþe*, nor the Latin terms *struma*, *synanchis* and *parotidis*. All of them seem to refer to the same disease, or complex of disease, with the same remedies, only the name changing from tradition to tradition, thus prompting the conclusion that these disease terms can be considered technical, since they are totally translatable and absolutely synonymous.

**Anatomy of the Upper Thorax**

Moving on to the anatomical terminology of the thorax, we have better evidence of consistent translation equivalents for words denoting the shoulder blades, shoulders, thorax, heart and lungs.

Although no parallel has yet been identified for the recipes ‘wiþ sculdor-wærc’ in I.20, we have several instances of identifiable translations involving the term in *Leechbook* II. The parallels are as follows

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Old English</th>
<th>Latin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II.17.3 astihð oþ þæt <em>wiþoban</em> 7 oþ ðone swiþran sculdor þæt sar.</td>
<td><em>LT</em> 37.1 Dolor… ascendet usque ad <em>iugulum</em> et <em>humerum</em> dextrum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.46.2 hwilum becymð on þa <em>weopobon</em> 7 eft ymb lytel ge þa <em>gesculdru</em> ge eft þone neweseoþan þæt sar gret.</td>
<td><em>LT</em> 34.2 Peruenit etiam dolor ad <em>iugulum</em>, percutiens et post scapulas et <em>humeros</em>, et <em>ilia</em> etiam dolore tenentur.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From this limited evidence we see that *sculdor* translates either *humerus* (the shoulder or upper arm) or *scapulas uel humerus* (the shoulder-blade or upper arm), while *iugulum* (throat, collarbone) is more consistently translated as *weopobon* (collarbone). It is notable that the Old English makes a more precise distinction between the upper arm and the shoulder than Latin, as the same Latin term

---

385 ‘The pain rises up to the collarbone as far as the right shoulder.’
386 ‘The pain… ascends up to the neck (collarbone) and the right shoulder,’ Fischer, ed., *Liber tertius*, p. 311.
387 ‘Sometimes it comes upon the collarbones and after a little while also upon the shoulder and then the pain greets the *ilia*.’
388 ‘The pain arrives at the neck, also stricking the shoulder-blades and shoulders, and the ilium is gripped by pain’ Fischer, ed., *Liber tertius*, p. 309.
humerus may refer to the upper arm, the bone of the upper arm, or the joint at which it is articulated.\textsuperscript{389}

Unfortunately, further direct parallels are not traceable, partly due to the propensity of the Old English translator to reiterate previously used terms, as in II.47.3 where ‘teoh þonne mid glæse on þa sculdru\textsuperscript{390} translates ‘et scarifas \textit{ea loca} detrahens sanguinem’\textsuperscript{391} in the \textit{Liber tertius}.

\textit{Heart and Breast}

Unfortunately there are no recorded parallels with the many instances of \textit{breost} present in \textit{Leechbook} I; however \textit{breost} and its related compounds are well documented in the parallel instances in \textit{Leechbook} II.

In the following example, \textit{ypocondriacas passiones} must be translated by \textit{breostwærc}, since \textit{heort-coþe} translates \textit{cardialgia}, \textit{fellewærc} translates \textit{epilepsia}, and the cumbersome paratactic phrase defining a further complaint of the stomach is translated almost verbatim.

\begin{quote}
II.1.7 and þæt deah wiþ \textbf{breostwærc} 7 wiþ \textbf{heortcoþe} 7 wið þon þe mon sie on þam magan omigre wætan gefylled.\textsuperscript{392}
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
PAL II.108 Nam dulcia omnia naturaliter \textit{praecordiis et visceribus sunt pessima}.\textsuperscript{395}
\end{quote}

In the following example, \textit{breost} seems to translate \textit{praecordia}, however:

\begin{quote}
II.37.3 \textit{and} eal ða swætan þing \textbf{breostum} 7 \textbf{innoþum ne dugon}.\textsuperscript{394}
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
\textit{PAL} II.108 Nam dulcia omnia naturaliter \textit{praecordiis et visceribus sunt pessima}.\textsuperscript{395}
\end{quote}

From the above findings, it would be difficult to consider OE \textit{breost} as a technical term, due to its apparent polyvalence and the difficulty in locating an absolute translation equivalent. OE \textit{heort}, on

\begin{footnotes}
\item\textsuperscript{389} The use of \textit{L. humerus} to denote either the upper arm or its underlying bone is noted in Langslow, \textit{Medical Latin}, pp. 151–2. The use of \textit{humerus} to denote the shoulder joint is not noted, but a similar form of semantic extension is noted with regards to \textit{L. cubitus}, which can refer either to the radius of the forearm or the elbow, at p. 140.
\item\textsuperscript{390} ‘Then draw with a glass from the shoulder.’
\item\textsuperscript{391} ‘And scarify that place, withdrawing blood’ Fischer, ed., \textit{Liber tertius}, pp. 310–11.
\item\textsuperscript{392} ‘and that helps against chest pain and heartburn and \textit{epilepsia} and in case one is filled with a phlegmatic humour in the stomach.’
\item\textsuperscript{393} ‘it not only treats \textit{cardialgia} but established epilepsy and abdominal diseases, and those whose stomach is filled with cold phlegm.’ Langslow, \textit{The Latin Alexander}, pp. 166.
\item\textsuperscript{394} ‘And all those sweet things are no good for the breast and bowels.’
\item\textsuperscript{395} ‘For all sweet things are bad for the breast and bowels.’ Puschmann, ed., \textit{Nachträge zu Alexander Trallianus}, p. 78.
\end{footnotes}
the other hand, would seem a much more consistent gloss for L. *cor*, and its compounding disease terms also consistently gloss Latinised Greek terms on *cardia- (καρδία-)*. Here are some further examples:

II.1.3 *se maga bip neah þære heortan 7 þære gelodr. 7 geadortenge þæm bræge*<ne>.

PAL II.14 *Est <sc. stomachus> enim sensiblier 7 bene in conpatiendo per vena vicinas epati 7 cordi, consentiens contingitur etiam cerebro.*

II.1.4 *hwilum wyrmas of þam niþerran dælum gesecad þa uferran dælas to þam magan. 7 eac heortcoþe wyrcead.*

PAL 2.36.3 *Scire autem oportet quia et lumbrici superiora sepius petentes ex inferioribus partibus ad stomachum necesse est ut faciant cardiacam passionem.*

II.1.6 *Þis deah eac on fruman þam þe þa heortcoðe 7 þæt gesceorf ðrowiaþ.*

PAL 2.37.3 *Hiis ergo ab initio hunc oportet uti qui cardialgeam patiuntur.*

II.1.7 *and þæt deah wiþ breostwærc 7 wiþ heortcoþe 7 wið fellewærce 7 wið þon þe mon sie on þam magan omigre wætan gefylled.*

PAL 2.37.17 *non solum cardialgias sanat sed inchoantem epilepsiam et ypocondriacas passiones uel quibus stomachus flegmate reple tus frigidus est.*

II.17.1 *and þurh feower ædra swiþost to þære heortan 7 eac geond ealne þone lichoman oþ þa ytme stan limo.*

VEA 19 *deinde acceptum maioribus venulis quatuor … usque ad finem membrorum emigrat redditque pulsium.*

---

396 ‘The stomach is near the heart and the spine, and is sympathetic with the brain.’
397 ‘(The stomach) indeed, is more sensitive, feeling together with the liver through neighbouring veins and sympathetic with the heart and also connected to the brain.’ Fradin, ed., *Practica Alexandri*, 34v.
398 ‘Sometimes worms from the lower parts seek the upper parts to the stomach, and also make heortcoþe.’
399 ‘Moreover it is important to know that because worms are frequently seeking the upper parts from the lower it is inevitable for the stomach that they create the cardiac disease.’ Langslow, *The Latin Alexander* p. 163.
400 ‘This also helps those who suffer heartburn and that cutting in the beginning.’
401 ‘Therefore those who suffer cardialgia ought to make use of these things.’ Langslow, *The Latin Alexander*, p. 164.
402 ‘And that helps against chest pain and heartburn and epilepsy and in case one is filled with a phlegmatic humour in the stomach.’
403 ‘it not only treats cardialgia but established epilepsy and abdominal diseases, and those whose stomach is filled with cold phlegm.’ Langslow, *The Latin Alexander*, p. 166.
404 ‘And (the liver) sends the blood mostly through four veins to the heart and thence beyond to the whole body as far as the outermost limbs’
405 ‘Then accepted in four large veins is led to the liver as if to a fortress… it returns the pulse as far as the ends of the limbs.’ Rose, ed., *Theodori Prisciani*, p. 475.
Old English *heortcoðe* is an interesting case insofar as it represents a semantic extension, or loan-translation of the Latinized Greek terms *cardialgia* and *cardiacus* which can refer to diseases of either the heart or the stomach.

*The Ribs*

II.17.3 on þa swiðran healfe under þam hnescan ribbe.406

II.46.2 Hwilum cnysse þæt sar on þa rib.408

In both of the above cases the source text seems to specify a Latin phrasal term, *costes molles*, which is first translated as *hnesce ribbe*, literally rendering ‘soft rib.’ In the second case, the Old English text is less closely related to the Latin, so it is quite possible the *mollibus* of the *Liber tertius* was not present in the translator’s exemplar. Nevertheless, *pa hnescan rib* would seem one of the most obvious cases yet of a direct Old English loan-translation in anatomical terminology based on a Latin example, in this case *costas molles*.

*Anatomy of the Gastro-Intestinal Tract*

According to Wilfrid Bonser, ‘the diseases of the interior of the body were a complete mystery [to the Anglo-Saxons];’410 however it is my hope here to show that this was not the case, and that the second *Leechbook* of Bald represents a very scholarly attempt to comprehend, synthesise and translate Latin texts on internal medicine with a consistent Old English technical vocabulary.

Words for the stomach and intestines are the most fruitful ground in the search for specific translation equivalents. From the layout of *Leechbook* II alone, it is obvious that the compiler was attempting to carefully disambiguate the terms *maga*, which denotes the organ associated with the first sixteen chapters, and the rest of the gastrointestinal tract, namely *wamb*, *innop*, *smælpearn*, *rop*, *neweseoþe* and *baeþpearm*, the complaints of which are dealt with mostly in chapters II.25–35 and the incomplete chapter on dysentery (II.59 or the ‘Leechbook Fragment’).

When we examine the copious evidence of absolute translatability we find that *maga* consistently translates *stomachus*, being the locus of *heortcoðe* (see above), that *wamb* consistently renders L. *venter*, that *innop* renders *viscera* or *intestinus*, OE *neweseoþe* renders L. *ilium* and OE

---

406 '(That swelling) is in the liver on the right side under the soft ribs.’
408 ‘Sometimes the pain strikes the ribs.’
409 ‘In whom the pain arises in the soft ribs’ Fischer, ed., *Liber tertius*, p. 309.
410 Bonser, ‘Anglo-Saxon Medical Nomenclature,’ p. 15.
bæcþearm, L. anus. Unfortunately rop and smælþearm do not occur in the passages for which close sources have been found.

i. OE maga and L. stomachus

OE maga, inflecting consistently as a weak masculine, is lemmatised as ‘stomach’ by Bosworth and Toller.\(^{411}\) The orthographic forms encountered overlap considerably with common forms of several ubiquitous terms, such as the verb magan, being one of the most common modal verbs in Old English, the adjective maga, meaning powerful or strong, and the strong masculine mæg, meaning ‘kinsman’ or relative,\(^{412}\) not to mention the existence of a formally identical weak masculine noun maga which also means relative or kinsman. Given this level of confusability with a number of lexemes with markedly different meanings, it is not surprising that OE maga meaning ‘stomach’ is restricted in usage to a small number of texts, most of which are drawn directly from Latin sources. Outside of medical texts, glosses and direct translations from Latin the term only occurs four times in one magical incantation,\(^{413}\) one saint’s life\(^{414}\) and one homily.\(^{415}\)

In Old English texts translated from Latin, the term is almost as rare, occurring once in the Prose Psalter (P) at Ps. XXX.10, translating uenter;\(^{416}\) once in the Cura pastoralis chapter 43\(^{417}\) and once in the Regula benedicti at chapter 8.\(^{418}\) The term also occurs in interlinear translations of Latin texts, occurring six times glossing stomachus in the interlinear Defensoris liber scintillarum found in London, British Library, Royal 7. C. IV,\(^{419}\) whilst in two separate interlinear glosses to the Lorica of Gildas, L. stomachus is glossed with OE maga.\(^{420}\)


\(^{412}\) Naturally mæg becomes maga in genitive plural. See Campbell, Old English Grammar, p. 62.


\(^{416}\) Bright, J. W. and R. L. Ramsay, eds., Liber Psalmorum: The West-Saxon Psalms, Being the Prose Portion, or the ‘First Fifty’ of the So-Called Paris Psalter (Boston, 1907).


\(^{418}\) Schröer, ed., Die angelsächsischen Prosabearbeitungen der Benediktinerregel, BDASP 2 (Kassel, 1885–8), p. 32.


\(^{420}\) One of these two occurs in the Lacnunga, the other in the ‘Book of Cerne’ (Cambridge, University Library, Ll. 1. 10); Kuypers, A. B., ed., The Prayer Book of Aedelwald the Bishop, Commonly Called the Book of Cerne (Cambridge, 1902), pp. 85–8.
The term is somewhat more common in glossaries and word lists. In seven separate glossaries, the OE *maga* glosses L. *stomachus* without further comment. In two glossaries, the term is used in a phrase glossing the lemma *fleumon*, which is presumably an orthographic variant of *phlegmone* (Gr. φλεγµονή) given the synonymy with L. *inflammans*. The glosses in full are interesting, given their medical nature:

_Fleumon magan_ untrymnes dictum apoplegi quod interpretatur inflammans.

_Fleumon .i<d est>. infirmitas stomachi <ue>l dicitur inflammans magan untrumnes._

The medical nature of these two lemmata is striking, but it is only when we compare this relatively paltry evidence from glosses with the occurrence of the term in medical prose that we realise that OE *maga* properly belongs to the genre of the _fachtext_. In all, the Old English term _maga_ appears in medical prose 141 times, as opposed to twenty-four times in non-medical genres including glossaries and wordlists. Of the medical instances, thirty-nine are in the _Herbal_, five in _Leechbook I_, eighty-two in _Leechbook II_, nine in _Leechbook III_, five in the _Peri didaxeon_, and one in the _Formation of the Foetus_. Of the twenty-four instances in the main text of the Old English _Herbal_, rather than the table of contents, the term _maga_ directly corresponds to L. _stomachus_ nineteen times, making the five exceptions the kind which reinforce, rather than test the rule that _maga_ glosses _stomachus_. Of these five exceptions, two occur where no source Latin parallel is available in the extant edition of Pseudo-Dioscorides, while the other three instances could perhaps be highlighted to some benefit.

_OEH_ 2.3 and clænsað þone magan 7 þa smælþearmas swyþe wundrum well.

_Herb._ 1.3 Herbae plantaginis sucum potui datum et interiora sanat et toracem hominis purgat mirifice.

---


422 On this term, see Chapter 6 below.


425 In _OEH_ 163.2 and 166.2.

426 ‘And that cleanses the stomach and the small intestines very wonderfully well.’

427 ‘The juice of the herb _plantago_ also heals the innards and wonderfully purges the man’s thorax.’ Howald and Sigerist, ed., _Herbaries_, p. 22.
59.1 Wið þone dropan 7 wið þone magan.428 58.1 Ad flegmata intercidenda.429
60.2 and eac hyt þone magan ealne
afeormað.430

Here we see that L. *interiora et toracem* has been translated as *þone magan 7 pa smælpbearmas*, indicating more than just the stomach in *OEH* 2.3, whilst at 60.2 OE *maga* seems to translate *thorax* for want of a better term. In *OEH* 59.1, the case is somewhat different, as ‘wið þone magan’ is part of a general heading, *maga* taking the syntactic position normally reserved for a disease, which is hardly related to the Latin rubric ‘ad flegmata intercidenda’ despite the similarity of the following recipes.

In Bald’s *Leechbook*, OE *maga* seems to translate *stomachus* unambiguously twenty-eight times out of the eighty-seven instances of the term across the two books. Here are some examples of such correspondences.

II.1.4 þonne ða wætan þa yfelan weorþaþ
gegaderode on þone magan. 7 þær rixiað mid
scearfunga innan. swiþost on þam monnum þe
habbað swipe gefelne 7 sarcrenne magan swa
þæt hie sune sommunga swelta þone magon
aberan þa stragan scearfunga þera ætarna
wætena. hwilum wyrmes of þam niþerran
dælum gesecað þa uferran dælas to þam
magan.432

*PAL* 2.36.2. Contingit autem his quibus
pessimi et uenonosi cum mordicatione
stomachi ibidem colliguntur humores et
dominantur maxime his qui nimis sensibilem
habent stomachum, ita ut interdum etiam aliqui
mox derepente moriantur non ferentes
insustentabilem mordicationem uenenosis
humoribus.

2.36.3 Scire autem oportet quia et lumbrici
superiora sepius petentes ex inferioribus
partibus stomacho necesse est.433
In these examples, it seems relatively clear that OE *maga* is used to consistently translate L. *stomachus*, suggesting a specialisation of the term in the technical prose of the *Leechbook* at least.

There are also a small number of exceptions to this rule which deserve consideration. There is one obviously mistaken use of OE *maga* at II.17.2, for example, where ‘aheardung þæs magan mid gefelnesse 7 mid sare’ translates *Liber tertius* 36.1 ‘scleria hoc est duritia cum sensu et dolore.’ The reason it must be a mistake is not the absence of *stomachi* in the Latin, but rather that the whole context of both the Latin and Old English texts are the types of disease in the liver. Indeed, three of the six *signa* listed in the Old English passage specify *pære lifre* (of the liver), suggesting that *þæs magan* (of the stomach) was probably an error for *þære lifre*.

In two instances the term is used where the Latin is *stomachicus* at II.2.1 and II.41.4. In *Leechbook* II.2.1 the heading ‘Wiþ sarum 7 aþunden magan’ would seem to translate the chapter heading ‘*De stomachicis*’ from *Liber tertius* 9.2. This paraphrase maintains the sense of the Latin disease adjective perfectly. At *Leechbook* II.41.4 ‘Þonne deah þis … ge wiþ milte adle. ge wiþ magan’ would seem to translate the *Physica Plinii Bambergensis* 83.43 ‘Non solum autem spleniticis saluberimum est, sed etiam stomachicis.’ Here *wiþ magan* (for the stomach) departs slightly from the sense of the passage, in that it simply means ‘it is good for the stomach’ rather than ‘it is most excellent for people diseased in the stomach’ or ‘it is most excellent for stomach-diseases.’
In two instances the Old English of Leechbook II specifies the stomach in the translation of Latin disease terms. These are at II.4.t. and II.6.t.. In II.4.t. the Old English ‘Wiþ heardum swile þæs magan’ would seem to translate L empneumatosis in the chapter heading for Liber tertius 17.1, given that the list of beneficial foods that follow in both texts are identical. In II.6.t. ‘Wiþ unlust 7 wleettan þe of magan cymð’ would seem to translate the chapter heading ‘De anorexia hoc est fastidium’ from Liber tertius 19.1, given the similarity in cures between Leechbook II.6.1 and Liber tertius 20.1.

In general, it would seem that in the overwhelming majority of cases, maga is used to gloss or translate stomachus specifically. Its usage outside of medical prose tends towards the recherché, confirming the word’s status as a technical term. In the Vercelli Homily 7, for instance, both occurrences of the word stipulate maga as the organ of digestion, the OE verb myltan or gemyltan being used of the process by which food is digested in the stomach:

1. 94. Ne sceal man swiðor etan þonne se maga gemyltan mæge. 446
2. 97 Helped þæt se mete hreðe 7 wel mylteð þe se maga ðygeð. 447

Even as a technical term, however, OE maga, just like L. stomachus can undergo semantic extension to denote the area of skin surface above the organ. 448 Sentences such as Leechbook II.2.1 ‘gedo ðonne on hnesce wulle smire þone magan mid’ 449 are infrequent, but do occur in instructions on how topical medicines are to be applied, indicating that the term has undergone a semantic extension, most likely influenced by the Latin usage. 450

Table 4.1 Summary of Instances of OE maga in Medical Prose

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Heading Duplicate</th>
<th>Latin Term</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Collocation</th>
<th>Latin Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Old English Herbal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>interior</td>
<td>clænsæð</td>
<td>Herb. 1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>stomachus</td>
<td>stomach</td>
<td>Herb. 12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>stomachus</td>
<td>sar</td>
<td>Herb. 45.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>stomachus</td>
<td>sar</td>
<td>Herb. 45.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

445 The term is not listed in Langslow, Medical Latin. The Liber tertius contains the incorporated gloss ‘id est inflatio’ in chapter 19.
446 ‘Nor should one eat more than the stomach can digest.’ Vercelli Homilies 7, line 94; Scragg, ed. Vercelli Homilies, pp. 134–7.
447 ‘It is beneficial that the food, which is beneficial to the stomach, digest quickly and well’. Vercelli homily 7, line 97; Scragg, ed. Vercelli Homilies, pp. 134–7.
448 See Langslow, Medical Latin, p. 151, n. 28.
449 ‘Place [the medicine] on soft wool, smear the stomach with [it].’ Cf. LT 9.2 ‘foueas easdemque lanas expressas super stomachum ponis et fascias,’ Fischer, ed., Liber tertius, pp. 300–301.
450 Other examples include Leechbook II.2.3, II.2.9, II.12.3 and II.15.2.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>yes</th>
<th>no</th>
<th>yes</th>
<th>no</th>
<th>yes</th>
<th>no</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>59.1</td>
<td>flegmata intercidenda</td>
<td>stomach</td>
<td>Herb. 58.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.2</td>
<td>thorax</td>
<td>stomach</td>
<td>afeormað</td>
<td>Herb. 59.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.3</td>
<td>stomachus</td>
<td>stomach</td>
<td>sar</td>
<td>Herb. 59.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84.1</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>stomachus</td>
<td>sar</td>
<td>Herb. 83.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91.3</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>stomachus</td>
<td>sar</td>
<td>Herb. 90.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94.2</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>stomachus</td>
<td>sar</td>
<td>Herb. 93.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94.11</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>stomachus</td>
<td>toþundennysse</td>
<td>Herb. 93.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106.1</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>stomachus</td>
<td>sar</td>
<td>Herb. 105.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111.1</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>stomachus</td>
<td>sar</td>
<td>Herb. 110.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144.3</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>stomachus</td>
<td>hæt</td>
<td>LMHF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153.1</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>stomachus</td>
<td>sar</td>
<td>LMHF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155.1</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>stomachus</td>
<td>sar</td>
<td>LMHF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163.2</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>sar</td>
<td>LMHF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166.2</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>heardnysse</td>
<td>LMHF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166.2</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>stomachus</td>
<td>heardnys</td>
<td>LMHF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170.0</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>stomachus</td>
<td>sar</td>
<td>LMHF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184.0</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>stomachus</td>
<td>sar</td>
<td>LMHF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184.2</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>stomachus</td>
<td>sar</td>
<td>LMHF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Bald’s Leechbook**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I.18.1</th>
<th>yes</th>
<th>n/a</th>
<th>stomach</th>
<th>acolod</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I.18.1</td>
<td>stomachus</td>
<td>stomach</td>
<td>Syn.VI.42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.18.5</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>stomach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.19.1</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>stomach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.1.1</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>stomach</td>
<td>adlig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.1.2</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>stomachus</td>
<td>stomach</td>
<td>adl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.1.3</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>*implied subject</td>
<td>stomach</td>
<td>PAL II.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.1.3</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>stomachus</td>
<td>stomach</td>
<td>intiga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.1.4</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>stomachus</td>
<td>sar</td>
<td>PAL 2.36.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.1.4</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>stomachus</td>
<td>sar</td>
<td>PAL 2.36.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.1.4</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>stomachus</td>
<td>sar</td>
<td>PAL 2.36.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.1.5</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>stomachus</td>
<td>sar</td>
<td>PAL 2.37.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

95
<p>| II.1.7 | no | stomachus | stomach | PAL 2.37.11 |
| II.2.1 | yes | *de stomachicis | stomach | sar and aþened | LT 9.2 |
| II.2.1 | no | stomachus | surface | LT 9.2 |
| II.2.3 | yes | *stomachus | surface | sar | LT 11.1 (Algema, id est dolor &lt;stomachi&gt;) |
| II.2.3 | no | stomachus | stomach | LT 12.1 |
| II.2.4 | no | stomachus | stomach | |
| II.2.5 | no | stomachus | stomach | âþunden | PAL 1.43 |
| II.2.7 | no | stomachus | stomach | sar | PPB 70.30, PPFP II.5.7 |
| II.2.9 | no | stomachus | stomach | PPB 72.2, PPFP II.7.2 |
| II.2.9 | no | super | surface | PPB 72.2, PPFP II.7.2 |
| II.3.t | yes | phlegmone | stomach | geswel 7 sar | LT 13.1 |
| II.4.t | yes | *scleroma | stomach | heard swil | LT 15.1 |
| II.5.t | yes | empneumatosis | stomach | âþunden | LT 17.1 |
| II.6.t | yes | *anorexia | stomach | unlust 7 wættan |
| II.6.2 | no | n/a | stomach | |
| II.7.t | yes | paralysis | stomach | adeadod | LT 21.1 |
| II.7.3 | no | n/a | stomach | âþunden | PPB 75.5, PPFP II.4.6 |
| II.7.3 | no | stomachus | stomach | geswenced | PPB 75.5, PPFP II.4.6 |
| II.7.4 | no | stomachus | stomach | adeadod | LT 21.1 |
| II.7.4 | no | stomachus | stomach | LT 21.1 |
| II.8.t | yes | stomachus | stomach | sar | PPB 70.1, PPFP II.5.3 |
| II.8.4 | no | n/a | stomach | sar |
| II.9.t | yes | stomachus | stomach | inwund | LT 23.1 |
| II.9.1 | no | n/a | stomach | sar | LT 23.2 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II.10.t</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>stomachus</td>
<td>stomach</td>
<td>to hætanne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.10.1</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>stomach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.11.t</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>stomach</td>
<td>apunden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.11.2</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>stomach</td>
<td>apunden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.11.2</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>stomachus</td>
<td>stomach</td>
<td>ceald</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.12.3</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>surface</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.13.t</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>stomach</td>
<td>springe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.14.t</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>stomach</td>
<td>trunness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.14.2</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>stomachus</td>
<td>stomach</td>
<td>bryn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.15.t</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>stomach</td>
<td>springe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.15.t</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>stoamchus</td>
<td>stomach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.15.2</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>stomach</td>
<td>apemung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.15.2</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>surface</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.16.t</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>stomach</td>
<td>hat omiht, ungemeticfast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.16.1</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>stomach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.16.3</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>stomachus</td>
<td>stomach</td>
<td>oferceald</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.16.3</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>stomachus</td>
<td>stomach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.16.4</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>stomachus</td>
<td>stomach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.16.6</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>stomachus</td>
<td>stomach</td>
<td>ceald adl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.16.6</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>stoamchus</td>
<td>stomach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.16.8</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>stomach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.17.2</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>*epatis / iecoris</td>
<td>liver</td>
<td>mistake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.25.4</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>stomach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.32.9</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>stomach</td>
<td>adl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.39.1</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>alia membra</td>
<td>stomach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.41.4</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>stomachicus</td>
<td>stomach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.44.1</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>stomach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.51.1</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>stomach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.56.11</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>stomach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>stomach</td>
<td>bridda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.15</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>wærce</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.69</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>asurod</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.70</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>wærce</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foetus</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>stomachus</td>
<td>stomach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Voss. Lat Q. 69\textsuperscript{531}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### iii. OE wamb and L. venter

OE *wamb* or *womb* occurs very frequently, 277 times in all, in Old English.\textsuperscript{452} Outside of medical texts, the term occurs in psalter glosses, biblical translations, homiletic literature and glossaries. The psalter glosses are immediately informative. The term occurs in eleven glossed psalter manuscripts, and appears as a gloss on the lemma *uenter* in each of its forty-six appearances. The use of L. *uenter* in the various Latin psalters in question was somewhat polyvalent, and indeed the term could refer to the female uterus, the intestines, or the skin surface covering the abdomen. The term occurs most frequently in the the Junius Psalter (B), in ten instances at XVI.14, XXI.10, XXI.11, XXI.15, XXX.10, XLIII.25, LVII.4, LXX.6, CXXVI.3 and CXXXI.11. The term also occurs nine times in the Cambridge Psalter (Psalter C, Cambridge, University Library Ff.1.23)\textsuperscript{453} The Latin term *uenter* refers to the viscera or skin surface in Psalms XXI.15, XXX.10 and XLIII.25, whilst it refers specifically to the female uterus in Psalms XXI.14, XXI.10, XXI.11, LVII.4, LXX.6, CXXVI.3 and CXXXI.11. OE *wamb* also glosses *uenter* four times in the Canterbury Psalter (Psalter E, Cambridge, Trinity College, R.17.1)\textsuperscript{454} at Psalms XVI.14, XLIII.25 and LVII.4 meaning ‘belly’ and at LXX.6 meaning ‘womb.’ Interestingly, in Psalms XLIII.25, LVII.4 and LXXVI.6, the Old English *wamb* or *womb* occurs in a double gloss ‘*wamb* uel innoð.’ In Psalm LXX.6, this makes most sense as a means of disambiguating the Latin terms *uenter* and *uterus* the latter being glossed simply with OE *innoð*. The term also appears three times in the Bosworth Psalter (Psalter L, London, British

\textsuperscript{531} Bremmer, ‘Leiden, Vossianus Lat. Q. 69’.
\textsuperscript{452} With one false positive, the placename Womburnan in Charter, S 813 bringing the total reported by DOEC to 278.
\textsuperscript{453} Wildhagen, K., ed., *Der Cambri
dger Psalter*, BDASP 7 (Hamburg, 1910).

It is perhaps easiest to summarise these findings with a table:

Table 4.2 Summary of Instances of OE *wamb* in Glossed Psalter Manuscripts\(^{462}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Psalm</th>
<th>A(^{463})</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Psalters</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XXI.10</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>womb</td>
<td>J, A, G, B</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXI.11</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>womb</td>
<td>A, B, K</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXI.15</td>
<td>21.12</td>
<td>belly, bowel</td>
<td>A, B</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXX.10</td>
<td>30.10</td>
<td>belly, bowel</td>
<td>J, A, B, K</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XLIII.25</td>
<td>43.26</td>
<td>belly, surface</td>
<td>E, J, A, I, B</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVII.4</td>
<td>57.3</td>
<td>womb</td>
<td>E, A, D, B</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


\(^{460}\) Lindelöf, U., ed., *Der Lambeth-Psalter*, Acta societatis scientiarum Fennicae 35.i and 43.iii (Helsinki, 1909).


\(^{462}\) Psalms are numbered by the Vulgate. Not all instances retain the reading of *L. uenter* in the Vulgate, but all contain the reading *uenter* in the glossed version.

\(^{463}\) Kuhn’s edition of the A psalter differs greatly from the Vulgate and other psalter editions in the numbering and division of psalm verses.
In addition to the Psalms, the Old English term is found frequently in other direct interlinear translations for Latin, occurring a further sixty times, each time glossing *L. uenter* with the same senses, i.e. the womb, the intestines, or the skin covering the intestines. Six of these instances occur in separate manuscripts of the Canticles of the Psalter, glossing *L. uenter*, where *Habacuc* III.16 is included in the monastic hours for Lauds on a Thursday.\(^{464}\)

The term is also used in a number of other interlinear translations of Latin texts, such as *Defensoris Liber scintillarum*, where *L. uenter* is glossed by OE *wamb* eighteen times.\(^{465}\) The Durham Hymnal also contains three instances of this gloss,\(^{466}\) and single instances are to be found in Isidore’s *Sententiae*,\(^{467}\) the glossed prayers in Arundel 155,\(^{468}\) the Book of Cerne version of the Lorica of Gildas\(^{469}\) and PseudoTheodore.\(^{470}\)

In glossaries and wordlists, the word seems to translate a wider range of Latin lemmata. While Ælfric gives us *wamb* for *uenter* once in his *Grammar* and once in the attached *Glossary*,\(^{471}\) the Antwerp glossator uses OE *wamb* twice, *seo inre wamb* glossing *aluus* and *seo utre wamb* glossing *uenter*.\(^{472}\) Forms in *womb*- gloss *L. uenter* in the Lindisfarne gospels at *Matthew* XV.17, *Mark* VII.19, *Luke* XI.27, XV.16, and XXIII.29 and John VII.38; and in the Rushworth gospels at


\(^{465}\) Rhodes, ed., *Liber scintillarum*, Thirteen of these instances occur in Chapter 10. The remainder occur in chapters 9, 21, 28, 47 and 54.


Matthew XII.40 and XV.17, Mark VII.19, XI.27 and XXIII.29 and John III.4 and VI.38. The term glosses L. *uulua* in Rushworth at Luke II.23

The term *wamb* occurs 123 times in medical prose, twenty-six times in the enlarged *Herbal*, ninety-two times in Bald’s *Leechbook*, four times in *Leechbook* III, and once in the *Lacnunga*. Of the 92 instances in Bald’s *Leechbook*, 28 can be seen to directly translate *uenter* from a Latin source text with the specific meaning of intestines or the overlying skin, but never with the specific meaning of the female uterus. The term only translates a small number of related Latin terms. For instance at *Leechbook* II.27.7 ‘Him hylpð eac þæt him fæt cild ætslape. 7 þæt he þæt gedo neah his *wamb* simle’⁴⁷³ seems to translate Oribasius *Synopses* V.53 ‘Juvat autem tales passiones et infans *cornus* bene enim cum eum dormiet, ita secus junctus tangit *subventrale* semper.’⁴⁷⁴

The following examples illustrate the direct translation of L. *venter* as OE *wamb*.

II.1.7 þonne hnescað þa *wamb* 7 tryme⁴⁷⁵

II.1.10 gif of þære *wamb* anre þa yfelan wætan cumen⁴⁷⁷

II.7.4 he þone sammeltan þurh ða *wamb* ut sent⁴⁷⁹

II.31.2 and biþ þæt sar on ða swiðran sidan. healfe on þa scare. 7 þa *wamb* swiþe genearwod⁴⁸¹

*PAL* II.37.10 Malaxorat autem et confortat *ventrem*⁴⁷⁶

*PAL* II.38 Si enim in solo *ventre* habundauerint humores⁴⁷⁸

*LT* 21.1 incoctas casque per *uentre* emittunt⁴⁸⁰

*LT* 69.1 Dolor in parte dextera super pectinem; *uentrem constrictum habent*⁴⁸²

---

⁴⁷³ ‘It also helps them that a fleshy child sleep by them, and that he put (the child) always near his belly.’ Compare to the Lugdunensis version ‘Jubat etiam talis, si infans calida natura et carne repletus est, si simul dormiat ut semper ejus tangat ventrem.’ The reading *cornus* in the Parisian recension makes little sense unless we compare it to the reading ‘calida natura et carne repletus’ (hot in nature and replete with flesh).

⁴⁷⁴ ‘Moreover it also helps such diseases that a very fat child will sleep with him so that it always touches alongside the belly.’ Moliner, ed., *Synopsis* in Bussemaker and Daremberg, VI, 92.

⁴⁷⁵ ‘Then it softens and confirms the bowel.’

⁴⁷⁶ ‘Moreover it softens and confirms the bowel.’ Langslow, *The Latin Alexander*, pp. 165–6

⁴⁷⁷ ‘If the harmful humours come from the bowel alone.’

⁴⁷⁸ ‘If the fluids abound in the bowel alone’, Fradin, ed., Practica Alexandri, 38v.

⁴⁷⁹ ‘Then (the stomach) sends the half-digested food out through the bowel.’

⁴⁸⁰ ‘They expel that undigested through the bowel.’ Fischer, ed., *Liber tertius*, p. 304.

⁴⁸¹ ‘And the pain is on the left side, half on the flank and the gut is very narrowed.’

⁴⁸² ‘The pain (is) on the right side over the breast, and they have a constricted gut.’ Fischer, ed., *Liber tertius*, p. 328.
Here we have six unambiguous examples of the direct translation of L. *venter* with OE *wamb*, and the context of the passages makes sense of this specific word selection, implying that the translator and compiler were making a concerted effort to disambiguate the Latin terms *stomachus* (OE *maga*), L. *venter* (OE *wamb*) and L. *intestinus* (OE *innofaran*).

Surveying medical prose as a whole, we find a number of subtle semantic variations in the usage of the term, which can refer generally to the abdominal organs, to the overlying skin surface, and, in the *Herbal Complex* at least, to the bowel. The meaning ‘bowel’ is assumed where the therapeutics are explicitly laxative or constrictive, or where the Old English term is used in a phrasal translation of such disease terms as L. *disintericos*.

Table 4.3 Summary of instances of OE *wamb* in medical prose

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Heading Duplicate</th>
<th>Latin Term</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Collocation</th>
<th>Source Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Old English Herbal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.11 yes</td>
<td>uenter</td>
<td>intestine</td>
<td>Sar</td>
<td>DHVL 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.21 no</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>surface</td>
<td>lege abutan</td>
<td>DHVL 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 yes</td>
<td>uenter</td>
<td>intestine</td>
<td>Sar</td>
<td>Herb. 1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 no</td>
<td>uenter</td>
<td>intestine</td>
<td>aþundeno</td>
<td>Herb. 1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 no</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>surface</td>
<td>lege on</td>
<td>Herb. 1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 no</td>
<td>disintericos</td>
<td>bowel</td>
<td>forweaxen</td>
<td>Herb. 1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 no</td>
<td>uenter</td>
<td>bowel</td>
<td>ðwænan</td>
<td>Herb. 1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7 no</td>
<td>uenter</td>
<td>bowel</td>
<td>ðwænan</td>
<td>Herb. 1.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

483 ‘How the spleen is alongside and in communication with the bowel, and (the membrane) covers the bowel and the intestine and warms them.’

484 ‘The spleen is situated in the left side of the abdomen; oblong in nature, it is connected to the bowels… which (membrane) covers and warms the bowel and intestine.’ Rose, ed., *Theodori Prisciani*, p. 476.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>yes</th>
<th>uenter</th>
<th>intestine</th>
<th>Sar</th>
<th>Herb. 2.2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>disintericos</td>
<td>bowel</td>
<td>forweaxen</td>
<td>Herb. 39.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.1</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>disintericos</td>
<td>bowel</td>
<td>forweaxen</td>
<td>Herb 52.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>disintericos</td>
<td>bowel</td>
<td>forweaxen</td>
<td>Herb 68.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Medicina de quadrupedibus**

| 2.1 | n/a | uenter | surface | wrið on | De moro |
| 3.2 | n/a | uenter | intestine | Sar | MEA 1 |
| 5.11 | n/a | uentriculus | animal gut | Haran | MEA 3 |
| 5.17 | n/a | uenter | intestine | wræce | MEA 3 |
| 7.9 | n/a | uenter | bowel | flewsan | MEA 5 |
| 7.11 | n/a | uenter | bowel | getogen | MEA 5 |
| 7.13 | n/a | uenter | surface | utan gewrið | MEA 5 |
| 12.4 | n/a | uenter | bowel | to astyrigenne | MEA 9 |
| 12.4 | n/a | uenter | bowel | onlyseþ | MEA 9 |

**Bald’s Leechbook**

| I.2.3 | no  | intestine | uferan |
| I.18.3 | no  | intestine | idlan |
| II.1.7 | no  | uenter | intestine | PAL II.37.10 |
| II.1.10 | no  | intestine | coþ |
| II.1.10 | no  | uenter | intestine | PAL II.38 |
| II.1.11 | no  | uenter | intestine | PAL II.38 |
| II.7.4 | no  | uenter | bowel | LT 21.1 |
| II.16.8 | no  | intestine | |
| II.19.3 | no  | uenter | bowel | LT 39.1 |
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<p>| II.21.1 | no | enter | bowel | LT 48.1 |
| II.22.5 | no | enter | bowel | LT 45.1 |
| II.22.6 | no | enter | bowel | LT 46.1 |
| II.25.t | yes | n/a | intestine | colp |
| II.25.t | no | n/a | intestine |  |
| II.25.1 | yes | n/a | intestine |  |
| II.25.2 | no | | intestine |  |
| II.25.3 | yes | | intestine |  |
| II.25.4 | no | | intestine |  |
| II.26.t | no | enter | intestine | colp | LT 28.1 |
| II.27.t | yes | enter | intestine | Syn. V.47 |
| II.27.1 | no | enter | intestine | Syn. V.47 |
| II.27.1 | no | enter | intestine | Syn. V.47 |
| II.27.2 | no | enter | intestine | Syn. V.47 |
| II.27.2 | no | n/a | intestine | Syn. V.47 |
| II.27.4 | no | enter | intestine | Syn. V.47 |
| II.27.4 | no | n/a | intestine | Syn. V.47 |
| II.27.6 | no | enter | surface | Syn. V.53 |
| II.27.7 | no | subuentralem | surface | Syn. V.53 |
| II.27.8 | no | n/a | intestine | Syn. V.53 |
| II.27.8 | no | n/a | intestine | Syn. V.53 |
| II.27.8 | no | enter | intestine | Syn. V.53 |
| II.27.12 | no | n/a | intestine | Syn. V.52 |
| II.27.12 | no | n/a | bowel | Syn. V.52 |
| II.28.1 | yes | enter | intestine | Syn. V.38 |
| II.28.4 | no | n/a | intestine |     |
| II.29.1 | no | uenter | intestine | Syn. V. 30 |
| II.30.1 | yes | uenter | intestine | Eup. I.9 |
| II.30.8 | yes | uenter | intestine | coþ |
| II.30.11 | yes | uenter | intestine | PPB 85, PPFP II.20 |
| II.30.11 | no | uenter | intestine | coþ |
| II.30.12 | no | uenter pullorum | animal gut | bridda |
| II.30.14 | no | n/a | intestine | coþ |
| II.30.16 | no | n/a | intestine | coþ |
| II.30.18 | no | n/a | intestine |     |
| II.31.1 | no | intestine | coþ |
| II.31.2 | no | intestine |     |
| II.32.3 | no | n/a | intestine | coþ |
| II.32.5 | no | intestine | coþ |
| II.32.6 | no | intestine | coþ |
| II.32.7 | no | intestine | coþ |
| II.32.7 | no | surface |     |
| II.32.8 | no | intestine | coþ |
| II.32.9 | no | intestine |     |
| II.32.10 | no | bowel | coþ |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II.32.10</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>surface</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.33.1</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>surface</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.33.12</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>intestine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.34.1</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>intestine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.34.4</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>bowel</td>
<td>forweaxen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.34.8</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>*uenter</td>
<td>intestine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.34.9</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>intestine</td>
<td>wyrmas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.34.9</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>intestine</td>
<td>wyrmas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.35.1</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>intestine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.35.2</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>intestine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.36.1</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>uenter</td>
<td>bowel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.36.3</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>uenter</td>
<td>intestine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.36.3</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>uenter</td>
<td>intestine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.39.1</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>uenter</td>
<td>intestine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.44.1</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>intestine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.47.6</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>rectum (enema)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.48.1</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>intestine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.56.10</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>uenter</td>
<td>intestine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.56.11</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>intestine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.H.18</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>intestine</td>
<td>ærce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.70.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>intestine</td>
<td>ærce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.70.</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>intestine</td>
<td>heardness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Laenunga</em> 129</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td>giccendre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As we can see from the above table, OE *wamb* never refers to the female uterus in medical prose, although it is frequently used for this purpose in other genres of text, such as the interlinear Psalter glosses. In medical prose, the term seems to undergo some semantic extension in parallel with Latin in referring both to the organs of digestion and egestion as well as the surface skin of the abdomen. Locating the organ more precisely than ‘intestine’ is problematic. On the one hand, in *Leechbook* II.46.7 the clause ‘þurh horn oððe pipan sio wamb biph to clænsianne’

would indicate that the term can refer to the rectum, due to the fact that an enema is prescribed to cleanse it. On the other hand, the stomach is said to directly send material out through the *wamb* in II.7.4 ‘7 he þone sammeldan þurh ða wambe ut sent’ suggesting that the stomach and *wamb* are directly continuous, and furthermore it is said to be in contact with the spleen (II.36.3), an organ located just beneath the stomach. In all, it would seem therefore that OE *wamb* can refer to any point on the alimentary canal beyond the stomach.

iii. OE *innod*

OE *innod* is lemmatised by Bosworth and Toller rather vaguely as ‘the inner part of the body, the inside, stomach, womb, bowels, breast, heart.’

I hope to show here that the primary medical meaning of the term is intestines, with a secondary meaning of ‘womb’ which is always flagged as belonging specifically to a woman. The term is very common, appearing over 500 times in the corpus as a whole. These include four instances in verse, about 115 instances in sermon literature, and about 200 instances in directly translated biblical and Patristic texts, and only 160 instances in medical prose.

The term is highly polyvalent in both medical and non-medical texts. Of the non-medical texts, it is perhaps best to limit our survey to a brief discussion of the usage of the term in glossed and translated Latin texts. The following table summarizes the occurrence of the term in glossed manuscripts of the Psalter.

Table 4.4 occurrences of OE *innod* in glossed Psalter manuscripts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Psalm</th>
<th>Latin Lemma</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Manuscript</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| XII.3 | guttur      | throat

485 ‘The *wamb* ought to be cleansed with a horn or pipe.’
488 The opening of this verse reads ‘Omnès declinauerunt simul inutiles facti sunt non est qui faciat bonum non est usque ad unum sepulchrum patens est guttur eorum’ (They are all gone aside, they are become unprofitable together: there is none that doth good: no not one. Their throat is an open sepulcre.) L. *guttur* is here glossed with OE *innod*. 107
As we can see, the Latin term most commonly glossed with OE *innoð* is L. *uenter*. The polysemy of OE *innoð* may well stem from the polyvalence of L. *uenter* which, in the Psalter above, can refer to the organs of the abdomen, the skin surface of the abdomen, or the organs of generation. In Psalm CXXXI.11, *uenter* actually refers to the male organs of generation, possibly by extension from the female: ‘Iurauit dominus dauid ueritatem et non frustrabitur eum de fructu uentris tui ponam super sedem tuam.’\(^{489}\) The term has a metonymic sense of the whole of one’s being in Psalm XXX.10\(^{490}\) whilst the same OE term, *innoð* translates L. *uiscera* in a similarly metaphorical usage at L.12.\(^{491}\)

Similar usages of OE *innoð* are found throughout the bible, translating *uenter* at Deuteronomy XXVIII.4 and XXVIII.18, Judges III.21, Matthew XII.40, Mark VII.19, Luke I.42, XI.27 and XXIII.29 and John III.4 and VII.38. The term is used to translate L. *uterus* at Genesis

\(^{489}\) ‘The Lord hath sworn truth to David, and he will not make it void: of the fruit of thy womb I will set upon thy throne.’

\(^{490}\) ‘Miserere mei domine quoniam tribulor conturbatus est in oculus meus anima mea et uenter meus’ (Have mercy on me, O Lord, for I am afflicted: my eye is troubled with wrath, my soul, and my belly).

\(^{491}\) ‘Cor mundum crea in me deus et spiritum rectum innoua in uisceribus meis’ (Create a clean heart in me, O God: and renew a right spirit within my bowels).
XXV.22, XXV.23, XXXVIII.24 and XXXVIII.27, Matthew I.18, I.23, and XIX.12 and Luke I.15, I.31, I.41, I.44 and II.21. Other Latin terms translated by *innod* include L. *intus* at Mark VII.23 and *uiscura* at Luke I.78. Outside of the Bible, OE *innod* glosses an even broader range of Latin terms, including *uterus, alius* and *uiscus*\(^{492}\) in Ælfric’s *Grammar and Glossary*.\(^{493}\)

OE *innod* occurs very frequently in the Old English version of the enlarged *Herbal*, with fifty-eight instances in the *Herbal*, and eight instances in the *Medicina de quadrupedibus*. The term translates a number of Latin anatomical terms found in Pseudo-Musa, Pseudo-Apuleius, Pseudo-Dioscorides and Sextus Placitus, including L. *colum* twice,\(^{494}\) L. *interaneum* four times,\(^{495}\) L. *intestinus* eight times,\(^{496}\) L. *uenter* twenty-six times\(^{497}\) and L. *uiscura* twice.\(^{498}\) In six instances the term is to translate the Latin term *aluus*, meaning ‘rectum’ or ‘anus,’ often where the medicine is to be administered as an enema or suppository.\(^{499}\) In four instances, the term is used in the phrase ‘wïð wyrmas on innoðe’ (for worms in the intestines) which consistently translates the Latin term *lumbricus* meaning ‘intestinal worm’.\(^{500}\)

Including the tables of contents, OE *innod* occurs thirty times in Bald’s *Leechbook* I and II. The vast majority of these fall in *Leechbook* II, with eight instances in the table of contents, and seventeen in the main text of Book II. Unfortunately, there are only a small number of instances in Bald’s *Leechbook* where we also have direct translation equivalents available for the term:

\[
\begin{align*}
II.36.3 & \quad \ldots7 \text{ wronde } & \text{wambe } & \text{7 } & \text{ha} & \text{ innofaran } & \text{7 } & \text{ha wyrmd} & \text{501} \quad VEA \text{ 20 } \ldots \text{ que ventrem vel intestinae} \\
& \text{cooperit vel calefacit.} & \text{502} \\
II.36.3 & \quad \ldots \text{ on oðre is } & \text{ðam innoðe} \quad & \text{VEA} & \text{20} & \text{ab altera visceribus} & \text{adherit.} & \text{504} \\
& \text{getang.} & \text{503}
\end{align*}
\]

\(^{492}\) Singular form of *uiscura*.
\(^{493}\) Zupitza, ed., *Ælfrics Grammatik*, pp. 28, 30, 58 and 298.
\(^{494}\) OEH 52.1 and 80.3.
\(^{495}\) OEH 11.1, 27.2, 81.4 and 184.4.
\(^{496}\) OEH 11.1, 37.4, 94.1, 94.11, 104.2, 148.1, 185.1 and MdQ 3.18.
\(^{497}\) OEH 1.11, 1.21, 2.3, 32.2, 53.2 (twice), 62.1, 69.2, 84.1, 94.4, 97.3, 113.1, 139.4, 146.2, 154.1, 155.1, 164.1, 170.0, 173.1, 184.2, 185.1, MdQ 7.9, 7.11, 7.24, 9.5 and 10.18.
\(^{498}\) OEH 150.1 and 185.1.
\(^{499}\) OEH 1.12, 18.2, 18.3, 28.1 (twice), 30.4 and 113.1.
\(^{500}\) OEH 137.2, 139.4, 147.4 and 156.1.
\(^{501}\) ‘And it covers and warms the bowel and the intestines.’
\(^{502}\) ‘And covers and warms the bowel or intestines.’ Rose, ed., *Theodori Prisciani*, pp. 475–6.
\(^{503}\) ‘(The spleen) is connected to the viscera on the other (side)’
\(^{504}\) ‘On the other (side) it joins to the viscera.’ Rose, ed., *Theodori Prisciani*, pp. 475–6.
II.37.3 and eal ða swætan þing breostum 7
innopum ne dugon\textsuperscript{505}

II.56.9 ðæt se innoph wyrð ge onburnen ge þurh ðæt gewundod\textsuperscript{507}

\begin{quote}
\textit{And all sweet things do no good to the breast and intestines.}
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
\textit{For all sweet things are naturally worst for the abdomen and intestines.} Puschmann, ed., \textit{Nachträge zu Alexander Trallianus}, p. 78.
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
\textit{Until the intestines either become inflamed or wounded through that.}
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
\textit{So that there will be wounds of the burned intestine.} Fischer, ed., \textit{Liber tertius}, p. 331.
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
\textit{With the exception of Liber medicinae ex herbis femininis, the Latin source texts for the Old English Herbal and Medicina de Quadrupedibus given in de Vriend, ed., Herbarium have been compared against Howald and Sigerist, ed., Herbarius.}
\end{quote}

Here we see that \textit{intestinus} is glossed by \textit{innofara} once and \textit{innoph} once, while \textit{viscera} is glossed by \textit{innoð} twice.

Table 4.5 Summary of instances of OE \textit{innoð} in medical prose

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
Heading & Latin term & Meaning & Source Location\textsuperscript{509} \\
\hline
\hline
1.11 & no & uenter & bowels & \textit{DHVL} 11 \\
1.12 & no & aluus & bowels / rectum & \textit{DHVL} 12 \\
1.21 & yes & ueretrum & penis & \textit{DHVL} 21 \\
2.3 & yes & interior & bowels & \textit{Herb.} 1.3 \\
11.1 & yes & interaneum & intestines & \textit{Herb.} 10.1 \\
11.1 & no & intestinus & intestines & \textit{Herb.} 10.1 \\
18.2 & yes & aluus & bowels / rectum & \textit{Herb.} 17.2 \\
18.2 & no & n/a & bowels / rectum & \textit{Herb.} 17.2 \\
18.3 & no & aluus & bowels & \textit{Herb.} 17.3 \\
22.1 & no & n/a & bowels & \textit{Herb.} 21.1 \\
27.2 & yes & strofus (στρόφος). hoc est interaneum & bowels & \textit{Herb.} 26.1 \\
28.1 & yes & aluus & bowels & \textit{Herb.} 27.1 \\
28.1 & no & aluus & bowels & \textit{Herb.} 27.1 \\
30.4 & yes & aluus & bowels & \textit{Herb.} 29.4 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\textsuperscript{505} 'And all sweet things do no good to the breast and intestines.'
\textsuperscript{506} 'For all sweet things are naturally worst for the abdomen and intestines.' Puschmann, ed., \textit{Nachträge zu Alexander Trallianus}, p. 78.
\textsuperscript{507} 'Until the intestines either become inflamed or wounded through that.'
\textsuperscript{508} 'So that there will be wounds of the burned intestine.' Fischer, ed., \textit{Liber tertius}, p. 331.
\textsuperscript{509} With the exception of Liber medicinae ex herbis femininis, the Latin source texts for the Old English Herbal and Medicina de Quadrupedibus given in de Vriend, ed., Herbarium have been compared against Howald and Sigerist, ed., Herbarius.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>yes</th>
<th>uenter</th>
<th>bowels</th>
<th>Herb. 31.2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>intestinus</td>
<td>bowels</td>
<td>Herb. 36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>ad colicos</td>
<td>bowels</td>
<td>Herb. 37.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.1</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>column</td>
<td>bowels / rectum</td>
<td>Herb. 51.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.2</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>uenter</td>
<td>bowels</td>
<td>Herb. 52.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62.1</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>uenter</td>
<td>bowels</td>
<td>Herb. 61.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63.1</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>uterus</td>
<td>bowels</td>
<td>Herb. 62.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69.2</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>uenter</td>
<td>bowels</td>
<td>Herb. 68.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80.3</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>column</td>
<td>bowels / rectum</td>
<td>Herb. 79.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81.4</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>interaneum</td>
<td>bowels</td>
<td>Herb. 80.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90.10</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>bowels</td>
<td>Herb. 89.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94.1</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>intestinus</td>
<td>bowels</td>
<td>Herb. 93.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94.4</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>uenter</td>
<td>bowels</td>
<td>Herb. 93.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94.6</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>uterus</td>
<td>womb</td>
<td>Herb. 93.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97.3</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>uenter</td>
<td>surface</td>
<td>Herb. 96.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104.2</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>intestinus</td>
<td>bowels</td>
<td>Herb. 103.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110.1</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>interaneum</td>
<td>bowels</td>
<td>Herb. 109.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113.1</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>uenter</td>
<td>bowels</td>
<td>Herb. 112.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136.2</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>*disintericus</td>
<td>bowels</td>
<td>LMHF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137.2</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>lumbricos</td>
<td>bowels</td>
<td>LMHF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139.4</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>uenter</td>
<td>bowels</td>
<td>LMHF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139.4</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>lumbricos</td>
<td>bowels</td>
<td>LMHF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146.2</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>uenter</td>
<td>bowels</td>
<td>LMHF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147.4</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>lumbricos</td>
<td>bowels</td>
<td>LMHF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148.1</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>intestinus</td>
<td>bowels</td>
<td>LMHF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150.1</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>uiscera</td>
<td>bowels</td>
<td>LMHF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151.2</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>bowels</td>
<td>LMHF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154.1</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>uenter</td>
<td>bowels</td>
<td>LMHF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154.2</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>aliquae intrinsecus</td>
<td>bowels</td>
<td>LMHF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155.1</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>uenter</td>
<td>surface</td>
<td>LMHF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155.3</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>testes</td>
<td>testes</td>
<td>LMHF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156.1</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>lumbricos</td>
<td>bowels</td>
<td>LMHF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158.1</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>bowels</td>
<td>LMHF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164.1</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>uenter</td>
<td>bowels</td>
<td>LMHF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The *Medicina de quadrupedibus* conflates the chapters on the dog and wolf found in Sextus Placitus, *Medicinae ex animalibus*. This is not obvious in de Vriend’s parallel text. See Howald and Sigerist, ed., *Herbarius* p. 261 and de Vriend, ed., *Herbarium* p. 265.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>No/Yes</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Tissue</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>170.0</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>enter</td>
<td>bowels</td>
<td>LMHF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173.1</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>enter</td>
<td>bowels</td>
<td>LMHF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173.2</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>uiscera</td>
<td>bowels</td>
<td>LMHF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184.2</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>enter</td>
<td>surface</td>
<td>LMHF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184.4</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>interaneum</td>
<td>bowels</td>
<td>LMHF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185.1</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>intestinus</td>
<td>bowels</td>
<td>LMHF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185.1</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>enter</td>
<td>bowels</td>
<td>LMHF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Medicina de quadrupedibus**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>No/Yes</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Tissue</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>intestinus</td>
<td>bowels</td>
<td>MEA α 1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>enter</td>
<td>bowels</td>
<td>MEA α 5.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.11</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>enter</td>
<td>bowels</td>
<td>MEA α 5.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>enter</td>
<td>bowels</td>
<td>MEA α 5.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.24</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>enter</td>
<td>surface / bowels</td>
<td>MEA α 5.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>enter</td>
<td>bowels</td>
<td>MEA α 7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>uterus</td>
<td>womb</td>
<td>MEA α 8.15(^{510})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.18</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>enter</td>
<td>surface</td>
<td>MEA α 8.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Bald’s Leechbook**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>No/Yes</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Tissue</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I.38.t</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>bowels, internal organs</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.47.3</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>bowels</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.48.2</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>bowels</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.48.3</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>intestinus</td>
<td>bowels</td>
<td><em>Herb</em> 93.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.H.1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>bowels, internal organs</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.H.53</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>bowels</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.H.60</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>womb</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.H.64</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>bowels</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.23.2</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>bowels</td>
<td><em>PAL</em> II.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.23.3</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>uiscera</td>
<td>bowels</td>
<td><em>PAL</em> II.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.25.4</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>bowels</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.33.2</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>bowels</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.33.3</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>bowels</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.33.4</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>bowels</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.33.5</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>bowels</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.36.3</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>uiscera</td>
<td>intestines</td>
<td>VEA 20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{510}\) The *Medicina de quadrupedibus* conflates the chapters on the dog and wolf found in Sextus Placitus, *Medicinae ex animalibus*. This is not obvious in de Vriend’s parallel text. See Howald and Sigerist, ed., *Herbarius* p. 261 and de Vriend, ed., *Herbarium* p. 265.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>II.37.3</th>
<th>n/a</th>
<th>uiscera</th>
<th>bowels</th>
<th>PAL II.108 (Phil)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II.37.3</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>bowels</td>
<td>PAL II.108 (Phil)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.44.1</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>bowels</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.46.2</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>bowels</td>
<td>LT 34.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.46.3</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>intestines</td>
<td>LT 34.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.54.2</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>bowels</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.56.7</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>bowels</td>
<td>LT 71.2-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.56.9</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>intestinus</td>
<td>bowels</td>
<td>LT 71.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.56.10</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>intestinus</td>
<td>bowels</td>
<td>PAL II.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.56.10</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>intestinus</td>
<td>bowels</td>
<td>PAL II.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.59.21</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>bowels</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.64.4</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>bowels</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.23</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>bowels</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Lacnunga**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ch 132</th>
<th>n/a</th>
<th>n/a</th>
<th>unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ch 151</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Formation of the Foetus**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>n/a</th>
<th>womb</th>
<th>V. Lat Q 69, cf. Gyn. 20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>womb</td>
<td>V. Lat Q 69, cf. Gyn. 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>womb</td>
<td>V. Lat Q 69, cf. Gyn. 20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Peri didaxeon**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ch 1</th>
<th>n/a</th>
<th>iecur</th>
<th>liver</th>
<th>Ter. 151</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ch 1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>liver</td>
<td>Ter. 151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ch 52</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>bowels</td>
<td>cf Ter. 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ch 61</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>iecur</td>
<td>liver</td>
<td>Ter. 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ch 63</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>uenter</td>
<td>bowels</td>
<td>Ter. 45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ch 63</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>surface</td>
<td>not located</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ch 63</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>bowels</td>
<td>not located</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ch 65</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>uenter</td>
<td>bowels</td>
<td>Ter. 49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ch 65</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>uenter</td>
<td>bowels</td>
<td>Ter. 49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ch 67</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>uenter</td>
<td>bowels</td>
<td>Ter. 49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

511 The ur-source, as identified by Chardonnens, is Vindicianus, Gynaecia 20. See Chardonnens, Anglo-Saxon Prognostics, p. 229 and Rose, ed., Throdori Prisciani, pp. 484–92. The closest Latin parallel has recently been edited in Bremmer, ‘Leiden, Vossianus Lat. Q. 69’.

512 Source latin text from Löweneck, ed., Peri didaxeon.
As we can see from the above data, OE innoð seems to translate a much wider range of Latin anatomical terms than either maga or wamb in medical prose. Of the three terms, it is the only one which can have the meaning of ‘womb,’ as in uterus.

OE neweseoþa and L. ilium

The next term is somewhat rarer, occurring only in Bald’s Leechbook II and seeming to translate a rare Latin anatomical term, ilium.\footnote{The neuter plural of L. ilium, ilia is occasionally treated as feminine singular ilia, iliae. See Vindicianus, Epitome altera 25 at note 518 below.}

Noting the two parallels between Vindiciani Epitome alter and Leechbook II, M. L. Cameron has already observed, in his 1993 monograph, that the compiler of the Leechbook used OE neweseoþa to translate L. ilium, but unfortunately continues to be misled by Bosworth and Toller’s dictionary, stating that ‘neweseoþa normally means “pit of the belly” (“stomach”)’ rather than, as in the Leechbook, “flank.”\footnote{Cameron, Anglo-Saxon Medicine, p. 96.} The only citation used by Bosworth and Toller\footnote{‘Neweseoþa’ in Bosworth and Toller, ed., An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary.} was, however, the very piece which Cameron was analysing, so he was unwittingly engaging in circular lexicography. The meaning ‘pit of the belly’ can be disregarded without further question. But the meaning of ‘flank’ is slightly more problematic, as it is precisely the kind of semantic extension which occurs in Latin medical texts, wherein a surface anatomical structure can refer to the underlying organ and vice versa.\footnote{For more on semantic extension in medical Latin see Langslow, Medical Latin, pp. 149–56, esp. section 3.6.1b at p. 151.}

This case of extension occurs once, in Leechbook II.31.2, describing the hue or colour of the patient’s body, which, logically, is only visible as an external surface: ‘Be hiora hiwe 7 þam nafolan. 7 þam rægereosan. 7 bæcþearme 7 neweseoþan. 7 milte scare. beoð æblæce 7 eal se lichoma ascimod.’\footnote{‘Concerning their colour, and the navel and the groin and the anus and the colon (neweseoþan) and the right flank (milte scare) are blackened and all the body ashen’}

The closest Latin parallel (LT 69.1) does not have a clause analogous to this sentence, but the term reappears later in Leechbook II.31.2 translating L. ilium. Here L. ilium probably means either the ascending and/or descending colon, rather than its more specialised meaning in modern anatomical terminology, especially since Vindicianus describes the two iliae: ‘Iliae autem sunt dextra levaque in lateribus, ubi costi non sunt.’\footnote{‘The ilia are on the right and left sides, where there are no ribs,’ Rose, ed., Theodori Prisciani, p. 478.} Here are the parallel text examples of the terms:
OE bæcþearm translates Latin anus twice. once in II.31.2 (above) and once in the description of the symptoms of dysentery:

II.31.2 geecymð æt þam bæcþearme 7 æt þam neweseoþan. \[521\]

II.36.3 Sio <milt> is aþened o þone winestran neweseoþan \[523\]

II.46.2 ge eft þone neweseoþan þæt sar gret\[525\]

The differentiation of the sense of bæcþearm into a) ‘anus’ and b) ‘rectum’ by the Dictionary of Old English is partly based upon glossary evidence, but seems too fine a distinction to be drawn with regard to actual anatomical usage.\[529\]

To conclude, the terms for the internal organs of the digestive system in Old English appear to have a remarkable degree of specificity. each appearing to refer to a precise structure, and correlating closely to semantic divisions in Latin anatomical vocabulary. It would seem that a surprisingly sophisticated technical language developed in Old English for the translation of Latin anatomical terms concerning the alimentary canal.

\[519\] 'The (liver) is extended as far as the neweseoþa on the right side.'
\[520\] 'Our liver is located on the right side, and extended as far as the longanon, that is the ilium.' Rose, ed., Theodori Prisciani, p. 474.
\[521\] 'It extends to the anus and the neweseoþa.'
\[522\] 'And it reaches as far as the anus from the ilium.' Fischer, ed., Liber tertius, p. 328.
\[523\] 'The spleen is extended as far as the left neweseoþa.'
\[524\] 'It is extended as far as the left ilium.' Rose, ed., Theodori Prisciani, p. 475.
\[525\] 'And the pain touches the neweseoþa again.'
\[526\] 'And their ilia are touched by pain.' Fischer, ed., Liber tertius, p. 309.
\[527\] 'That the man feels pain… and thirst and lack of appetite and a little blood drips through the anus.'
\[528\] 'They have thirst and lack of appetite and emit small and bloody droplets through the anus.' Fischer, ed., Liber tertius, p. 331. The dictionary of Old English uses the Tereoperica or Practica Petrocelli 78 as the source here.
\[529\] 'Bæcþearm ' in Cameron et al., ed., Dictionary of Old English: A to H online.
The Kidneys and Lower Back

By semantic extension of surface structure to underlying organ, the same Old English word, *lenden*, literally ‘loin,’ and the rare *lendenbræde*, ‘broad-loin,’ can mean both kidneys (L. renes) and the small of the back (L. *lumbus*). This form of semantic extension is well documented in Latin medical vocabulary by Langslow, who notes that Celsus alone uses nine different anatomical terms to refer to the overlying area of the skin surface.⁵³⁰

**Meaning Loins (Small of the Back)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page 530</th>
<th>DHVL 46 <em>Ad lumborum et coxarum dolorem</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DHVL 46</td>
<td><em>Vettonicae dragmas II</em>⁵³²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Meaning Kidneys**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page 531</th>
<th>VEAL 19 <em>&lt;Epar&gt; pinnas habet quinque continens renis.</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VEAL 19</td>
<td><em>Nefreticos esse… Nam nefreticus aut sanguinem meiant aut harenas mittit.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These three collocations and compounds on *lenden* all imply the kidney in some way or other, but also clearly demonstrate that the word for ‘loin’ was semantically extended to imply ‘kidney’ for want of a better term in Old English.

**OE rægereorsa**

Bosworth and Toller define OE *rægereorsa* as ‘a ridge of muscles at the side of the spine running up the back’ based upon Cockayne’s translation of the term as ‘dorsal muscles.’ The term occurs in *Leechbook* I.71.1–2 as the locus of pain to be treated, with unfortunately no identified Latin parallels as yet. The term also occurs in II.31.2 in a sentence that seems to be an interpolation to the main

---

⁵³⁰ Langslow, *Medical Latin*, p. 151
⁵³¹ ‘For pain of the lower back take as much betony as two pennies weighed.’
⁵³³ ‘The (liver) has five lobes, it holds the kidneys.’
⁵³⁴ ‘(The liver) has five lobes containing the kidneys.’ Rose, ed., *Theodori Prisciani*, p. 474.
⁵³⁵ ‘Foolish medics think that that is kidney disease… nefretics men urinate blood.’
⁵³⁶ ‘Then, if the physician is ignorant of these signs they suffer the error that he thinks that it is kidney disease… but nefretics either urinate blood or expel sand.’ Fischer, ed., *Liber tertius*, p. 328.
source of the passage, namely *Liber tertius* 69.1. Later in the same paragraph we find the following parallel however:

| II.31.2 bib þæt sar… eft fram þam nafolan oþ þone milte. 7 on þa winestran | LT 69.1 Dolor ab umbilico ascendit usque ad splenem et descendit usque ad | raegereosan⁵³⁷ | inguinem sinistrum⁵³⁸ |

This parallel would imply that in this case at least, OE *raegereorsa* translates L. *inguin*, which probably has the meaning of ‘groin.’ It is unfortunate that no further parallels have been identified, as this throws considerable doubt on the meaning of the word, without being strong enough evidence for any consistent translation practice.

**Gynaecological Terms**

The study of Old English gynaecological terms is hampered by the loss of a gathering from Royal 12. D. xvii which contained Bald’s *Leechbook* II.60, recorded in the table of contents as ‘Læcedomas wip wifæ gecyndum forsetenu 7 cælum wifæ tydernessum’⁵³⁹ Nevertheless, there are a number of terms used within this table of contents, as well as within the other parts of the corpus which can be seen to have specific meanings in gynaecological contexts separate from their normal medical meanings.

In *Leechbook* II.H.60 we have the following sentence: ‘gif bearn weorþe dead on wifes innoðe oððe gif hio cennan ne mæg’⁵⁴⁰ This usage would suggest that *innoð*, normally meaning intestines above, can contextually refer to the human womb or uterus. Analogous recipes, which mirror the phrasing of this *capitulum* at least, exist in the *Herbal* and *Leechbook III*.

*OEH* H.63.1 Wið þæt wifæ hæbbe on hyre innoðe deadboren tuddur.⁵⁴¹

*OEH* H.94.6 Gif deadboren cild sy on wifes innoðe.⁵⁴²

---

⁵³⁷ ‘And again (the pain) is from the navel to the spleen and in the left groin.’

⁵³⁸ ‘The pain rises from the navel as far as the spleen and falls as far as the left groin.’ Fischer, ed., *Liber tertius*, p. 328.

⁵³⁹ ‘Recipes for obstructed genitalia of women, and for all womens’ ailments.’ The entry notes that there were forty-one recipes, which could have been quite an extensive collection of obstetric and gynaecological knowledge for its day.

⁵⁴⁰ ‘If a child becomes dead in a woman’s *innoð* or if she may not give birth.’

⁵⁴¹ ‘In case a woman has a stillborn offspring in her *innoð*.’ De Vriend, ed., *Herbarium*, p. 12.

⁵⁴² ‘If there is a stillborn child in a woman’s *innoð*.’ De Vriend, ed., *Herbarium*, p. 17.
OEH 63.1 Gyf hwylc wif hæbbe on hyre
innoðe deadboreyn tudur genim ypsse wyrte
wos þe we dictamnum nemdun. 543

Herb. 62.1 Herba Diptamnum
Si qua mulier in utero pecus mortuun
habuerit. Herbae diptamni sucum… 544

OEH 94.6 Gyf deadboren cyld sy on wifes
innoðe genim ypsse ylcan wyrte
<dwergedwoesle> þry cyþas. 7 þa syn
niwe swa hy swyþost stincen. cuoca on
ealdon wine. syle drincan. 545

Herb. 93.7 Herba Paleium
Si infans mulieri in utero mortuus fuerit.
Herbae pulei codas tres recentes. quae olent
suauiter. tritum. in uino ueteri optimo
quartario dabis bibere. 546

Formation of the Foetus

Her onginð secgan ymbe mannes gecynde
hu he on his modor innoþe to men
gewyrðed.

Ærest þæs mannes brægen bið geworden on
his moder innoþe. þonne bið þæt brægen
utan mid reaman bewefen on þære syxtan
wucan

þonne gelimpð þære manigfeald sar þonne
þæs byþres lic on hire innoþe scypigende
biþ. 548

Tunc ueniunt dolores matri quod mouetur.
corpus. Idem. pastus in utero. 549

As we can see from the above parallels, innoð translates L. uterus with the sense of ‘womb’ with relative consistency in pseudo-Apuleius Herbarius, whilst in the Formation of the Foetus, the term is

543 ‘If any woman has a stillborn offspring in her innoð, take the juice of this plant that we call dictamnum.’ De Vriend, ed., Herbarium, p. 106.
544 ‘If any woman has a dead thing in her uterus. (Give) the juice of the herb diptamnum.’ Howald and Sigerist, ed., Herbarius p. 116.
545 ‘If there is a stillborn child in a mothers innoð, take three sprigs of this same herb (pennyroyal), and may they be fresh so that they smell most strongly, grind in old wine, give to tdrink.’ De Vriend, ed., Herbarium, p. 138.
546 ‘Should an infant die in a woman’s uterus. You give three fresh sprigs of pennyroyal which smells sweetly to drink ground in a most generous quarter-sextarius of old wine.’ Howald and Sigerist, ed., Herbarius, p. 169.
548 ‘Here it begins to tell about the generation of man, how he is turned into a man in his mother’s innoð. First the man’s brain is formed in his mother’s innoð; then the brain is covered outside by a membrane in the sixth week. … Then many a pain befalls her when the body of the foetus is stirring in her womb.’ Formation of the Foetus, ed. Liuzza, Liuzza, R. M., Anglo-Saxon Prognostics: An Edition and Translation of Texts from London, British Library, MS Cotton Tiberius A. III (Cambridge 2011) pp. 200–201. See also Chardonnens, L. S. ‘A New Edition of the Old English “Formation of the Foetus”’, pp. 10–11, and Chardonnens, Anglo-Saxon Prognostics, p. 229.
549 ‘Another piece. First of all the brain is put together in a human. The backbone is made towards the tripartite brain in the sixth week…. Then the maternal pains come because the body is moved. Also, it is fed in the womb.’ Text and translation from Bremmer, ‘Leiden, Vossianus Lat. Q 69’, p. 34.
used with the same extended sense, possibly even influenced by the use of L. *utero* in a Latin exemplar.\(^{550}\) It is highly probable that OE *innoð* is semantically extended to mean ‘womb’ in these instances due to the polyvalence of L. *utero* in medical Latin, which can mean both ‘belly’ and more specifically ‘womb’.\(^{551}\)

The Old English term *maga* also appears once in the text on the *Formation of the Foetus*:

\[
\text{On þam teþa<\textit{n}> monþe þæt wif hit negedigð} \quad \text{In x. feltacus hoc est, stomachus qui, conpellit}
\]
\[
\text{hyre feore gif þæt beam accenned ne biþ, for} \quad \text{hominem nasci.}\(^{553}\)
\]
\[
\text{þam þe hit in þam magan wyrð hire to feorh} \quad \text{adle oftost on tiwes niht.}\(^{552}\)
\]

In this instance the Latin and Old English are quite different, given that the Latin text agrees more closely with Vindicianus, *Gynaecia* 20 in predicting natural parturition rather than calamity, as in the Old English text. What is surprising in this particular Latin text is the use of the unusual word *feltacus*, with the incorporated gloss *hoc est stomachus*. This usage of L. *stomachus* may explain why OE *maga* is used in this sentence rather than OE *innoð*, even though the sense of the two passages diverges considerably at this point.

**Interim Conclusions**

In the study of anatomical vocabulary thus far, we have been able to note a considerable effort to disambiguate between terms that are often synonymous in everyday language, giving us a specialisation of meaning within the semantic field of medicine. We have also been able to note a consistent approach to the translation of often obscure Latin anatomical terms from a range of differing authorities. These two facets of the language, the narrowing of meaning and the creation of absolute synonymy and total translatability between Latin and Old English medical terminology represents a very well organised investment of scholarly resources.

In the above study, we can see essentially two different kinds of anatomical terms emerging, and two different semantic forces acting. The first force is specialisation, wherein a common word such as *maga*, *wambe* or *innoð* becomes specialised and is used only to translate a single concept, or even a single Latin term. The second type concerns those words which are rarely, if ever, attested outside of medical prose. It is here that the *Allegemeinverständlichkeit* of the word would seem to indicate that it has a special status as a technical term given that it has been coined specifically for

\(^{550}\) The Latin text of Leiden, Vossianus Lat. Q 69 supplied here is close enough to be a textual precursor to the Old English prognostic, but cannot be said to be the direct source with any great confidence.

\(^{551}\) Langslow, *Medical Latin*, p. 140.

\(^{552}\) ‘In the tenth month it is fatally harmful to the woman if the child is not born, because it turns to a fatal malady in her stomach, most often on a Tuesday night.’ Formation of the Foetus, ed. Liuzzo, p. 201.

\(^{553}\) ‘In the tenth, *feltacus*, that is the stomach which forces man to be born’ Bremmer, ‘Leiden, Vossianus Lat. Q. 69,’ p. 34.
use in medicine. For example, OE *neweseoþa and *ragereorsa do not seem to appear at all outside of the Bald’s *Leechbook, whilst the term *baecþearm is very rare outside of the *Leechbook, occurring only in five glosses and the confessional of Pseudo-Ecgbert, in which it appears to refer to sexual anal penetration.\textsuperscript{554}

Thus we see that Old English terms were either specialised in their meaning, or even invented to deal with the complexities of translating Latin anatomical vocabulary, while loan translations such as *þa hnescan rib are further evidence of the influence of Latin on Old English anatomical vocabulary, all pointing towards a sophisticated and intelligent linguistic approach to the discipline of medicine.

\textsuperscript{554} ‘Gyf he in hire bæcþearm hæme, fæste X winter.’ ‘If he fornicates in her anus, he is to fast for 10 winters.’ Spindler, R., ed., *Das Alteenglische Bussbuch* (Leipzig, 1934).
CHAPTER 5: OLD ENGLISH PHYSIOLOGICAL VOCABULARY

Introduction: The Four Humours

Before Old English physiological vocabulary can be discussed in any detail, it is necessary to briefly describe the physiological system by which the human body, and indeed diseases attacking it, were thought to operate.

The system in operation was humoral, that is, it was based upon the assumption that the body was made up of four humours or fluids, and illness arose from an imbalance of these fluids. Thus an overabundance of one fluid could be rebalanced either by the purgation of that humour by phlebotomy, emetics, diuretics, laxatives or enemas, or the body could be restored to a state of equilibrium by diet and regimen, the physician prescribing those foods and activities which would heat a cold body, moisten a dry body, dry a moist body, or cool a hot body.

That this system was known about in Anglo-Saxon England should take but a small number of literary references to establish. Byrhtferth of Ramsey, writing in the early eleventh century, describes the nature of man, and his makeup of four humours, and the relationship between this and the four elements, and winds, and then goes on to paraphrase in Old English what he has said in Latin:

… Lengtentima and cildiugoð gehwærlæcað, and enihtiugoð and sumor beoð gelice, and hærfast and geþungen yld geferlæcað, and winter and yld ateriað. Lengtentima ys wæt and wearm; þæt lyft ys wæt and wearm; cildylþ beð wæt and wearm, and hyra blod byð wæt and wearm. Æstas ys sumor; he byð wærm and drigge. Colera rubea (þæt synt read incoða) beoð on sumera; hig beoð wearme and drigge. Autumnus (þæt byð hærfest) his gecynd ys þæt he beo ceald and drigge. Eorðe ys ceald and drigge; geþungen yld byð drigge and ceald. On hearfeste beoð colera nigra (þæt synt sweat incoðan) þa beoð drige and cealde. Hiemps ys winter; he byð ceald and wæt. Wæter is ceald and wæt; swa byð se ealda man ceald and snoflig. Flegmata (þæt byð ðraca oððe geþosu) derið þam ealdan and þam unhalan.555

Springtime and childhood are in accordance, summer and youth are alike, autumn and middle age keep company, and winter and age decline. Springtime is wet and warm, the air is wet and warm, childhood is wet and warm and their blood is wet and warm. Aestas, that is summer, is warm and dry, cholera rubea, (that is red bile) is (increased) in the summer, they are warm and dry. Autumnus (that is, harvest), its type is that it is cold and dry. Earth is cold and dry, middle age is dry and cold. In harvest colera nigra (that is black bile), which is dry and cold is [increased]. Hiemps is winter. It is cold and

wet. Water is cold and wet; so the old man is cold and snuffly. Flegmata (that is a cough or sneeze) afflicts the old and the unhealthy.’

While this Old English paraphrase of the Latin text is somewhat simplistic in its glossing of flegmata as being purely rheumatic afflictions of the respiratory tract, it nevertheless portrays the fundamental points of medieval cosmology inherited from Classical antiquity and which remained pertinent well into the Early Modern period, namely the relationship between the four elements, the observable characteristics of matter as either hot, cold, dry or wet, the four humours which make up the human body, and the four ages of man and the seasons.

To investigate how deeply this theory penetrates into the medical texts of the Anglo-Saxon period, we should consider specific Old English words for ‘humour,’ starting with the words which denote the concept of ‘humour’ or ‘fluid’ itself.

**Substantives on the Stem Wæt- in Old English**

The main term which is used to denote the concept of ‘humour’ in Old English is the weak masculine wæta and weak feminine wæte, whilst a related strong neuter wæt seems almost synonymous in some situations. While the weak and strong declensions of this noun are normally lemmatized separately, the following study will not consider them a priori to be separate lexemes, but will consider how grammatical class interacts with semantics with regards to this term. Although a study has already been undertaken by Lois Ayoub on the subject of OE wæta and humoral theory, the present study aims to be considerably more comprehensive than Ayoub’s, who lists in her appendix only sixty-three instances of the term, citing ‘only those instances referring to the doctrine of the four humours.’ In addition to studying the relationship between the strong and weak declensions on the same stem, the following study goes beyond the scope of Ayoub’s also by comparing, where possible, the source Latin lexeme, and also by examining the relative frequency of the term when it does not refer to a bodily humour.

**Limits and Exclusions**

This word study is concerned with substantives on the OE stem wet only, not adjectives or verbs with overlapping orthographic forms. Since Old English adjectives, nouns and even verbs on the same stem often overlap in many forms, a large number of non-substantives will naturally be found in a simple search of the corpus for the various declensional forms of such substantives, such as the following example from the Cambridge Psalter (C).

---

556 This wonderful Old English word would seem to convey the literal sense of ‘phlegmatic,’ as in suffering from an excess of phlegm, far better than ‘phlegmatic’ itself.

557 Ayoub, ‘Old English wæta,’ p. 344.
Psalm VI.7 Ic wonn on geomrunge minre ic þwea þurh syndrige nihte bedd min tearas stræte mine ic wæte Laboraui in gemitu meo lauabo per singulas noctes lectum meum lacrimis stratum meum rigabo.558

The above example of a present indicative verb, and others, mostly adjectives, have been silently removed from the list of examples.

Lemmatization

This survey initially juxtaposes two lexemes which are normally lemmatized separately with the intention of discerning whether or not they are semantically distinct, and whether or not there is a dialectal, generic, temporal or sociolinguistic bias in the selection of the two lexemes. The lexemes in question share the same stem, wæt-, merely differing in the declensional paradigm within which the stem is inflected. As a weak noun the word appears as both masculine (se wæta) and feminine (seo wæte). The strong declension appears consistently neuter. Bosworth and Toller559 agree with this lemmatisation, listing wæt as a strong neuter noun, and wæta, -e as both masculine and feminine. The word is not revised in the supplement560 or addenda.561 Table 5.1 illustrates the observed morphological forms. Unattested forms are prefixed by an asterisk (*).

Table 5.1 Forms of OE wæt, wæta and wæte

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>weak m. or f.</th>
<th>weak m. or f.</th>
<th>strong n</th>
<th>strong n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nominative</td>
<td>wæta, -e</td>
<td>wætan</td>
<td>wæt</td>
<td>*wæt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accusative</td>
<td>wætan</td>
<td>wætan</td>
<td>wæt</td>
<td>*wæt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>genitive</td>
<td>wætan</td>
<td>wætena</td>
<td>wætes</td>
<td>*wæta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dative</td>
<td>wætan</td>
<td>*wætum</td>
<td>wæte</td>
<td>wætum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instrumental</td>
<td>wætan</td>
<td>*wætum</td>
<td>*wæte</td>
<td>*wætum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

558 'I have laboured in my groanings, every night I will wash my bed: I will water my couch with my tears.' Cambridge, University Library, FF. 1. 23, ed. Wildhagen, Der Cambridger Psalter.


Senses Listed in Bosworth and Toller

For the neuter \textit{wæt}, the dictionary gives two possible senses, the principal sense being wetness or moisture, the secondary sense being something drunk, with an extended sense of the blood of Christ. The Supplement lists the gloss on \textit{L. irrigium} as a separate sense.\textsuperscript{562}

For the weakly declined \textit{wæta} (m) and \textit{wæte} (f), Bosworth and Toller give four senses: i. ‘wet, moisture,’ ii. ‘a liquid,’ including potable fluid, iii. ‘moisture in an animal body, humour’ (including a subclass for urine), and iv. ‘moisture found in plants, juice, sap.’\textsuperscript{563}

Overall there is little to be argued about in these senses; however, there is scope to examine the contextual nature of these disparate senses over a variety of genres of text, from the homiletic writings of Ælfric to Bald’s \textit{Leechbook}. Given the number of times this term occurs, each item has been consecutively numbered by genre, and in each sentence the relevant word or words are in bold typeface. Where there is a clear relationship demonstrated in published editions between Old English texts and their Latin sources or parallels, the printed Latin has been provided.

Instances in medical literature

\textit{OEH}: Headings

1. 125.1 Wib ealle gegaderunga þæs yfelan \textit{wætan}.\textsuperscript{564}
   ‘For all gatherings of the harmful fluid.’

2. 175.2 Gif wif of ðam gecyndelican limon þone flewsan þæs \textit{wætan} ðolige.\textsuperscript{565}
   ‘If a woman suffers a flow of the fluid from the reproductive organs.’

3. 181.1 Wib þone yfelan \textit{wætan} þæs lichoman.\textsuperscript{566}
   ‘For the harmful fluid of the body.’

\textit{OEH}

4. 1.20 geðiege ðonne þæs \textit{wætan} þreo full fulle.\textsuperscript{567} \hspace{1cm} \textit{DHVL} 39 et aquae calidae quiatos duo bibat.\textsuperscript{568}
   ‘then drink three cups full of that liquid.’ ‘and drink two cyathos of hot water.’

---

\textsuperscript{562} ‘\textit{Wæt’} in Bosworth and Toller, ed., \textit{An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary}; and Toller, ed., \textit{Supplement}.  
\textsuperscript{563} ‘\textit{Wæta’} in Bosworth and Toller, ed., \textit{An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary}.  
\textsuperscript{564} De Vriend, ed. \textit{Herbarium}, p. 21.  
\textsuperscript{565} Ibid. p. 28.  
\textsuperscript{566} Ibid. p. 29.  
\textsuperscript{567} Ibid., p. 34.  
\textsuperscript{568} Howald and Sigerist, ed., \textit{Herbarius}, p. 9.
4.9 lege to þære wunde swa óþær ða corn þurh ðone *wætan* gehnesode syn.\(^560\) ‘apply to the wound thus until the grains are softened by the moisture.’

3.9 tritici quoque grana integra indito uulneribus, donec *humore* mollita explet.\(^570\) ‘whole grains of wheat placed likewise on the wounds until they swell, softened by moisture.’

37.6 Wið niwe wunda þe þone *wætan* gewyrceap.\(^571\) ‘For new wounds that produce fluid’

36.6 Ad vulnera vetera quae *humorem* praestant.\(^572\) ‘For old wounds which produce fluid.’

86.1 na he on caldum wætere cume ne he cealdne *wætan* ne þicge.\(^573\) ‘He should not come into cold water, nor drink any cold fluid.’

85.6 in frigida non descendat neque *frigida* bibat.\(^574\) ‘He should not go down into cold (water) nor drink any cold (water).’

93.3 (Wiþ wæterseocnyse) Eac hyt bynman healfon geare ealne þone *wætan* ut atyhþ.\(^575\) ‘(For dropsy) It will also drive out all the fluid within half a year.’

85.2 in frigida non descendat neque *frigida* bibat.\(^576\) ‘Indeed, throughout the year every humour is reduced.’

92.3 Per anum enim *humor* omnis detrahitur.\(^577\) ‘For apostema.’

125.1 Wið ealle gegaderunga þæs yfelan *wætan* of þam lichoman.\(^578\) ‘With all gatherings of the harmful fluid of the body.’

125.2 *frigida* non bibat.\(^579\) ‘For apostema.’

---

\(^{560}\) De Vriend, ed. *Herbarium*, p. 46.
\(^{571}\) De Vriend, ed. *Herbarium*, p. 84.
\(^{572}\) Howald and Sigerist, ed., *Herbarius*, p. 82.
\(^{574}\) Howald and Sigerist, ed., *Herbarius*, p. 152.
\(^{580}\) Howald and Sigerist, ed., *Herbarius*, p. 212.
‘For pain of the bladder… nor consume any cold liquid.’

LMHF Haec etiam matricibus mulierum sanguinem profundentibus praestat; si autem humoris profluvium mulieres ex naturalibus patiuntur, haec herba decocta omnem humorem supersedentium mulierum solo vapore constringit.

‘For pain of the bladder… nor drink cold water.’

‘If a woman suffers a flux of fluid from the reproductive organs, take this same plant boiled, lay under the sitting woman; it binds all the fluid by its vapour.’

‘This too, is good for blood pouring from from the wombs of women; if women suffer an outpouring of fluid from the genitals, this herb boiled restrains every humour of women sitting on it by its vapour alone.’

‘If a woman suffers a flux of fluid from the reproductive organs, take this same plant boiled, lay under the sitting woman; it binds all the fluid by its vapour.’

‘This too, is good for blood pouring from from the wombs of women; if women suffer an outpouring of fluid from the genitals, this herb boiled restrains every humour of women sitting on it by its vapour alone.’

‘If a woman suffers a flux of fluid from the reproductive organs, take this same plant boiled, lay under the sitting woman; it binds all the fluid by its vapour.’

‘This too, is good for blood pouring from from the wombs of women; if women suffer an outpouring of fluid from the genitals, this herb boiled restrains every humour of women sitting on it by its vapour alone.’

‘For the harmful fluids of the body… and when he begins to vomit, he should often drink a light drink of beor.’

‘Fifteen grains of it ground with aqua mulsa purges the body of humours through vomit… He should take the aqua mulsa frequently in that vomiting.’

‘For the harmful fluids of the body… and when he begins to vomit, he should often drink a light drink of beor.’

‘Fifteen grains of it ground with aqua mulsa purges the body of humours through vomit… He should take the aqua mulsa frequently in that vomiting.’

Medicina de quadrupedibus

MEA α 1.1 Ad omnes homones. cornus cervinis habet vim omnes humores siccandi.

‘For the bite of a snake, stag’s horn has the power to dry every liquid.’

‘For all humours: the horn of a stag has the power to dry all humours.’

‘For the bite of a snake, stag’s horn has the power to dry every liquid.’

‘For all humours: the horn of a stag has the power to dry all humours.’

582 Ibid., p. 221.
583 Ibid., p. 226.
584 Ibid., p. 227.
585 Ibid., p. 240.
586 humores]. homines Two of the three MSs of the Sextus Placitus α read homines, but Howald and Sigerist emend to humores on the basis of the β reading, whilst de Vriend records homines faithfully; cf. De Vriend, ed., Herbarium, p. 241; Howald and Sigerist, ed., Herbarius, p. 235.
16 7.10 genim þæt wæter þe innan gæt
byþ 7 heo hwilum ut geoteð menge
þone wætan wið hunige 7 sealte. 588
‘Take that fluid which is within a goat and
she sometimes pours out, mix the liquid
with honey and salt.’

17 7.11. Wið innoðes heardnyssse: swa
hwæt swa he ete menge wið þone wætan. 591
‘For hardness of the bowels: mingle
whatever he eats with that liquid.’

18 7.12. Wið þone wætan. 593
‘For the humour.’

19 8.2. smyre mid þam wætan þe drype
of healfsodenre rammes lungenne.
‘smear with the liquid that drips from a
half-boiled ram’s lung.’

20 9.11 ahefe upp 7 abid oþþæt se wæta
of aflogen sy.
lift up and wait until the water has flowed
out of it.

Bald’s Leechbook I: Chapter Headings

Since a translation of the whole text has been provided in the appendices, translation of the
following citations shall be omitted here.

21 I.H.17 of yfelre wætan slitendre

589 caprae lacte: α reads capra. Sigerist and Howald emend on the Basis of the β reading.
590 Howald and Sigerist, ed., Herbarius, p. 252.
592 Howald and Sigerist, ed., Herbarius, p. 252.
593 De Vriend, ed., Herbarium, p. 256.
594 Howald and Sigerist, ed., Herbarius, p. 252.
I.H.31 wiþ ælcre yfelre swellendre **wætan**

I.H.77 gif þu wille þæt yfel swyle & æterno **wæte** ut berste.

Bald’s *Leechbook I*

I.1.18. sio adl cymð of yfelre **wætan** ufan flowendre. *PAL I.45 Et fit hoc cum superfluitas ibi aliqua incesserit: aut certe resolutus humor in ventositatem exagitat loca.*

I.1.24 atihð þæt þa yfelan **wætan** ut ofþe þurh muð oððe þurh nosu. *PPB I.1 materia detrahare per nares uel per os.*

I.1.25 Eft þus þu scealt þa yfelan ofsetenan **wætan** utadon þurh spatl 7 hræcean meng pipor wiþ hwit cwudu sele to ceowanne. *MDM V.7 Masticem cum pipere qui diu commanduauerit calefacto cerebro umorem pituitae naribus effundit.*

I.2.3. *and mettas.* 7 þa swiþost þa ðe on þære uferan wambe gewuniað 7 ne magon meltan. ac þær yfelæ *wætan* wyrcæð 7 þicce. *Oribasius, Synopsis V.37 In suspitionem sit vin<e>s multus et dulces et cibos qui in superiora ventris multum manet et indigestis et humida generant opera et pinguis erudga, porrus.*

I.4.5 þonne atihð hio mid ealle þa yfelan **wætan** ut 7 þone gund. cf. Marcellus 15.51

I.4.12 þa yfelan **wætan** & þat sar n/a

I.18.1. Se cymð … of to micelre fylle. oððe of to miclre lærnesse. oððe of yfelum **wætan** slitendum 7 sceorfendum þone magan. *Syn. VI.42 Singultus fit aut ex plenitudine aut de evacuatione, vel inaninate, aut certe ex acros humores mordicationem in stomacho facta.*

---

595 Fradin, ed., *Practica Alexandri*, 7r.
I.18.2 Gif þonne se seoca man þurh spiwedrenc aspiwð þone yfelan bitendan þæt þonne forstent se geohsa waetan on weg þonne forstent se geohsa sed mox vomuerit humores, requiescit singultus.

I.18.2 se geohsa se þe of þæs yfelan waetan micelnyssse cymð hii ergo qui ex plenitudinem aut mordicationem humorum singultiunt.600

I.18.5 Gif of hatum waetan yfelum on þone magon gesamnodum se geohsa cume.

I.31.10 Wiþ yflum waetan 7 swile

I.31.10 þæt worms 7 þone yfelan waetan aweg deþ 7 adrifþ.

I.31.12 Wiþ alecum yflum waetan.

I.36.1 Drince þonne æfter þone drenc 7 nanne oþerne waetan.

I.42.1 Of geal adle... þonne geweaxeð on innan ungemet waetan.

I.47.9 Drince nigon morgenas nanne oþerne waetan.

I.56.1 and meddrosna do to waetan.

I.63.1 do eala to waetan.

I.63.3 Drince þisne drenc... 7 nane oþre waetan þæt þice & stille sie.

I.72.6 þonne þa yfelan waetan beoþ gegaderode.

I.73.1 do on þæt lim 7 nane waetan.

I.73.1 gif þu waetan dest to oþþe smera sealfe.

I.75.1 heald þritig nihta wiþ waetan.

I.80.2 swilcre waetan swa he drincan scyle.

Bald’s Leechbook II: Chapter Headings

II.H.25 hu mon þa yfelan waetan þære wambe lacnian scyle

II.H.25 for þære yfelan omihtan waetan

II.H.28 þæt ufærre hrif sie gefyllde wiþ yfelre waetan

II.H.29 and cirre on fule 7 yfel waetan oþþe scittan.

Molinier, ed., Synopsis in Oeuvres d’Oribase, ed. Bussemaker and Daremberg, VI, 123.
II.H.38 hu mon sceal þa wætan & wonscefta utan lacnian.

II.H.38 and be þam wætum yflum þæs miltes

II.H.38 and wido slipunge wætan þæs miltes.

II.H.42 Læcedomas gif omihtre blod 7 yfele wætan on þam milte syn þindende

Bald’s Leechbook II

II.1.3 se maga bip neah þære heortan 7 þære gelodr. 7 geaortenge þæm bræge<ne>. of þam cumað þa adla swípost of þæs magan intingan 7 on yflum seawum wætan atterberendum. PAL II.14 Est enim sensiblior 7 bene in conpatiendo per vena vicinas epati 7 cordi consentiens contingitur etiam cerebro. In hiis ergo principalibus tantas 7 tales passiones 7 causa stomachus facit.601

II.1.4 Þonne da wætan þa yfelan weorðþa gegaderode on þone magan. 7 þær rixiað mid scearfunga innan. PAL II.36.2 Contingit autem his quibus pessimi et uenonosi cum mordicatione stomachi ibidem colliguntur humores…

II.1.5 be þære gelicunge þæs magan þe þa yfelan wætan sceorfendan 7 scearpan hæfð PAL II.37.2 si is qui patitur sit temperantia satis calida, et in eius stomacho contineantur humores mordicantes et acres nimir.

II.1.6 þa ðe mægen wiþ habban þam yfelan wætan PAL II.37.4 sed repugnando uincere possunt malos qui continentur humores

II.1.7 and wiþ þon þe mon sie on þam magan omigre wætan gefylled PAL II.37.11 uel quibus stomachus flegmate repletus frigidus est

II.1.7 and wido manegum adlum þæt deah. þa þe cumað of oferfyllo and of missenlicum yflum wætum. sed et alia plurima de quibus nunc non est tempus ad commemorandum.603

601 Fradin, ed., Practica Alexandri, 34v.
603 Ibid., p. 165.
II.1.9 Gif he þonne cumað of ofrüm biterum 7 yfelum [wætum] þa þe wyrcead oman …

II.1.9 þonne beoþ þa elcran to stillanne ofþæt þe he unstrangran woerðan swiþost gif þa [wætan] beoð þicce 7 slipegran.

II.1.10 Be wambe coþe ofþhe gif of þære wambe anre þa yfelan [wætan] cumen. 

gift þonne sio yfele [wæte] of þære wambe oferyrneþ ealne þone lichoman 

hwilum him mon sceal of ædran blod lætan gif þæs blodes to fela þince 7 þære yflan [wætan].

II.16.3 and gif him ofstondeþ on innan æniguu ceald [wæte].

II.16.4 þa slipinga [wætan] on þam magan 7 þa acolodan 7 þæt ofstandene þicce slipige horh þu scealt mid þam ærgenemnedan læcedum wyrman 7 þynnian.

II.16.6 and gifernes arist of þæs hores [wætan] þe of þam magan cymð 7 he beoþ spiwende 7 swa swa hund eft sona secâð þa mettas.

PAL II.38 Si autem ex humorum acredine fit cacochimia est.

Flegmatici autem extenuandi sunt 7 maxime si pingues 7 viscosi sunt.604

Si autem ex toto corpore decurrunt in ventres humores

Si autem ex toto corpore decurrunt in ventres humores

Interdum etiam flobothomandi sunt si sanguinis videtur esse habundantia 7 nihil sit quo impediat.605

PAL II.15 sed humor aliquis frigidior subsistens606

Pass II.31 Et si nimium phlegma inducis in stomacho idest in ore ventris congestum, huius medicaminis 607

PAL II.15 Alia habent etiam nam 7 flegma vomunt/ 7 cibos quemadmodum canis 7 iterum ad vomitus reuertuntur.608
II.21.5 þincþ him sona on fruman þæt sio waete swiþor niþor gewite þonne hio upstige. 609

II.23.3 Æle broþ is to forganne forþon þe hit biþ þindende 7 yfele waætan wyrcþ.

II.23.3 Ægru sint to forganne forþonþe hira waete bið fæt 7 maran hæto wyrcð. 610

II.23.6 and adriþ mid þy læcedome þa waætan 7 wirð se swile swa heard swa stan.

II.24.13 7 nænige ofre waætan.

II.24.13 …7 nane ofre waætan.

II.24.13 … 7 nanne oferne waætan.

II.25.t hu mon þa yfelan waætan þære wambe laecnian seycle.

II.25.4 Gif þæt sie omihite waete innan onburnenu.

II.25.4 and wyrð gegaderodu omig waete on þære wambe.

II.27.8 Gif sio yfle waete to micel sie. cf Oribasius, Synopsis. V.53 613 þonne dugon him ceald wæter 7 scarpe mettas butan hætu.

II.27.8 Hwilum beoþ þa waætan on þære wambe filmenum. Syn. V.53 sed si autem circumtenetur humor in tonicis ventris.

II.27.8 and mid swelcum utyrnendum drencum ateon ut þa horhehtan waeta. Syn. V.53 per ea quae mediocriter purgat; 614

609 It would seem that the translator either misread tumor for humor or the misreading had crept into an exemplar at some point in the transmission process.
610 Fradin, ed., Practica Alexandri, 43r.
611 Ibid., 43r.
612 Ibid., 43v.
613 ‘Nam ea que supercurrunt repremenda sunt.’ Molinier, ed., Synopsis in Oeuvres d’Oribase, ed. Bussemaker and Daremberg, VI, 92–3. The mention of cold food and drink in the Old English seems to be an interpolation absent from both known recensions of the Latin Oribasius.
II.28.4 Gif sio wamb bip windes full þonne cymð þæt of wlace wætan

II.29.2 Seo wæte wyrçþ, gif hie mon ne deþ aweg, uneaplacna adla

II.30.5 swiðost on forweardne lencten ær þon sio yfele wæte se þe on wintra gesomnad bið hie togeote geond oþera lima.

II.30.6 þonne becymð of þam yflum wætum oððe sio healfdeade adl oþfe fyllewarc oððe sio hwite riefþo þe mon on suþerne lepra hæt oþfe tetra oþfe heafod hriefðo oþfe oman

II.30.7 Forþon sceal mon ær clæsnian þa yflan wætan aweg ær þon þa yfelan cuman 7 geweaxen on wintra 7 þa limo geondyrnen.

II.35.2 Gif his mon getilað æt þære yfelan wætan

II.36.6 Of cele ungemeticum, of hæto & of drignesse, of micelre yfelre wætan forþon wixþ se milte ofer gesceap PAL II.104 (Philagrius) nam <splen> infrigidatur et calefit et siccatur et humectatur et post haec sicut alia

Syn. V.38 Galenus. Ad eos qui flegnam in ventrem superiorem repletem habent.⁶¹⁵

Syn. V.30 De his quibus in ventre conrumpit cibus.⁶¹⁶

Eup I.16 Hoc autem faciat in primum uer antequam ebulescat et effundatur collectus ex hieme humor superhabundans et currat per ali qua membrorum loca et periculosoas generat passiones et alii pati uidentur exantematas (ἐξάνθηματος) similia aut aspera, qualia sunt lepre aut impetigines, alii acoras (ἄχωρ) in capite, aerisipilas et aerpitas. purgare oportet antequam ebullescant collecti humores de hiemee resoluentur et currant per membra.⁶¹⁷

⁶¹⁵ Ibid., VI, 73.
⁶¹⁶ Ibid., VI, 68.
⁶¹⁷ Ibid., VI, 413; See also Cameron, Anglo-Saxon Medicine, pp. 77–82, 118–9.
membra distemperatus efficitur et aegritudines in eo generatur.

II.36.6 *and swiþost of cele 7 of ungemetlic re wætan.*

II.36.10 þurh þas þing þa *yfelan wætan* 7 windigo þing beop acenned on þam milte

II.38.t Hu man sceal þa wætan 7 þa wonsceaf tan utan lacnian.

II.38.2 Wîp þam wætan yfle þæs miltes.

II.38.5 Ne bið þæt an þæt þæt drige þa *wætan*

II.38.5 …ac þa aheardodan swilas þa de cumað of þiccum wætum slipegrum bet & þwænð.

II.38.6 Wîp slipegrum wætum þæs miltes …potest enim digerer hum idam splenis di stemerantiam.

II.40.1 þa lacniað þone milte 7 aweg adoð þæt þicce & lifrige blod. 7 þa yfelan wæ tan.

II.42.1 Gif omihte blod 7 yfel wæte on þam milte sie þindende

II.46.6 Swa þu meaht ongitan þæt þære sidan sar cymð of yfelre wætan *LT 34.4 sic lateris intelligis dolorem ex reumatismo contigisse.*

II.53.1 to wætan healf halig wæter

II.56.7 sum mid þiccum wætum geond goten.

---

619 *Ibid*, p. 76.
II.66.4 gif he þæs stanes gesceafenes hwilcne dæl on wætan onfeð

II.66.5 gif he ðone stan on wætan þigeð

II.66.8 þe ðone stan on wætan byrigð.

*Leechbook III*

III.29 and wip þam þe man sie mid wætan forbærned\(^{622}\)

and in case one is scalded with liquid

III.2. do þæt se wæta mæge furþum ofer yran þa wyrta.\(^{623}\)

make it so that the liquid may also run over the herbs

III.29. Gif mon sie mid wætan forbærned nime elmrinde 7 lilian moran.\(^{624}\)

‘If one is scalded with liquid take elm bark and lily root.’

III.29 Wylle þonne on cetele oþ þæt se wæta sie twæde on bewylled.\(^{625}\)

‘Then boil in a kettle until the liquid is reduced by half.’

London, British Library Addit. 43703\(^{626}\)

Nim þonne vi and xxx lybcorna, gnid smæle, do wætes hwon in, geot innon þone drenc.

‘Then take thirty-six purgative seeds, grind finely, add in a little liquid, pour that drink inside.’

*Leechbook Fragment: Harley 55*\(^{627}\)

This text has been included in the Appendices as *Leechbook* II.59, and has been treated as above.

II.59.1 þæs þa sina toslupað 7 beoð mid slipigre 7 þiccere wætan yfelre 7 yfelre þiccere 7 micelre.  

*Syn. VIII.14 De paralysin Contingit ergo haec passio ex humoribus gluttinosis et pinguissimis constipantis nervus.*

---


\(^{623}\) Ibid., II, 304.

\(^{624}\) Ibid., II, 324.

\(^{625}\) Ibid., II, 324.


II.59.1 Þa wæt an man scæl mid blodlæsum 7 drencum 7 læcedomum on weg adon. Manifestum est ergo quia evacuari tales humores.  

II.59.7 lytlad þa yfelan wætan on þam seocum men  

II.59.16. ac hwilc æθwega yfel wæte LT 79.2 sed cuiuscumque humoris bið gegoten on þæt lim deriuatio, qui partem corporis tenet.  

II.59.18. od ðæt þriddan dæl þære wætan oððe feorðan  

Laemungã  

43 (42) and ða wyrte geornlice wið þone wætan gemengce, drince þonne.  

‘And thoroughly mix the plants with the liquid, then drink.’  

64 (66) Þas gebedu þriwa man sceal singan, ælc þriwa on þysne drænc; 7 þæs mannæ oruð eallinga on þone wætan þæt hwile þe he hit singe.  

‘One should sing these prayers three times, each three times onto the liquid, and the man’s breath entirely on the liquid while he sings it.’  

64 (66) Gif se mon sy innan forswollen, þæt he ne mæge þone wætan þiegean.  

‘If the man be swollen inside so that he may not consume the liquid,’  

68 (71) and nænigne oþerne wætan ne ðige.  

and do not consume any other liquid.  

84 (91) and ne cume þær æt nan wæta, butan of þan wyrтан sylfan.  

and let no liquid at it except of the plants themselves.  

115 (122) Nim þone wætan 7 wyrm, 7 lafa þin heafod mid.  

take the liquid and warm it, and wash your head with it.

---

628 Orbiasius, Synopsis viii.14 (ed. Molinier, VI, 222–3).  
629 Fischer, ed., Liber tertius, p. 337.  
630 The DOEC text is taken from Grattan and Singer, eds., Anglo-Saxon Magic and Medicine Illustrated specially from the Semi-Pagan Text ‘Lacnunga’. The DOEC relies upon Grattan and Singer for the majority of the text, alternating with Dobbie, ed., Minor Poems for those recipes which may be scanned as verse. The paragraph numbering used here follows Pettit’s edition. Paragraph numbers in parentheses refer to Grattan and Singer’s edition.  
631 Ibid., I, 24.  
632 Ibid., I, 36.  
633 Ibid., I, 66.  
634 Ibid., I, 72.  
635 Ibid., I, 84.
125 127 (Metrical Charm 4, A43.4) ‘Wið færstice’

Nim þonne þæt seax, ado on wastan.636

‘Then take that knife, place in water.’

126 173 (180) Wið hwostan: hu he missenlice on man becymð & hu his man tilian sceal. Se hwosta hæfð mænigfealdne tocyme, swa ða swat beoð missenlicu, hwilum he cymð of ungemæftæstre hæto, hwilum of ungemæftæstum cyle, hwilum of ungemætlicre wastan, hwilum of ungemætlicre drignesse.637

‘For a cough, how it variously comes upon one and how one shall treat it. The cough has a manifold onset, as the sweats are diverse; sometimes it comes from immoderate heat, sometimes of immoderate chill, sometimes of immoderate moisture, and sometimes of immoderate dryness.’

PAL II.1.1 De tusse. Tussis quidem est accidentia et ipsa, quemadmodum et dispnia, et differentias et ipsa habet qualitatis causarum, [sed] quoniam initium habet modo a calida distemperantia, est autem quando a frigida aut humida aut etiam sicca.638

636 Ibid., I, 94.
637 Ibid., I, 120.
639 Cockayne, ed., Leechdoms, III, 292.
640 Cockayne suggests this reading in his translation, his edition shows the characters ‘GT’ with some kind of abbreviation mark above them.

127

And þas wyrta sy swyþe smæl corflode. 7 gedon innan þam croccan on uppan þam sy gedon grut640 of þe wastan þæt hi þearle wel wese beon.

‘And let the herbs be finely cut and place [them] into the pot, on top of them is placed grout or a liquid that they may be very well soaked.’

‘Flyleaf’ Recipes641

128 10. Eft wið þæt ilce nim sauina 7 betonica 7 wermod 7 merc 7 seoð on win oððe on oðer wast swyðe.
‘Again for the same, take savin juniper and betony and wormwood and celery and boil well in wine or in other fluid.’

_Peri didaxeon_

129 1. and hi gesæddun þæt feower _wætun_ syndon on þan manniscen lichama. Petrocellus, _Tereoperica_. 151 _Epistola Ypocratis et Galieni_ contemplantium quatuor esse _humores_ in humano corpore.642

‘And they said that there were four humours in the human body.’

130 1. þat ys þa _wæte_ on þan heafode and þæt blod on þara breosta… Ter. 151 _Flegma_ naturalem locum cerebrum ostendit; sanguis vero in arterias et venas sedet…

‘That is phlegm in the head, and blood in the breast.’

131 1. Þæt ys fram xviii _kalendas_. _ianuaris_. Kalendas Aprilis crescit in capite _flegma_ et augmentatur usque in viii _kalendas_. _aprilis_., þæt on ðan heafde se _wæte_ byð wexende;643

‘That is, from the 15th of December to the 25th of March, that the phlegm is increased in the head.’

132 3. Ad scabiosos. Nim wingeardes sæt and gnid on _wæte_ and lege uppan þar sar.644

‘Take grape seed, grind in fluid and lay upon the sore.’

133 5. Efisona nim mintan and cnuca hy smale and lege uppan þa wunda, and ealle þa _wæten_ ، ðe þarat gað of þan sare, call heo hit adrigh, and gehælð þæt sare.645

Ter 15 Item menta trita et imposita vulnera capitis et _humores_ natos discutit.

642 All sources for the _Peri didaxeon_ are from De Renzi, Darember and Henschel, eds., _Collectio Salernitana_ IV, 185–286 after Löweneck, ed., _Peri didaxeon_.
644 Ibid., p. 5.
645 Ibid., p. 5.
‘Again, take mint and grind it finely and lay upon the sore, and it dries them, all of the fluids that rise thereabout from the sore, and heals the sore.’

‘Likewise mint ground and placed upon the wound also strikes down the humours produced.’

‘For a broken or wounded head from which fluid is engendered in the head.’

‘We speak of the fracture of the head, the wound from which fluid is generated in the head.’

‘And most severely for that man who drinks a cold fluid in that sickness.’

‘most severely for him who will have assumed to take a cold drink in the sickness.’

‘Therefore they are generated from the dark humour.’

‘which have origin from the melancholic humour.’

‘That is first, that that pain comes upon the eyes with great heat, sometimes it comes on with fluid’

‘Disease of the eyes sometimes occurs through the unnatural fervor of pain, sometimes with swelling, sometimes with a plentiful rheumatic discharge.’

---

646 Ibid., p. 7.
647 Ibid., p. 13.
648 Ibid., p. 13.
'The worst humour often comes to the teeth from the head.'

‘Pains of the teeth are brought about by moist and cold phlegm.’

Ter 30 Reumatizantibus gingivis ipsi dentes cavernantur … et putridi facti aut lividi aut nigri.

Also the upper humour of the head falls upon the teeth and penetrates them and makes so that they rot and swell

The gums becoming rheumatic, the teeth themselves are made hollow … and made rotten or livid or dark

Ter 43 Sed sciant hoc nescientes, quod omnis humor stomachum pulsat et vulnerat pectus

‘And it is true that every humour comes first from the stomach.’

‘But let the ignorant know this: that every humour beats the stomach and injures the breast’

Quia vene et viscera morbo putrido sunt plena.

‘Because the veins and bowels are filled with putrid disease.’

n/a

Ter 47 Aliquibus enim ex flegmate capitis…Aliquando ieiunis,…

649 Ibid., p. 21.
650 Ibid., pp. 33–5.
651 Ibid., p. 39.
‘It afflicts some men from the humour of the head, and it ails some men when they are fasting.’

‘Some from the phlegm of the head, some by fasting.’

Ter 43. Scias enim magnum auxilium pectoris… et contra omnium vitia superiorum parcium satis est.

‘Know truly that this emetic gives him much good and assistance both in the breast … and in all the harmful humours that are in the stomach and about the heart.’

‘Know therefore it is of great benefit to the chest, and it is sufficient against every pain of the upper parts.’

Ter 46 Magnum est auxilium vomitus ad omnem crassitudinem fglegmatis capitis; vel ad omnes, qui thoracem contingent inundationes exagitatas. id est flegma et coleram atque humorem felliticum evacuat, et non permitit congregari in stomacho humores nequissimos.

‘The vomit is good that the strength of the harmful humours in the head and the overflowing harmful humour in the breast are moved after food, and the harmful humours in the gall are likewise stirred, then through that drink they are cleansed, and it is not permitted that any harmful humours be gathered there inside the stomach.’

‘The vomit is the best help for every phlegmatic thickness of the head; or for all floods driven out which touch the thorax, that is it drives out phlegm and choler as well as the harmful humour, and it does not permit the most wicked humours to gather in the stomach.’
**Grammatical Gender**

In lemmatising the Old English substantives in *wæt*- it has been assumed that there are three possible declensions: the weak masculine *wæta*, the weak feminine *wæte* and the strong neuter *wæt*. The masculine and feminine weak nouns only differ in form in the nominative singular, which occurs rarely, so gender has been largely inferred from agreement with strong adjectives and demonstratives.

There are nevertheless places where it cannot be determined what declension a noun is. It can be impossible to tell whether a noun is strong or weak in the case of the dative plural, and it can be impossible to ascertain its gender in the case of a weak plural in the nominative or accusative, unless it is modified by a strong feminine adjective. As such a great many instances of the word are described merely as ‘weak plural’

This method holds for all of the sources with the exception of the *Peri didaxeon*, in which many of the instances show unexpected declensional endings in either the substantive or the modifying adjective or demonstrative. These irregularities in the *Peri didaxeon* arise partly due to its very late date of copying (s. xii med), although there are nonetheless many correctly declined instances of the nominative and accusative singulars such as *se wæta* (eg. item 146) and *cealdne wætan* (item 135), alongside otherwise unattested constructions such as *pa yfele wæta* (item 144).

Table 5.2 Summary of Declensional Classes of *wæt* in Medical Prose

The table uses the following abbreviations for declensional classes

- **wm**: weak masculine
- **wf**: weak feminine
- **wp**: weak plural, wherein the gender is indeterminate
- **sn**: strong neuter
- **w**: weak, wherein the gender is indeterminate
- **irr**: irregular, wherein the substantive is in false concord, or exhibits an idiosyncratic form.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>wm</th>
<th>wf</th>
<th>wp</th>
<th>sn</th>
<th>irr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OEH</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDQ</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLB I</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLB II</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leechbook III</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotton Otho B xi</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leechbook Fragment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lacnunga</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cot. Faust. A.x</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cot. Vit. C. III</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flyleaf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peri didaxeon</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There would seem to be an overwhelming bias towards the weak masculine declension of the substantive in medical texts with the sole exception of Bald’s *Leechbook* and its sister text, the *Leechbook Fragment* in Harley 55. In *Leechbook* I, there seems to be a relatively even distribution of masculine and feminine forms, whereas in *Leechbook* II, the forms with determinable grammatical gender are predominantly feminine. In *Leechbook* III the term occurs only four times, two of which are definitively feminine. Most notably, all occurrences of the substantive which may be assigned a grammatical gender in the tables of contents of all three *Leechbooks* use the feminine form *wæte*, even where the chapter referred to declines the noun as masculine. This implies that whoever drew up or copied the tables of contents felt that this was the correct declension of the noun, even where it disagreed with the exemplar. It is likely, then, that the masculine instances survived in the main body of the text as the result of the use of materials already translated into a different dialect of Old English than the compiler’s own.

Beyond Bald’s *Leechbook*, there is one instance of *wæte* as a feminine in *Lacnunga* 173 (item 126), a text which otherwise deploys the masculine *wæta*. In this case two possible explanations may be given for its deployment. The word denotes ‘moisture’ in an abstract sense, as one of the four abstract temperamental qualities which may cause a cough, and directly translates *Practica Alexandri* II.1.1, *De tusse* (see item 126 above). This would suggest that this section of the *Lacnunga* is drawn from an exemplar common to Bald’s *Leechbook*, written in the dialect which prefers the
feminine *wæte*. The same passage appears in *Leechbook* I.15.1 but the manuscript omits the crucial phrase ‘hwilum of ungemaetlicre wætan.’

**Semantics**

At the most basic level, *wæta* and the related lexemes all mean the same thing: fluid, liquid or moisture. In medical texts, the word seems to have been adapted to have the specific sense of bodily fluid or humour, but also retains its more general sense as it may be used to refer to liquids which are imbibed, used in the preparation of medicines, or as external to the patient, as deployed in injunctions to avoid wetting a bandage, or to partake of baths of one kind over another.

Largely speaking, there are three main senses into which the sense of ‘fluid’ can be divided, that is, a bodily fluid, an extrabodily fluid which may be drunk, and an extrabodily, or environmental fluid which is not normally drunk. In referring to bodily fluids the word may have a general sense of ‘humour’ often glossing Latin *humor*, it may have the specific sense of ‘the four humours’, as in the *Peri didaxeon* (item 129) and *Enchiridion* of Byrtferth of Ramsey (see below) or it may even refer specifically to phlegm as one of those four humours, as in the *Peri didaxeon* (item 130) or *Leechbook* I (item 25). The word is never used in medical texts to refer to a specific humour other than phlegm.

The usage of the word to denote drink is quite straightforward. In medical texts it normally occurs in dosage instructions or in injunctions not to partake of certain classes of drink, such as ‘ne he colne *wætan* þice’ for ‘frigida non bibat’ in the *Herbarius* (item 10). The usage of the word as a classeme for beverage will recur very frequently when we examine the occurrences of the word in non-medical prose below. The usage of the word to denote extrabodily or environmental fluids which are not normally drunk can be seen either in such injunctions as ‘heald… wið wætan’ in item 46, which is essentially an injunction to keep bandaging dry. The word may also act as a classeme for which a specific referant is stipulated, such as ‘to *wætan* healf halig wæter’ in *Leechbook Fragment, BLB II.59.1* (item 104).

Based on this rough tripartite division, the occurrences of the word have been classed (in Table 5.3 below) as either ‘fluid’, meaning extrabodily fluid or environmental fluid including fluids in salves and potions where the word acts as a classeme governing a specific referant, ‘humour’ meaning bodily fluid or specific humour, and ‘drink’. Of the 147 instances of *wet-* noted below the word means ‘humour’ 105 times, ‘fluid’ twenty-three times and ‘drink’ seventeen times. The word is used as a disease term once, in the forumula ‘wiþ wætan’ (item 18).

The following table summarises the sense, source lexeme and declensional class of the medical instances of *wet, waeta* and *weote*.
Table 5.3: Summary of Instances of OE *weet*- in Medical Literature

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>text</th>
<th>sense</th>
<th>translates</th>
<th>modifier</th>
<th>form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td><em>OEH</em> H.125.1</td>
<td>humour</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>yfel</td>
<td>wm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td><em>OEH</em> H.175.2</td>
<td>humour</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>wm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td><em>OEH</em> H.181.1</td>
<td>humour</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>yfel</td>
<td>wm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td><em>OEH</em> 1.20</td>
<td>drink</td>
<td>aqua calida</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>wm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td><em>OEH</em> 4.9</td>
<td>humour</td>
<td>humor</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>wm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td><em>OEH</em> 37.6</td>
<td>humour</td>
<td>humor</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>wm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td><em>OEH</em> 86.1</td>
<td>drink</td>
<td>frigida</td>
<td>ceald</td>
<td>wm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td><em>OEH</em> 93.3</td>
<td>humour</td>
<td>humor</td>
<td></td>
<td>wm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td><em>OEH</em> 125</td>
<td>humour</td>
<td><em>paraphrase</em></td>
<td>yfel</td>
<td>wm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td><em>OEH</em> 126.2</td>
<td>drink</td>
<td>frigida</td>
<td>ceald</td>
<td>wm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td><em>OEH</em> 175.2</td>
<td>humour</td>
<td>humor</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>wm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td><em>OEH</em> 175.2</td>
<td>humour</td>
<td>humor</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>wm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td><em>OEH</em> 181.1</td>
<td>humour</td>
<td>humor</td>
<td>yfel</td>
<td>wm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td><em>OEH</em> 181.1</td>
<td>drink</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>lið</td>
<td>wm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>MdQ 3.1</td>
<td>humour</td>
<td>humor</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>wm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>MdQ 7.10</td>
<td>fluid</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>wm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>MdQ 7.11</td>
<td>drink</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>wm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>MdQ 7.12</td>
<td>disease</td>
<td>humor</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>wm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>MdQ 8.2</td>
<td>fluid</td>
<td>liquor</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>wm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>MdQ 9.11</td>
<td>humour</td>
<td>aquaticus humor</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>wm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>BLB I H.17</td>
<td>humour</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>yfel</td>
<td>wf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>BLB I H.31</td>
<td>humour</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>yfel</td>
<td>wf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>BLB I H.77</td>
<td>humour</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>æterno</td>
<td>wf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>BLB</td>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>BLB 1.1.18</td>
<td>humour</td>
<td>yfel</td>
<td>wf</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>BLB 1.1.24</td>
<td>humour</td>
<td>yfel</td>
<td>wp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>BLB 1.1.25</td>
<td>humour</td>
<td>yfel</td>
<td>wp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>BLB 1.2.3</td>
<td>humour</td>
<td>yfel</td>
<td>wf</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>BLB 1.4.5</td>
<td>humour</td>
<td>yfel</td>
<td>wf</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>BLB 1.4.12</td>
<td>humour</td>
<td>yfel</td>
<td>wp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>BLB 1.18.1</td>
<td>humour</td>
<td>yfel</td>
<td>slitend</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>BLB 1.18.2</td>
<td>humour</td>
<td>yfel</td>
<td>bitend</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>BLB 1.18.2</td>
<td>humour</td>
<td>yfel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>BLB 1.18.5</td>
<td>humour</td>
<td>yfel</td>
<td>hat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>BLB 1.31.10</td>
<td>humour</td>
<td>yfel</td>
<td>wp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>BLB 1.31.10</td>
<td>humour</td>
<td>yfel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>BLB 1.31.12</td>
<td>humour</td>
<td>yfel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>BLB 1.36.1</td>
<td>drink</td>
<td>yfel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>BLB 1.42.1</td>
<td>humour</td>
<td>ungemet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>BLB 1.47.9</td>
<td>drink</td>
<td>yfel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>BLB 1.56.1</td>
<td>fluid</td>
<td>yfel</td>
<td>wp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>BLB 1.63.1</td>
<td>drink</td>
<td>yfel</td>
<td>wp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>BLB 1.63.3</td>
<td>drink</td>
<td>yfel</td>
<td>wp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>BLB 1.72.6</td>
<td>humour</td>
<td>yfel</td>
<td>wp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>BLB 1.73.1</td>
<td>fluid</td>
<td>yfel</td>
<td>wp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>BLB 1.73.1</td>
<td>fluid</td>
<td>yfel</td>
<td>wp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>BLB 1.75.1</td>
<td>fluid</td>
<td>yfel</td>
<td>wp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>BLB 1.80.2</td>
<td>drink</td>
<td>yfel</td>
<td>wp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>BLB 11 H.25</td>
<td>humour</td>
<td>yfel</td>
<td>wp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>BLB 11 H.25</td>
<td>humour</td>
<td>yfel</td>
<td>omiht</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>BLB 11 H.28</td>
<td>humour</td>
<td>yfel</td>
<td>wp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Words</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>BLB II H.29</td>
<td>humour</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>yfel</td>
<td>wf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>BLB II H.38</td>
<td>humour</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>wp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>BLB II H.38</td>
<td>humour</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>yfel</td>
<td>wp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>BLB II H.38</td>
<td>humour</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>slipung</td>
<td>wf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>BLB II H.42</td>
<td>humour</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>yfel</td>
<td>wf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>BLB II.1.3</td>
<td>humour</td>
<td>paraphrase</td>
<td>ætterberend</td>
<td>wp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>BLB II.1.4</td>
<td>humour</td>
<td>humor</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>wp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>BLB II.1.4</td>
<td>humour</td>
<td>humor uenenus</td>
<td>ætern</td>
<td>wp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>BLB II.1.5</td>
<td>humour</td>
<td>humor</td>
<td>yfel</td>
<td>wp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>BLB II.1.6</td>
<td>humour</td>
<td>humor</td>
<td>yfel</td>
<td>wm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>BLB II.1.7</td>
<td>humour</td>
<td>flegmata</td>
<td>omig</td>
<td>wf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>BLB II.1.7</td>
<td>humour</td>
<td>paraphrase</td>
<td>yfel</td>
<td>wp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>BLB II.1.9</td>
<td>humour</td>
<td>humor</td>
<td>yfel biter</td>
<td>wp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>BLB II.1.9</td>
<td>humour</td>
<td>paraphrase</td>
<td>pic 7 slipig</td>
<td>wp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>BLB II.1.10</td>
<td>humour</td>
<td>humor</td>
<td>yfel</td>
<td>wp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>BLB II.1.10</td>
<td>humour</td>
<td>humor</td>
<td>yfel</td>
<td>wf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>BLB II.1.10</td>
<td>humour</td>
<td>paraphrase</td>
<td>yfel</td>
<td>wf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>BLB II.16.3</td>
<td>humour</td>
<td>humor frigidior</td>
<td>ceald</td>
<td>wf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>BLB II.16.4</td>
<td>humour</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>slipung</td>
<td>wf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>BLB II.16.6</td>
<td>humour</td>
<td>flegma</td>
<td>horh</td>
<td>wm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>BLB II.21.5</td>
<td>humour</td>
<td>tumor</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>wf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>BLB II.23.3</td>
<td>humour</td>
<td>ydrie</td>
<td>yfel</td>
<td>wf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>BLB II.23.3</td>
<td>humour</td>
<td>liquor</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>wf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>BLB II.23.6</td>
<td>humour</td>
<td>humor</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>wf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>BLB II.24.13</td>
<td>drink</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>wf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>BLB II.24.13</td>
<td>drink</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>wf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>BLB II.24.13</td>
<td>drink</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>wm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>BLB</td>
<td>Column 1</td>
<td>Column 2</td>
<td>Column 3</td>
<td>Column 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>BLB II.25.t</td>
<td>humour</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>yfel</td>
<td>wp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>BLB II.25.4</td>
<td>humour</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>omiht</td>
<td>wf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>BLB II.25.4</td>
<td>humour</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>omig</td>
<td>wf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>BLB II.27.8</td>
<td>humour</td>
<td>distemperantia</td>
<td>yfel</td>
<td>wf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>BLB II.27.8</td>
<td>humour</td>
<td>humor</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>wp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>BLB II.27.8</td>
<td>humour</td>
<td>paraphrase</td>
<td>horheht</td>
<td>wp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>BLB II.28.t</td>
<td>humour</td>
<td>flegma</td>
<td>yfel</td>
<td>horheht</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>BLB II.28.4</td>
<td>humour</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>wlac</td>
<td>wf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>BLB II.28.4</td>
<td>humour</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>ceald</td>
<td>wf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>BLB II.29.t</td>
<td>humour</td>
<td>paraphrase</td>
<td>yfel</td>
<td>wf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>BLB II.29.2</td>
<td>humour</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>wf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>BLB II.30.5</td>
<td>humour</td>
<td>humor</td>
<td>yfel</td>
<td>wf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>BLB II.30.6</td>
<td>humour</td>
<td>paraphrase</td>
<td>yfel</td>
<td>wp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>BLB II.30.7</td>
<td>humour</td>
<td>humor</td>
<td>yfel</td>
<td>wp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>BLB II.35.2</td>
<td>humour</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>yfel</td>
<td>wf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>BLB II.36.6</td>
<td>humour</td>
<td>humectatur</td>
<td>yfel</td>
<td>wf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>BLB II.36.6</td>
<td>humour</td>
<td>humida</td>
<td>distemperantia</td>
<td>ungemetlic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>BLB II.36.10</td>
<td>humour</td>
<td>rheuma</td>
<td>yfel</td>
<td>wp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>BLB II.38.t</td>
<td>humour</td>
<td>humida</td>
<td>distemperantia</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>BLB II.38.2</td>
<td>humour</td>
<td>paraphrase</td>
<td>yfel</td>
<td>wm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>BLB II.38.5</td>
<td>humour</td>
<td>distemperantia</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>wp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>BLB II.38.5</td>
<td>humour</td>
<td>humor</td>
<td>bicc slipig</td>
<td>wp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>BLB II.38.6</td>
<td>humour</td>
<td>humida</td>
<td>distemperantia</td>
<td>slipig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>BLB II.40.1</td>
<td>humour</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>yfel</td>
<td>wp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>BLB II.42.1</td>
<td>humour</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>yfel</td>
<td>wf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Manuscript</td>
<td>Column 1</td>
<td>Column 2</td>
<td>Column 3</td>
<td>Column 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>BLB II.46.6</td>
<td>humour</td>
<td>rheumatismus</td>
<td>yfel</td>
<td>wf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>BLB II.53.1</td>
<td>drink</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>wp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>BLB II.56.7</td>
<td>humour</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>þicc</td>
<td>wp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>BLB II.66.4</td>
<td>drink</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>wp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>BLB II.66.5</td>
<td>drink</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>wp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>BLB II.66.8</td>
<td>drink</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>wp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>Leechbook III.H.29</td>
<td>fluid</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>wp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>Leechbook III.2</td>
<td>fluid</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>wm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>Leechbook III.19</td>
<td>fluid</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>wp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>Leechbook III.29</td>
<td>fluid</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>wm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>Cotton Otho B. XI</td>
<td>fluid</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>sn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>Leechbook Fragment, BLB II.59.1</td>
<td>humour</td>
<td>humor</td>
<td>þicc, yfel, slipig</td>
<td>wf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>BLB II.59.1</td>
<td>humour</td>
<td>humor</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>wp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>BLB II.59.7</td>
<td>humour</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>yfel</td>
<td>wp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>BLB II.59.16</td>
<td>humour</td>
<td>humor</td>
<td>yfel</td>
<td>wf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>BLB II.59.18</td>
<td>fluid</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>wf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>Lacnunga 43</td>
<td>fluid</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>wm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>Lacnunga 64</td>
<td>fluid</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>wm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>Lacnunga 64</td>
<td>fluid</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>wm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>Lacnunga 68</td>
<td>fluid</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>wm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>Lacnunga 84</td>
<td>fluid</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>wm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>Lacnunga 115</td>
<td>fluid</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>wm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>Lacnunga 127</td>
<td>fluid</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>w</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>Lacnunga 173</td>
<td>moisture</td>
<td>humida</td>
<td>ungemætlic</td>
<td>wf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Material</td>
<td>Fluid</td>
<td>Humour</td>
<td>Phlegm</td>
<td>Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>Cotton. Faustina A. X</td>
<td>fluid</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>wm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>Flyleaf 10</td>
<td>fluid</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>sn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td><em>Peri didaxeon</em> 1</td>
<td>humour</td>
<td>humor</td>
<td>feower</td>
<td>w (irr)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td><em>Peri didaxeon</em> 1</td>
<td>humour</td>
<td>flegma</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>wf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td><em>Peri didaxeon</em> 1</td>
<td>humour</td>
<td>flegma</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>m (irr)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td><em>PeriD</em> 3</td>
<td>fluid</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>sn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td><em>PeriD</em> 5</td>
<td>humour</td>
<td>humor</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>w (irr)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td><em>PeriD</em> 8</td>
<td>humour</td>
<td>humor</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>wm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td><em>PeriD</em> 18</td>
<td>fluid</td>
<td>potio</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>wp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td><em>PeriD</em> 18</td>
<td>humour</td>
<td>melancolicus humor</td>
<td>swert</td>
<td>wp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td><em>PeriD</em> 19</td>
<td>humour</td>
<td>rheumatismus</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>wp (irr)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td><em>PeriD</em> 33</td>
<td>humour</td>
<td>flegma frigida</td>
<td>wyrst</td>
<td>m (irr)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td><em>PeriD</em> 33</td>
<td>humour</td>
<td>rheumatismus</td>
<td>ufe</td>
<td>wf (irr)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td><em>PeriD</em> 52</td>
<td>humour</td>
<td>humor</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>wf (irr)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td><em>PeriD</em> 52</td>
<td>humour</td>
<td>humor</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>wm (irr)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td><em>PeriD</em> 52</td>
<td>humour</td>
<td>flegma</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>yfel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td><em>PeriD</em> 59</td>
<td>humour</td>
<td>flegma</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>w (irr)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td><em>PeriD</em> 61</td>
<td>humour</td>
<td>humor</td>
<td>yfel</td>
<td>(irr)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Latin Source Lexemes

It is often difficult to isolate a source lexeme for a given Old English word, even when the Latin source for the work in which it occurs is known. It is rare indeed for translations to proceed in a word-for-word fashion, and very often idioms, interpolations and circumlocutions prevent a direct parallel between an Old English word and a specific word in its Latin text. Where there is an obvious verbal link between an Old English passage, but the Old English word in question has no precedent in the Latin, I have described it as a paraphrase in Table 5.2 above. Where an Old English text is related to a Latin text, but the verbal parallels are very weak, I have simply left the field blank.

It has been possible to identify the Latin textual sources for seventy-two of the 147 instances where the *wæta* or *wæte* occurs in an Old English medical text. In nine of these instances, although the source text for the passage was known over all, the Old English seemed to be some sort of interpolation, or drastic paraphrase of the Latin, rendering close lexical comparison impossible, and in a further fifteen instances, the Old English sentence in question seems to paraphrase a Latin sentence, being very close in meaning, but not close enough in wording to allow a lexical comparison on a word-for-word basis. These instances have been defined in the table as *paraphrase*. This leaves only forty-eight instances in medical literature in which the Old English word *wæta* or *wæte* can definitively be shown to translate a given Latin lexeme.

Table 5.4 Latin terms Translated by OE *Wæta*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><em>OEH + MDQ</em></th>
<th><em>BLB I</em></th>
<th><em>BLB II</em></th>
<th><em>Lacn</em></th>
<th><em>PD</em></th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>calida / frigida</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>distemperantia</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flegma</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>liquor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>humor</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pituitas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Despite the paucity of evidence, it should nonetheless be clear that well over half of the instances of *wæta* or *wæte* in Old English medical texts can be seen to directly translate Latin *humor*, but that the word has a wider contextual meaning than *humor* alone, being used as the only available lexeme where the Latin medical authors have the capacity to choose from several with specific connotations, such as *rheumatismus, flegma* or *pituitas*.

In the instances where I have defined OE *wæta* as translating *calida* or *frigida* (such as items 7 or 10) we can see a tendency in Old English to supply a noun where Latin uses an adjective substantivally. In Pseudo-Apuleius, *Herbarius* 85.6 ‘in recente non descendat neque *frigida* bibat,’ (item 7 above) we see the adjective *frigidus* as a neuter plural acting as a substantive. The translator saw fit to introduce a substantive here, specifying *cealdne wætan* to avoid using an adjective substantivally.

Another interesting feature in the choice of the substantive *wæta* to translate Latin adjectives occurs with the Latin substantive *distemperantia*, where in two instances, items 94 and 126 above, *distemperantia* is in agreement with *humida*, meaning ‘a moist intemperance,’ but the phrase is translated as *ungemetlic wæta*, ‘an immoderate humor’, wherein the sense is preserved, but with an Old English noun taking the role of a Latin adjective, and an Old English adjective taking the role of the Latin noun. In item 100, *wæta* translates *distemperantia humida* using the adjective *slipig* (slippery) rather than *ungemetlic* (immoderate). In item 98, moreover, *distemperantia* seems to be translated directly as *wæta*. However there is some degree of paraphrase here. We can clearly see a marked preference for denoting the concept of ‘humour’ with a substantive, rather than literally translating Latin descriptions of hot, dry, cold or wet imbalances.

**Adjectives and collocations**

The contextual sense of the word denoting ‘humour’ is frequently highlighted by the use of adjectives, the most common of which is *yfel*, meaning ‘harmful’, and thereby denoting pathogenicity. In medical contexts the adjectives used to describe fluids are often more important than the words meaning fluid themselves. When referring to drinks, the use of temperature adjectives or adjectives of quality is common, while adjectives qualifying bodily fluids are of the utmost importance in understanding how medical authors and translators understood disease aetiology. The following table summarises the adjectives which modify *wæta* in medical literature by text.
Table 5.5: Adjectives Found in Agreement with *wæta* in Medical Prose

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>OEH</th>
<th>BLB I</th>
<th>BLB II</th>
<th>Lacn.</th>
<th>PerID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>æterno/ æterberend</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bitend</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>biter</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ceald</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fæt</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hat</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>horheht</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lið</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ofset</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>omig</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>slipig</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>slitend</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>þicc</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ungemet</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yfel</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first thing to note is the difference between the *Old English Herbal* and the other texts. In the *OEH*, the adjective *ceald* acts to describe imbibable fluids, which are to be administered or prohibited. In the remainder of the literature, the same adjective, *ceald* tends to refer to the humours of the body, as it does in *Leechbook* II.

Modifying only the humoral sense of the word, *yfel* appears in a staggeringly high proportion of cases. It would seem to be the standard description, across a number of medical texts, for any humour that is pathological. As such, it occasionally requires further modification, and in 9 instances in the Bald’s *Leechbook* and the *Leechbook Fragment*, *wæta* is modified by at least one adjective in addition to *yfel*. The adjectives cover a range of qualities including texture (*fæt*, ‘fat’; *slipig*, ‘slippery’; *þicc*, ‘thick’), temperature (*hat*, ‘hot’; *ceald*, ‘cold’), taste (*biter*, ‘bitter’), pathogenicity (*æterno*, ‘poisonous’; *yfel* ‘harmful’; *ungemet*, ‘immoderate’), and even colour (*omig*, ‘rust-coloured’). Two participles denoting actions normally carried out by animals, *bitend*, ‘biting’ and *slitend*, ‘tearing’ are also used to modify *wæta*. Two of the adjectives, *horheht* and *omig* are related to nouns also used to denote humours. In the case of *omig*, the related noun, *oman*, will be dealt with below, along with its derivatives. While it may mean ‘rust-coloured,’ more generally, it seems to have a special meaning within the field of pathology which will be dealt with forthwith. In the case of *horheht*, the noun *horh* seems to denote phlegm or catarrh, as in *Leechbook* I.1.24: ‘þa þurh horh
oððe þurh snofl ut ateo þær þær egleþ’ (which expels what ails there through phlegm or through mucous). This would suggest that the best translation for OE horheht is ‘phlegmatic’.

**Instances of Wæta and Wæt in Non-Medical Texts**

Ælfric’s Catholic Homilies

1  I.4 (B1.1.5) þæt he ne mæg ætes oðde 
**wætes** brucan,653

‘so that he may not have enjoyment of food or drink.’

2  I.11 (B1.1.12) [and] he ða fæste 
feowertig daga 7 feowertig nihta swa þæt he ne onbyrigde ætes ne **wætes** on 
eallum þæm fyreste.655

‘And then he fasted for forty days and forty nights so that he did not consume food or drink in all of that time.’

3  I.25 (B1.1.27) He bið mare ætforan 
gode: ne abyrigð he wines ne nan þæra 
**waetana** þe men ofdrunciað.657

‘May he be great before God, and let him taste no wine nor any fluids that may intoxicate one.’

4  Eal his reaf wæs awefen of oluendes 
hærum: his bigleofa wæs stičlic: ne 
dræn he wines drene ne nanes 
gemencgedes **waetan** ne gebrownes.658

**Passio Iohannis** Et neque esca cibari 
potest neque poculo satiari.654

‘and neither can he eat food nor be satisfied by drink.’

**Mt 4:2** Et cum ieiunasset quadraginta 
diebus et quadraginta noctibus postea 
esuriit.656

‘And when he had fasted forty days and forty nights, afterwards he was hungry.’

**Luke I.15** eri enim magnus coram 
Domino et vinum et **sicera** non bibet.659

‘For he shall be great before the Lord and shall drink no wine nor strong drink.’

655 Clemoes, ed., *Catholic Homilies I*, pp. 266–74 at p. 266.
656 after Godden, ed., *Commentary*, pp. 84–94 at p. 85.
659 The passage seems to be a synthesis of synoptic descriptions of John the Baptist, probably from an intermediary source.
‘His garment was woven of camel’s hair, his belief was steadfast, he never drank any drink of wine nor mixed drink or brewed.’

Ps-Augustine 196 Unum a potu atque epulis temperare.  

‘One is anyone who tempers himself with moderation in food and drink.’

Acts IX.9 Et erat ibi tribus diebus non videns, et non manducavit, neque bibit.  

‘And he was there three days, without sight, and he did neither eat nor drink.’

Paulus Deaconus, Relatio de dedicatione, Ob hoc et vitreum vas eiusdem receptui praeparatum argentea pendet catena suspensum.  

‘On account of this a glass vessel hangs by a silver chain prepared to catch it.’

‘taste of the heavenly liquid.’

‘For it is both sweet in taste and wholesome in touch.’

---

660 Ibid., p. 385.
663 after Godden, ed., Commentary, pp. 221–9 at p. 223.
Many quickly regained their health after lengthy fever and various sicknesses through the consumption of this liquid.

‘Having drunk this drop a great many people immediately obtain health from the long heat of fevers.’

He drank neither wine nor sicera nor ale, nor any of the drinks that may make men drunk.

‘And it was scorched in sprouting because it had no moisture.’

‘And dried out having sprouted because it had no moisture.’

Then it shrank, for it had no moisture.

‘Then it withered because the moisture had not fastened to the roots.’

Then it withered because the moisture had not fastened to the roots.

Then it shrank, for it had no moisture.

Then it withered because the moisture had not fastened to the roots.

Then it shrank, for it had no moisture.

Then it withered because the moisture had not fastened to the roots.
‘what is the moisture except love and orthodoxy?’

16 II.10 (B1.2.11) þa wolde þæt folc þæt fyr adwæscan. gif hit ænig wæta wanian mihte.670

‘Then the people wanted to put out the fire if any liquid would diminish it.’

17 II.12.2 (B1.2.14) oððe æt his mæle to micel ðiège mid oferflowendynsse. ætes oððe wætes. Alcuin, De virtutibus et vitii671

‘or partakes of too much to his harm with superfluity in food and drink.’

18 We sceolon oferwinnan ærest gifernysse mid gemetegunge. ætes. and wætes.671

‘We shall first overcome avarice with temperance in food and drink.’

19 II.14.1 (B1.2.16) and for ði gebudon. eced ðam drihtnæ. unwynsumne wætan. Augustine, Tract 119.4, 18–20

swa swa hi sylfe wæron.673

‘and therefore gave vinegar to the Lord, unwholesome fluid, just as they themselves were.’

19 II.15 (B1.2.18) þæt wæter is brosniendlic wæta and æfter gastlicere gerynu hæfð halwende mihte.675

Ratramnus De Corpore et Sanguine 18676

‘That water is a corruptible fluid and according to the spiritual course it has healing power.’

670 Ibid., pp. 81–91 at p. 84; Godden notes that the same miracle is recorded in chapter 13 of the prose Vitae Sancti Cuthberti, but that ‘there are no close parallels of phrasing.’ See Godden, ed., Commentary, p. 420.


674 Godden, ed., Commentary, pp. 474–86 at p. 484.


II.18 (B1.2.21) Ne dranc he wines drenc. ne nan ðæra wætenant he druncennysse styriað. 677

‘He drank no sup of wine, nor any of the fluids that stir drunkenness.’

Rufinus, Historia ecclesiastica ii.23.4–6 Vinum et siceram non bibit neque animalem manducavit 678

‘He drank neither wine nor siceram, nor ate any animal.’

II.33 (B1.2.41) Ða heton ða apostoli hi aberan to heora inne. and hi ðrim dagum ne onbirigdon ætes. ne wætes. ac symle hrymdon. 679

‘Then the apostles commanded them taken to their lodging and for three days they did not consume food or drink, but constantly cried out’.

Passio Simonis et Iude Tunc apostoli Dei iusserunt eos… duci ad hospitia sua, et per triduum non manducare non bibere neque dormire illis possible fuit. 680

‘Then the apostles of God commanted them to be lead to their inn, and for three days it was not possible for them to eat or drink or sleep.’

II.39 (B1.2.48) Eles gecynd is. þæt he wile oferstigan ælcne wætan.

Augustine, Sermon 93.5 Omnibus enim humoribus oleum supereminet.

‘The nature of oil is that it wants to rise over every liquid.’

For oil rises above all liquids’

Ageot ele uppon wæter. oððe on oðrum wætan. se ele flyt bufon; Ageot wæter uppon ðone ele. and se ele abrecð up and swimð bufon.

Mitte aquam, et superinfunde oleum, oleum supereminet. Mitte eleum, superinfunde aquam, oleum supereminet.

‘Pour oil upon water, or on another fluid, the oil floats above. Pour water upon the oil, and the oil breaks up and floats to the top.’

‘Take water, and pour oil over it, the oil rises above. Take oil, pour water over it, the oil rises above.’

Æfre he oferswið þone oðerne wætan. and seo soðe lufu næfre ne fyld. 681

Si ordinem servaveris, vincit: si ordinem mutaveris, vincit. ‘Caritas nunquam cadit.’ 682

679 Godden, ed., Catholic Homilies II, pp. 280–7, at p. 284
680 Mombritius, Sanctuarium seu vitae sanctorum, II, 537 after Godden, ed., Commentary, p. 618.
‘Ever it rises over the other fluid, and the true love never fails’

‘If you keep the order, it conquers, if you change the order, it conquers. “Love never fails”’

26  Il.40 (B1.2.49) Ḟa leohant gyltas sind ydele spæra. and þæt man underfo on æte and on weæte mare ðonne his lichaman neod sy. Caesarius, Sermon 179 Quotiens aliquis aut in cibo aut in potu plus accipit quam necesse est. 683

‘The light sins are idle speech and that one consumes more in food and drink than his body needs.’

‘As often as one takes more than necessary in either food or in drink.’

Ælfric, Lives of Saints

27  St Maur (B1.3.7) And Maurus þa bletsode bliðelice þæt win, cwæð þæt God mihte gemyclian þone wætan. 685

‘And Maur then gladly blessed that wine, said that God might increase the liquid.’

28  St Agatha (B1.3.9) Quintianus ða het hi to cwearterne gelædan, and het hire ofteon ætes and wætes. 686

‘Then Quintianus commanded them to lead her to prison, and commanded that she be deprived of food and drink.’

29  St George (B1.3.15) ac him naht ne derode se deofollica wæta. 687

‘But the demonic water did not harm him.’

30  Memory of Saints (B1.3.17) An is gecwæden gula … oððe he eft to micel nimð on æte oððe on wæte. 688

‘One is called gula … or to take too much of food and drink.’

31  An is temperantia … þæt is þæt man beo gemetegod and to mycel ne ðiege on æte and on wæte. 688

‘One is temperantia which is that one does not consume too much food or drink.’

---

686 Ibid., I, 194–208 at p. 202  
687 Ibid., I, 306–18 at p. 312.  
32 *St Martin* (B1.3.30) and his mæssepreoste sealde healfne dæl þæs vætan þe wæs on þære blede.689

‘And he gave his mass-priest the half part of the liquid which was in the vessel.’

33 *Healing of a Blind Man* (B1.5.2)  

*Ac him wæs þæs vætan forwyrnd, swa swa he forwyrnde ær þa crumen þam earmen Lazare.*690

‘But this liquid was denied him, just as he before denied the wretched Lazarus crumbs.’

34 *De duodecim abusivis* (B1.6.2.1) Se oferlyfa on æte 7 on væte deð þone man unhalne.

‘Gluttony in food and drink does the man harm.’

35 to mycel forhæfdnyss on æte 7 on væte deð þone man unhalne.

‘excessive fasting and too much abstinence in food and drink does one harm.’

36 An is gecweden gula, … oððe he eft to mycel nimð on æte oððe on væte.

‘One is called *gula* … or to take too much of food and drink.’

37 An is temperantia … 7 to mycel ne þiege on æte 7 on væte.

‘One is *temperamentia* … which is that one does not consume too much food or drink.’

38 On manegum wisum man mæg wyrcan ælmyssan on æte & on væte & on gewædum eac 7 on cumliðnyssse.692

‘In many ways one may give alms in food and drink and also in clothes and in hospitality.’

Ælfric’s Letters

689 Ibid., II, 218–314 at p. 260.
691 Ibid., p. 70; cf. Luke XVI.22–31
Second Old English Letter to Wulfstan (B1.8.3)

Seðe aniges þinges abirigð, ætes oððe wætes … ne ræde he pistol ne godspell to mæssan.693

‘If he tastes anything, food or drink … he may not read the epistle or Gospel at mass.’

Admonitio ad filium spiritualem (B1.9.3)

ðonne bist þu gelic þam luftyrum treowe þe grewð wið þone stream stedefæst on wætan and byrð æfre wæstmas.694

‘Then you are like the loftiest tree that grows by the stream, steadfast in moisture and forever bears fruits.’

Ælfric, De temporibus anni (B1.9.4)

10.11 Forbærn ðone oðerne ende þonne geð se wæta ut ðæt ðan oðrum ende mid ðan smice.695

‘Burn one end, then the moisture goes out at the other end with the smoke.’

11.2 Seo lyft liccað 7 athihð þone wætan of ealre eorðan 7 of ðære sæ696

Bede, De natura rerum 32 Nubes coacto guttatim aere conglobantur, qui naturali leuitate uapores aquarum de terra marique sustollens.

‘The air licks and draws up the moisture from all of the earth, and from the sea.’

11.7 and of ðære sæ ealne ðone wætan, þe bið to renum awend

Bede, De natura rerum 32 Nubes coacto guttatim aere conglobantur, qui naturali leuitate uapores aquarum de terra marique sustollens.

‘Clouds are formed having collected in the air drop by drop, which vapours of the waters from the earth and the sea.’

11.8 Ðære lyfte gecynd is þæt heo sicð ælne wætan upp to hire.

Cf. DNR 33

696 Ibid., pp. 76–80.
‘The nature of the air is that it sucks all fluids up to itself.’

9.1 .DIS mæg sceawian se ðe wile, hu se waeta ged upp,

‘You may observe this, if you will, how the fluid goes up.’

9.2  And ðurh ðære lyfte bradnysse to ferscum waeten awend.

‘And it is turned to fresh water by the broadness of the air.’

13.1  Snaw cymð of ðam ðynnum waeten. 697

‘Snow comes from the thin moisture.’

14 De tonitru. Þunor cymð of hætan & of waeten, seo lyft tyhð þone waeten to hire neðan. 7 ða hætan ufan. 7 ðonne hi gegaderode beðð. seo hæte 7 se waeta, binnon þære lyfte, þonne winnað hi him betwynan mid egeslice swege. 7 ðæt fyr aberst ut ðurh ligette. 7 ðerað wæstum. gif he mare bið þonne se waeta; swa hattrum sor swa mare ðunor. 7 liget on geare. gif se waeta bið mare ðonne ðæt fyr, þonne fremað hit. 698

Thunder comes from heat and moisture, the air draws up the moisture to itself from below, and the heat from above; and when they are gathered, the heat and the moisture within the air, then they fight between them with dreadful noise, and the fire bursts out through lightning, and may harm crops, if it

DNR 34. Niues aquarum uapore, … formantur,

‘Snows are formed by the vapour of waters.’

DNR 29. Quidam dicunt, dum aer in se uaporaliter aquam de imis, et ignem caualiter de superioribus trahat, ipsis confligentibus horisonos tonitruorum crepitus gigni: et si ignis uicerit obesse fructibus: si aqua, prodesse.

Some say that when air draws water as vapour into itself from the depths and fire as heat from above, the clash of thunder is brought forth by their dreadful sounding battle: and if the fire wins it is a nuisance to crops, if the water, it is useful.

697 Ibid., p. 81.
698 Ibid., p. 82.
is greater than the moisture; if the moisture is
greater than the fire, then it is beneficial.

Other Prose Texts

53 Wulfstan, Homily 14 (B2.3.2) þæt æfre ænig cristen man ænige dæge ær nontide
naðor ne abyrgie ne ætes ne wætes buton hit for unhæle sy.  
‘That any Christian man neither partake of food nor drink any day before noon unless it be for
ill health.’

54 Vercelli Homily 19 (B3.2.34)  
Ne … ænig man ætes oððe wætes to onbyrigenne ær þære nigodan tide 7 ær he
mæssan hæbbe gehyred.  
‘Nor is any man to consume food or drink before the ninth hour and before he has heard mass.’

55 Vercelli Homily 20 (B3.2.38)  
Seo ys ungemetigende gewilnung ægðer
ge ætes ge wætes.  
‘Which is unmoderated desire either in food
or drink.’

56 Inuenio crucis (B3.3.6)  
Þa bebead seo cwen Elena þæt hine man name 7 sette on ænne diopne seað buton æte
7 buton wæte.
‘Then the queen Elena bade that he be taken and set him in a deep pit without food and
without drink.’

57 Prose Life of St. Guthlac (B3.3.10.1)  
Hwæt, he nænigre wætan onbitan nolde, þe druncennysse þurh come.
‘Lo, he would imbibe none of the drink from which drunkenness arises.’

pp. 3–17, at p. 11
703 Gonser, ed., Das angelsächsische Prosa-Leben des heiligen Guthlac, Anglistische Forschungen 27
(Heidleberg, 1909), pp. 100–73.
... swiþe wynsum ond hlutter wæta ut flowende …

‘a very sweet and clear fluid flowing out.’

Þonne wæs ongean ðyssum wæterscipe glæsen fæt on seolfrenre racenteage ahangen þæt ðæs wynsuman wætan þær onfeng.

‘Then there was a glass vessel hung by a silver chain by that conduit so that it collected the wonderful fluid.’

Þæt hie æfter hlæddrum up to ðæm glæsenum fæte astigon 7 þære hefonlican wætan hie þær onfengon 7 onbyrigdon.

‘that afterwards they climbed up a ladder to the glass vessel and took the heavenly fluid they found there and tasted it.’

Is þis eac to tacne þæt manige men on feforadle 7 on mislicum oþrum untrumnessum þurh ðy ses wætan onbyrgnesse wurdan sone gehælde. 704

‘This is also a sign that many people in fever-sickness and in many other infirmities were immediately healed through the taste of this liquid.’

Vitae Patrum (B3.3.35) and uncer mete was healfsoden flæsc and uncer wæta was olfenda miolec. 706

‘and our food was half-boiled flesh and our drink was camels’ milk.’

705 after Godden, ed., Commentary, p. 285; Migne, ed., Homiliary of Paul the Deacon, p. 1524 CD.
On þam nehstum tidum þisse worlde þær bið micel gefeoht 7 hungur 7 eorðrenas 7 micel wæta geond middaneard.  

‘In the last hour of this world there shall be great war and hunger and earthquakes and a great flood through the earth.’

Men ða leofestan, hwæt fromað ænigum menn þæt he fæste 7 þæt he hyne forhæbbe fram flæsce 7 fram wine 7 fram oðerum myssenlicum ægþer ge ætum ge wætum

‘Most beloved men, it is beneficial to any man that he fast and that he withhold himself from flesh and from wine and from other various things, either in foods or in drinks…’

Luke VII.44 (ne sealdest þu me wætan to minum fotum.

‘thou gavest me no water for my feet.’

Luke VIII.6 And sum feoll ofer þæne stan 7 hit forscranc forþam þe hit wætan næfde.

‘And other some fell upon a rock: and as soon as it was sprung up, it withered away, because it had no moisture.’

Donan cymeð sio mettrymnes ðæm healedum, ðe se wæta ðara innoða astigð to ðæm lime.

Gregori Magni Regula pastoralis i.11

Vitium quippe est ponderis, cum humor uiscerum ad uirilia labitur.


‘When the infirmity comes to the dropsied, the humour of the bowels sinks to the limbs.’

‘It is, in fact, a fault of heaviness, when the fluid of the bowels sinks to the manly (members).’

‘Then the deadly fluid in that man is slain with the bitter drink.’

‘The deadly humour is voided through bitterness.’

‘That they could carry few of them for the moisture, and therefore they were put to flight, because elephant’s hide will absorb fluid like a sponge does.’

‘Whose nature it is that just like sponges they absorb rain; because they were not able to carry them, they could not defend.’

‘They drank no clear wine, nor did they know how to mix any fluid with honey.’

‘They, who were in the habit to ease their late hunger with easily gathered chestnuts did not know how to mix Bacchian (wine) with clear honey.’

---

711 Sweet translates: ‘Hydrocele is caused by the humours of the body collecting within the member.’


714 Parallel text is taken from Sweet, H., ed., King Alfred’s Orosius, EETS OS 79 (London, 1883), Sweet’s Latin text is based on the edition of Haverkamp, PL 31 (1738).


716 Godden and Irvine, ed., Old English Boethius, 1, 271.

33, ll. 167–70: swa þæt heora nan oðres mearcce ne ofereode, & se cile geþwærode wið ðæta hæto, & þæt waet wið þam drygium.

Boethius, *CP* III. met. 9, 10–12

Tu numeris elementa ligas, ut frigora flammis,
Arida conueniant liquidis, ne purior ignis
Euolet aut mersas ducant pondera terras.

‘so that none of them overstep the boundary of the other, and the chill agreed with the hot, and the wet with the dry.’

39, l. 351 Hwilum flihð se waeta þæt dryge.

Boethius, *CP* IV met. 6, 21

Vicibus cedant humida siccis.

‘Sometimes the wet flees the dry.’

Gregory’s *Dialogues* 1.9 (B9.5.2) and þa þa he of þam wætan þæs wines hwæthugu sænde geond ealle þa fatu… þæ þe he geat ær swyðe lytelne dæl þæs þynnestan wætan,

Gregori Magni *dialogi* I.ix.4

Cum uero ex liquore uini parum aliquid in uasis omnibus misisset… et uasa in quibus tenuissimum liquorem fuderat ubertim uinum fundentia inuenit,

‘When he had distributed a little of the fluid of that wine throughout the vessels… into which he had before only poured a very little quantity of the thinnest fluid.’

3.34 (B9.5.5) And seo þonne asworeted 7 bideð æt þam fæder þanes landes 7 wætes.

*Dialogi* III.xxxiv.4 Quae suspirans a patre terram inriguam petit.

‘When he had placed very little from the fluid of the wine in all of the vessels… and found the vessels in which the thinnest fluid had been poured flowing abundantly with wine.’

---

719 geþwærode] Sedgefield: geþrowode
'and then she is grieved and prays to the father for his land and water.'

‘Who, sighing, entreats irrigated ground from the father.’

… ac þonne gyt hi beþurfon þanes landes 7 wætes.

…sed adhuc inriguam indigent. 725

‘yet they needed that land and moisture.’

‘but they still need well watered (land).’

And ic cwæð ær, þæt wæron twa cynn þære inbryrdnesse, 7 þæt se fæder hire sealde þan 7 wæt bufan. and þan 7 wæt beneoðan. Witodlice seo sawl onfæhð þan 7 wæt bufan heo hi sylfe geswænceð in tearum for ðam luste þæs heofonlican rices, 7 heo onfæhð þanum 7 wætum beneoðan. 726

‘And I said before, that there were two kinds of inspiration, and that the father gave him then both the wet above and then also the wet below. Truly the soul receives then also the wet above, when it distresses itself in tears for the desire of the heavenly kingdom, and it receives then also the waters below…’

‘But because as I said there are two kinds of remorse, the father gives them moisture from above and moisture from below. The soul, of course, receives the moisture from above, when it is overcome in heavenly tears by the desire of the heavenly kingdom and receives the moisture from below…’

3.37 Þa þa Langbeardisce mæn wrungon elebergan on þære treddan 7 heom wæs wana, þæt hi mihton ænigne eles wætan ut aþyn. 728

‘When the Langobardic men pressed olives in the press and it was absent for them, that they might squeeze out any moisture of oil.’

‘At that time when the Langobards press olive in their oil presses, so that they could press them into oil’

---

725 Ibid., II, 402.
726 Hecht, ed., Dialogues, pp. 244–6.
728 Hecht, ed., Dialogues, pp. 249–57.
4.28 Soðlice his handa 7 his fet wæron swellende 7 aþundene for þy waetan þære fotadle rhyme

‘Truly his hands and his feet were swollen and inflamed for the humour of the gout.’

Bede, HE i.27 (B9.6.3)

Forðon he bær þa waetan þære uncyste in þæm telgan, þone he geteah ær of þam wytruman.

‘For he bore the sap of vice in the branch, which he had drawn from the roots.’

Bede, Historia Ecclesiastica Gentis Anglorum i.27 nam ut arbor quae portat in ramo umorem uitii, quem traxit ex radice.

For like a tree which bears in the branch the sap of evil which he drew from the root.

Old English Rule (B10.3.1.1)

43 and be dæle æt and waet gewanod sy, oðþæt he þæs gyltes gymeleaste gebete.

‘and by degrees food and drink are to be reduced, until he ask for the forgiveness of that guilt.’

Benedicti regula

xliii.16 sed sequestratus a consortio omnium reficiat solus sublata ei portione sua unum usque ad satisfactionem et emendationem.

‘But he should eat sequestered from all company, alone in the taking of the portion of wine to him until satisfaction and correction (occur)’

---

730 de Vogüé, ed., Dialogues, III, 96
731 Miller, T., ed., The Old English version of Bede’s Ecclesiastical history of the English people, EETS OS 95, 96, 110, 111, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1890–8), I, 82.
733 Translation from Colgrave and Mynors.
736 Schröer, ed. Die angelsächsischen Benediktinerregel, p. 69.
43 Ne gedyrstlæce nan, ne ær gesettere tide ne æfter, nan ðing to ðigenne, ne on æte ne on wæte.

‘None should presume, neither before nor after the set time, to consume any thing, either in food or in drink.’

49 … and began hy geornlice syndrige gebeda and forhæfndesse healdan, ægðer ge on æte, ge on wæte, ge on slaep…

‘And they earnestly observe many prayers and hold self restraint, either in food or in drink and in sleep.’

5 Be þam þæt on preosta geferræddene ealle gelice onfon ætes and wætes.

‘For that in a community of priests all are to partake of food and drink equally.’

38 And nelle we na forbeodan þæt se seoca on ælcne sæl æt and wæt þicge.

‘And neither do we forbid that the sick not consume food or drink in any cell.’

60. Nan fefor nis mannon mara, þonne se winlica wæta, of þam deaflæð þa earan and wleaffað seo tunge.

‘No fever is greater to men, than the vinous fluid, by which the ears are deafened and the tongue stammers.’

xliii.18. Et ne quis praesumat ante statutam horam uel postea quicquam cibi aut potus praesumere.

xlix.5 Ergo his diebus augeamus nobis aliquid solito pensu seruitutis nostrae, orationes peculiare, ciborum et potus abstinentiam.

5 De eo quod in congregatione canonica equaliter cibus et potus accipiatur.

5 De eo quod in congregatione canonica equaliter cibus et potus accipiatur.

Nulla febris hominum, maior quam uiteus humor./ Surdescunt aures, balbutit denique lingua.

‘No fever of men is greater than liquor./ The ears go deaf and then the tongue stutters.’

---

737 Langefeld, B., ed., The Old English Version of the Enlarged Rule of Chrodegang, Münchener Universitätschriften Texte un Untersuchungen zur Englischen Philologie 26 (Frankfurt am Main, 2003), p. 181.

738 Ibid., pp. 294–5.
Theodulf of Orleans, *Capitula* (B10.6.2) 34 Witodlice swa hwylce swa wenað þæt soð lufu sy on æte 7 on waete.\(^{\text{739}}\)

‘Truly, just as those who think that true love is in food and drink.’

§40 Soþlice wines 7 ælces waetan druncennes 7 galnes synt forbodene.\(^{\text{741}}\)

‘Truly drunkenness and revelry of wine and all drink are forbidden.’

Rules of Confraternity (B10.7) §18 and þam do eallum æt 7 waet.\(^{\text{742}}\)

‘And give them all food and drink.’

Confessionale pseudo-Egberti (B11.1.1) 28.b. Se ðe oþrum sylle þone waetan þe bið on deadmus oððe wesleadruncen.\(^{\text{743}}\)

‘He who gives someone else a drink, in which there is a dead mouse or a weasel drowned.’

34.f. Gif lytel fearh afealle and cwicu sy of atogen sprengan þæne waetan mid haligwætere and berece mid recelse gyf hit dead sy and ðone waetan man ne mæge syllan, geote man ut.\(^{\text{744}}\)

‘If a little piglet falls in and is taken out alive, one should sprinkle that drink with holy water and fumigate with incense. If it is

Nam quicumque in potu et cibo et dandis atque a cipiendis rebus esse caritatem putant.\(^{\text{740}}\)

‘For whoever believes charity to be in food and drink and in the giving and receiving of things’

Uini enim ebrietas et luxuria prohibitę sunt.

‘Drunkenness and luxury in wine are to be forbidden’


\(^{\text{740}}\) Parallel Latin from Sauer’s edition


\(^{\text{742}}\) Brotanek, R., ‘Synodalbeschlüsse aus Ms. lat. 943.’ in *Texte und Untersuchungen zur altenglischen Literatur und Kirchengeschichte*, ed. R. Brotanek, (Halle, 1913), pp. 27–8. Brotanek does not identify a specific Latin source for this text.

\(^{\text{743}}\) Spindler, ed., *Das Altenglische Bussbuch*, p. 191. From the context of the chapter it would appear that waeta specifically refers to the sanctified eucharistic wine.


dead and one may not give the drink; it is to be poured out.’

it is dead, all of the drink is to be thrown out, given to no men, and the vessel washed.’

98

34. h. Gyf on mycelne wætan hwylc mus oððe wesle afealle and ðær dead sy, sprengce man mid haligwætere and ðicge.746

‘If a mouse or weasel has fallen and is dead in a lot of fluid, one should sprinkle it with holy water and drink.’

99

Confessor’s Handbook (B11.4.2) V. Be dædbetan

…and hine silfne on his Drihtenes est þreage swiðe þearle mid forhæfdnesse ætes and wætes and gehwilces lichamlices lustes.748

‘And he rebukes himself in the name of his lord very vigorously with self control in food and drink and all bodily desire.’

100

Poenitentiale Theodori and Capitula d’Acheriana (B11.5)749

Gyf fugeles meox on wætan befeallað, sy hit of anumen and do halig wæter on, þonne bið clæne se mete.

‘If bird’s dropping falls in liquid, it is to be taken away, and put holy water on it, then the food is clean’

101

Wulfstan, Institutes of Polity III.50 (B13.3) Utan gyfon hushleow, þam ðe þearf sy, and fyr and foddor and æt and wæt and bedd and bæo.750

Give shelter without, to those who need it, and fire and fuel and food and drink and bed and bath.

746 Ibid., p. 193.
747 Haddan and Stubbs, ed., Councils and Ecclesiastical Documents, p 183.
748 R. Fowler, ‘A Late Old English Handbook for the Use of a Confessor’, Anglia 83 (1965), 1–34, at p. 29; Fowler found ‘no specific source’ for the chapter in question.
and they dwell in the fen, those that were born of the moisture of the fen.

‘And from the knots of that tree a liquid of sweet fragrance flows, which has the likeness of oil.’

‘If one gives a little drop of that fluid to a sick man, he is immediately better.’

‘They believed, our ancestors, that they had spirit from the sun, and body from the moon, declaring that they have spirit from the sun, body from the moon, intelligence and speech.

---

753 Kotzor, ed., Das altenglische Martyrologium, p. 42.
and understanding from Mercury and lust from Venus and blood from Mars and temperance from Jove and moisture from Saturn.’

from Mercury, pleasure from Venus, blood from Mars, temperance from Jove and moisture from Saturn.’

106 Alexander’s Letter to Aristotle (B22.1) — Epistola Alexandri ad Aristotolem

10 Da ferde we in Agustes monþe þurh þa weallendan sond, & þurh þa wædlan stowe wætres & ælcere wætan. 757

‘Then in the month of August we went through the sandy foreign place, and through the place poor in water and every fluid.’

‘In the month of August we set out through the sandy place hot from the sun and lacking in moisture.’

107 13 Sume men ðonne of hiora scome þa wætan for þæm nyde þigdon. — Uidimus etiam plerosque pudore amisso suam ipsam urinam uexatos ultimis necessitatibus haurientis. 759

‘Then in their shame some men in their need drank piss.’

‘Then we saw many having lost their shame who drank their own urine vexed by necessity.’

108 36 and cwæð ðæt ic wende ðæt hie for miclum wætan 7 regnum swa heage weoxon. — Cum eas mirarer diceremque frequentibus inbribus in tantum creuissete 760

‘and said that I thought that grew so high because of great moisture and rain.’

‘Then I marvelled at them and said that they grow so much through frequent rainfall.’

In two instances in the prose material the word carries its specialised medical sense of bodily fluid or humour (item 68, Patalor Care and item 83, Gregory’s Dialogues iv).

758 Ibid., p. 207.
759 Ibid., p. 208.
760 Ibid., p. 219.
Other than these two examples the uses of *wætan* in non-medical prose generally refer either to drink or bodies of water, while in the scientific language of Byrhtferth’s *Enchiridion* and Ælfric’s *De Temporibus Anni* and elsewhere we see the word take on its full function as a means of classifying together all fluids, and as a general term for environmental moisture.

Table 5.6 Summary of Instances in non-Medical Prose

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>text</th>
<th>sense</th>
<th>word</th>
<th>collocation</th>
<th>declension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ælfric, <em>CH</em> I.4</td>
<td>drink</td>
<td><em>paraphrase</em></td>
<td><em>æt</em></td>
<td><em>sn</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td><em>CH</em> I.11</td>
<td>drink</td>
<td><em>paraphrase</em></td>
<td><em>æt</em></td>
<td><em>sn</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td><em>CH</em> I.25</td>
<td>drink</td>
<td><em>sicera</em></td>
<td>relative</td>
<td>w (m/f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td><em>CH</em> I.25</td>
<td>drink</td>
<td><em>sicera</em></td>
<td>relative</td>
<td>w (m/f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td><em>CH</em> I.25</td>
<td>drink</td>
<td><em>paraphrase</em></td>
<td><em>æt</em></td>
<td><em>sn</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td><em>CH</em> I.27</td>
<td>drink</td>
<td><em>paraphrase</em></td>
<td><em>æt</em></td>
<td><em>sn</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td><em>CH</em> I.34</td>
<td>fluid class</td>
<td><em>paraphrase</em></td>
<td>wynsum</td>
<td><em>wm</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td><em>CH</em> I.34</td>
<td>fluid class</td>
<td>liquor</td>
<td>heofonlic</td>
<td><em>wm</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td><em>CH</em> I.34</td>
<td>fluid class</td>
<td><em>paraphrase</em></td>
<td>*wynsum</td>
<td><em>wm</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td><em>CH</em> I.34</td>
<td>fluid class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>wm</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td><em>CH</em> II.3</td>
<td>drink class</td>
<td><em>sicera</em></td>
<td>relative</td>
<td>w (m/f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td><em>CH</em> II.6</td>
<td>moisture</td>
<td>humor</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>wm</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td><em>CH</em> II.6</td>
<td>moisture</td>
<td><em>recap</em></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>wm</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td><em>CH</em> II.6</td>
<td>moisture</td>
<td>humor</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>wm</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td><em>CH</em> II.6</td>
<td>moisture</td>
<td><em>recap</em></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>wm</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td><em>CH</em> II.10</td>
<td>fluid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>wm</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td><em>CH</em> II.12</td>
<td>drink</td>
<td><em>potus</em></td>
<td><em>æt</em></td>
<td><em>sn</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td><em>CH</em> II.12.2</td>
<td>drink</td>
<td><em>æt</em></td>
<td><em>sn</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td><em>CH</em> II.14.1</td>
<td>drink class</td>
<td>aceto</td>
<td>unwynsum</td>
<td><em>wm</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td><em>CH</em> II.15</td>
<td>fluid class</td>
<td>humor</td>
<td>brosniendlic</td>
<td><em>wm</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td><em>CH</em> II.18</td>
<td>drink class</td>
<td><em>sicera</em></td>
<td>relative</td>
<td>w (m/f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td><em>CH</em> II.33</td>
<td>drink</td>
<td><em>paraphrase</em></td>
<td><em>æt</em></td>
<td><em>sn</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td><em>CH</em> II.39</td>
<td>fluid class</td>
<td>humor</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>wm</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td><em>CH</em> II.39</td>
<td>fluid class</td>
<td>aqua</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>wm</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td><em>CH</em> II.39</td>
<td>fluid class</td>
<td>aqua</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>wm</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td><em>CH</em> II.40</td>
<td>drink</td>
<td><em>potus</em></td>
<td><em>æt</em></td>
<td><em>sn</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Ælfric, <em>Lives of Saints</em> III.6</td>
<td>drink class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>wm</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td><em>LS</em> III.8</td>
<td>drink</td>
<td><em>æt</em></td>
<td><em>sn</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td><em>LS</em> III.14</td>
<td>fluid class</td>
<td></td>
<td>deoffolic</td>
<td><em>wm</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>LS III.16</td>
<td>drink</td>
<td>æt</td>
<td>sn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>LS III.16</td>
<td>drink</td>
<td>æt</td>
<td>sn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>LS III.31</td>
<td>drink class</td>
<td>wm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Healing of a Blind Man</td>
<td>drink class</td>
<td>wm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>De duodecem abusivis</td>
<td>drink</td>
<td>æt</td>
<td>sn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>DDA</td>
<td>drink</td>
<td>æt</td>
<td>sn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>DDA</td>
<td>drink</td>
<td>æt</td>
<td>sn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>DDA</td>
<td>drink</td>
<td>æt</td>
<td>sn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>DDA</td>
<td>drink</td>
<td>æt</td>
<td>sn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>2nd Letter to Wulfstan</td>
<td>drink</td>
<td>æt</td>
<td>sn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Admonitio ad filium spiritualem</td>
<td>water</td>
<td>w (m/f)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Ælfric, De temporibus anni x.11</td>
<td>elemental</td>
<td>wm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>DTA xi.2</td>
<td>elemental</td>
<td>aqua</td>
<td>wm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>DTA xi.7</td>
<td>elemental</td>
<td>paraphrase</td>
<td>wm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>DTA xi.8</td>
<td>elemental</td>
<td>paraphrase</td>
<td>wm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>DTA xi.9</td>
<td>elemental</td>
<td>paraphrase</td>
<td>wm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>DTA xiii</td>
<td>elemental</td>
<td>paraphrase</td>
<td>fersc</td>
<td>wm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>DTA xiv</td>
<td>elemental</td>
<td>aqua</td>
<td>δynn</td>
<td>wm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>DTA xiv</td>
<td>elemental</td>
<td>paraphrase</td>
<td>wm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>DTA xiv</td>
<td>elemental</td>
<td>paraphrase</td>
<td>wm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>DTA xiv</td>
<td>elemental</td>
<td>paraphrase</td>
<td>wm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>DTA xiv</td>
<td>elemental</td>
<td>paraphrase</td>
<td>wm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>DTA xiv</td>
<td>elemental</td>
<td>paraphrase</td>
<td>wm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Wulfstan Homily 14</td>
<td>drink</td>
<td>æt</td>
<td>sn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Vercelli 19</td>
<td>drink</td>
<td>æt</td>
<td>sn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Vercelli 20</td>
<td>drink</td>
<td>æt</td>
<td>sn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Inuenio crucis</td>
<td>drink</td>
<td>æt</td>
<td>sn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Anon V. Guthlací</td>
<td>drink class</td>
<td>relative</td>
<td>wf</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Blickling Homilies: St Michael</td>
<td>fluid class</td>
<td>liquor</td>
<td>hlutfor</td>
<td>wm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>ibid</td>
<td>fluid class</td>
<td>paraphrase</td>
<td>wynsum</td>
<td>wm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>ibid</td>
<td>fluid class</td>
<td>paraphrase</td>
<td>heofonlic</td>
<td>wf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>ibid</td>
<td>fluid class</td>
<td>paraphrase</td>
<td>wm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Vitae patrum</td>
<td>drink</td>
<td>wn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Apocalypse of Thomas</td>
<td>flood</td>
<td>wm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Vercelli 21</td>
<td>drink</td>
<td>uinum</td>
<td>æt</td>
<td>pl (sn)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Luke VII.44</td>
<td>water</td>
<td>aqua</td>
<td></td>
<td>w (m/f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Luke VIII.6</td>
<td>moisture</td>
<td>humor</td>
<td></td>
<td>w (m/f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Cura pastoralis 11</td>
<td>humour (medical)</td>
<td>humor</td>
<td>ḍara innoða</td>
<td>wm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Cura pastoralis 41</td>
<td>humour (medical)</td>
<td>humor</td>
<td></td>
<td>wm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Orosius Historiae v.77</td>
<td>moisture</td>
<td>paraphrase</td>
<td></td>
<td>wm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Historiae v.77</td>
<td>moisture</td>
<td>inber</td>
<td></td>
<td>w (m/f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Consolation of Philosophy 15</td>
<td>wet (abstract)</td>
<td>paraphrase</td>
<td></td>
<td>wm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Consolation 33.5</td>
<td>wet (abstract)</td>
<td>liquidus</td>
<td></td>
<td>sn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Consolation 39.13</td>
<td>wet (abstract)</td>
<td>humidus</td>
<td></td>
<td>wm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Gregory Dialogi 1.9</td>
<td>drink class</td>
<td>liquor</td>
<td>þæs wines</td>
<td>wm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Dialogi 1.9</td>
<td>drink class</td>
<td>liquor</td>
<td>þynnest</td>
<td>wm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Dialogi 3.34</td>
<td>irrigation</td>
<td>inriguum</td>
<td>land</td>
<td>sn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Dialogi 3.34</td>
<td>irrigation</td>
<td>inriguum</td>
<td>land</td>
<td>sn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Dialogi 3.34</td>
<td>irrigation</td>
<td>inriguum</td>
<td></td>
<td>sn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Dialogi 3.34</td>
<td>irrigation</td>
<td>inriguum</td>
<td></td>
<td>sn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Dialogi 3.34</td>
<td>irrigation</td>
<td>inriguum</td>
<td></td>
<td>sn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Dialogi 3.34</td>
<td>irrigation</td>
<td>inriguum</td>
<td></td>
<td>sn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Dialogi 3.37</td>
<td>fluid classeme</td>
<td>paraphrase</td>
<td></td>
<td>wm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>Dialog 4.28</td>
<td>humour</td>
<td>humor</td>
<td>þære fotadle</td>
<td>w (m/f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Bede, HE i.27</td>
<td>sap</td>
<td>humor</td>
<td></td>
<td>w (m/f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>HE iv.19</td>
<td>humour</td>
<td>humor</td>
<td>sceðþend</td>
<td>wf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>Regula 43</td>
<td>drink</td>
<td>uinum</td>
<td>æt</td>
<td>sn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>Regula 43</td>
<td>drink</td>
<td>potus</td>
<td>æt</td>
<td>sn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>Regula 49</td>
<td>drink</td>
<td>potus</td>
<td>æt</td>
<td>sn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>Rule of Chrodegang 5</td>
<td>drink</td>
<td>potus</td>
<td>æt</td>
<td>sn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>Chrodegang 38</td>
<td>drink</td>
<td>potus</td>
<td>æt</td>
<td>sn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>Chrodegang 60</td>
<td>drink class</td>
<td>humor</td>
<td>winlic</td>
<td>wm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>Capitula Theodori 34</td>
<td>drink</td>
<td></td>
<td>æt</td>
<td>sn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>Capitula 48</td>
<td>drink class</td>
<td>druncennes</td>
<td></td>
<td>wm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>Confraternity 18</td>
<td>drink</td>
<td></td>
<td>æt</td>
<td>sn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>Pseudo-Ecgbert 28</td>
<td>drink</td>
<td>paraphrase</td>
<td>relative</td>
<td>wm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>Pseudo-Ecgbert 34</td>
<td>drink</td>
<td>liquor</td>
<td></td>
<td>wm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>Pseudo-Ecgbert 34</td>
<td>drink class</td>
<td>liquor</td>
<td></td>
<td>wm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>Pseudo-Ecgbert 34</td>
<td>drink class</td>
<td>liquidus</td>
<td></td>
<td>wm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Inflection

When considering the distribution of inflectional forms a marked preference for the weak inflection seems to predominate, with seventy instances of the substantive declined weak, to thirty-eight possible instance of the substantive declined strong (and neuter).

Attempting to ascertain the gender of the weak noun is more problematic. In fifty-four instances, the substantive appears definitively masculine, while in only five cases does it appear as unambiguously feminine. There are eleven instances in which the gender of the substantive is not discernible from linguistic information.

Semantics of the Strong Declension

There would appear to be a strong semantic element in the selection of weak or strong inflection. In thirty-one of the thirty-eight instances where the substantive is inflected as a strong neuter it appears in the collocation æt and wæt, sometimes translating *cibus et potus*, with the sense of ‘food and drink.’

In six consecutive instances from the Old English translation of Gregory’s *Dialogues*, OE *wæt* is declined as a weak neuter translating the Latin *inriguus*, an adjective meaning ‘moist.’ Where the adjective modifies a noun, it seems to be treated separately as a substantive by the translator, *terra inrigua* becoming *land and wet*. Where the adjective is treated substantivally in the Latin, it is similarly translated merely as *wæt*.

In only one other occasion does the strong neuter appear in nonmedical prose: in item 72, the Old English Consolation of Philosophy 33.5, where *wæt* translates the Latin adjective *liquidus* in
Boethii de consolatio philosophiae III met 9, 10–12. The use of the strong declension is probably an intentional attempt to render the abstract substantivizing of the adjective for wetness implied in the Boethian verse. Strangely this is not carried through in a universal application of all instances of the abstract concept of elemental ‘wetness’ in the Old English Consolation of Philosophy, which uses the weak masculine for this purpose in item 73.

Thus there appear to be only two situations when the strong neuter form wet is used in preference to the weak forms wæta or wæte: as a general noun meaning food in the collocation æt and wæt, and as a substantivized adjective with an abstract sense translating L. inriguus.

Semantics of the Weak Declension

The weak declension of wæta or wæte is far more common than the strong neuter wet, occurring in a ratio of 70:38 across the non-medical prose corpus. Within the two possible genders in which the weak noun may be inflected, the masculine seems to predominate, with fifty-four definitively masculine occurrences to only five unquestionably feminine, with eleven further instances indeterminate with regards to gender. Using Table 5.7 (below) to further investigate this distribution, it is not unreasonable to infer from the table that the three indeterminate instances of wæta in the weak inflection occurring in Ælfric were considered by the author to be grammatically masculine. We can thus disregard at least those indeterminate usages in Ælfric as being masculine, giving us a modified ratio of 58:5 in favour of the masculine inflection.

Table 5.7 Distribution of Masculine and Feminine Weak Forms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Feminine</th>
<th>indeterminate</th>
<th>masculine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ælfric</td>
<td>Catholic Homilies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ælfric</td>
<td>Other Works</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>Life of Guthlac</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>Blickling Homilies (St Michael)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>Vitae Patrum</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>Apocalypse of Thomas</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gospel of Luke</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The only authors, scribes, or translators who may have considered *weete to be properly feminine in the prose corpus under consideration are those of the Anonymous life of St Guthlack, the Blickling Homelies, and the translators of Bede’s *Ecclesiastical History and Alexander’s *Letter to Aristotle. Two of these texts exhibit both masculine and feminine forms.

The possible significance of the weak *weeta or *weete would appear to encompass much the same lexical fields in non-medical prose as in medical prose. Firstly, there is the sense of ‘fluid’ or ‘moisture’ as a class of substance, a concrete classeme including drinkable fluids. Secondly, the use of the word in its medical sense of ‘humour’ or ‘bodily fluid’ occurs several times in non-medical Old English prose, and can, from a semantic perspective, be considered a further concretisation of the classeme. Then there is the abstract sense of ‘wetness’ or ‘moisture’ proper to philosophical and natural historical discourses of the elemental nature of matter.

**Fluid Class**

The word appears to denote fluids as a class of substance in those instances labelled ‘fluid class’ in Table 5.6 above. This usage occurs in two separate paraphrases of the same miracle story relating to St. Michael, related in *Catholic Homilies* I.34 (items 7–10) and the *Blickling Homily* for the Feast of
St. Michael (items 58–60). The miraculous fluid dripping from the ceiling north of the Altar is first described by Ælfric with the concrete term *wæter*, where his Latin source uses *aqua*. But where the Latin uses a pronoun (*eiusdem*) to refer to the fluid, Ælfric uses the classeme *wæta*, modified by the adjective *wynsum*. The lexeme appears only once in direct correspondence to a Latin substantive, where *heofonlic wæta* translates *liquor coelestis* in item 8. In all three other instances in this section Ælfric has supplied the lexeme which is pronominalized or assumed as a verbal subject in the Latin. The *Blickling Homilies*, though varying a great deal in detail from the Ælfrician version, has the same sequence of determiners for the classeme: *hluttor*, *wynsum* and *heofonlic*.

In the *Catholic Homilies* II.15 (item 20), water (*wæter*) is defined as a *brosniendlic wæta* or corruptible fluid, before its spiritual transmutation. The word appears as a general classeme for fluids in *Catholic Homilies* II.39 (items 23–5), in which the physical properties of oil are expounded exegetically, *wæta* being used as a classeme for all fluids, the point being that oil floats above all other fluids. In item 23, the Latin source lexeme is *humor*, a word with much the same capacity to denote a class of fluid substances. In the two following instances from the same text, however, the Latin source concretises from *humor* to *aqua*, whereas the Old English keeps the open classeme *wæta*.

In the *Lives of Saints* III.14 (item 29), *wæta* is a fluid class determined by the adjective *deoffolic* meaning diabolical. The unknown fluid is capable of doing harm given the context of the passage. The word also denotes the class of fluid as a substance in item 82, from Gregory’s *Dialogues* 3.37, where ‘ænigne eles *wætan* ut alyn’ is an attempt to render a verb, *liquo*, ‘to strain or melt’, in the Latin. Again, oil is one of the class of substances covered by *wæta*.

**Drink Class**

Our word occurs very frequently as a class of drinkable fluid, which is properly a subset of the class of all fluids covered above. While many of the fluids above are drinkable, they are not so necessarily, yet in the following discussion, potability seems to be an implicit characteristic of the fluid, therefore it has been labeled as ‘drink class’ in Table 5.6 above.

When the word is deployed as a drink class it is frequently modified by a complex determiner such as a relative clause, for example, ‘ðe menn ofdruncniað’ (item 11), ‘þe druncennysse styriað’ (item 21), ‘þe druncennysse þurh come’ (item 57), and ‘þe bið on deadmus oððe wesle’ (item 95). In three of these four relatives, what is being stressed is the intoxicating power of certain potable fluids, normally in the context of John the Baptist or a saint eschewing such drinks. In the last case, it would be plausable that any drink is in question, since the context is the penance required for giving someone else a polluted drink, knowingly or unknowingly.
Simple determiners also modify *wæta* when it is used as a class of potable fluids. We find adjectives (*winlic*, 91; *þynnest*, 75), participles (*gemencged*, 4) and genitives (*wines*, 74) acting as determiners. The word can also act to stand for any fluid which may be drunk without any determiner, such as in Old English *Consolation of Philosophy* 15 (item 71) where the context refers to the mixing of drinks with honey.

**Latin Sicera**

The Angelic prophecy of John the Baptist’s abstinence occurs at Luke I.15 ‘erit enim magnus coram Domino et vinum et sicera non bibet.’ The term sicera seems to be translated in many different ways. In the so-called ‘West Saxon’ Gospels, Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 140, *L. sicera* is translated as OE *beor.*

In *Ælfric’s* *Catholic Homilies*, I.25, John’s abstinence is mentioned twice, first with the phrase ‘ne abyrigð he wines ne nan þæra *wætana* þe men ofdrunciað’ which otherwise closely follows the wording of Luke I.15, and again in item 4, with the wording ‘ne dranc he wines drenc ne nanes gemencgedes *wætan* ne gebrownes’ in a contexts which seems to follow Luke much less closely, and includes details not found in the other synoptic gospels. Finally, in item 21 (*Catholic Homily* II.18), *L. sicera* again appears in the source identified by Baker and Lapidge, in Rufinus’ *Historia ecclesiastica*. Again the term is glossed by *Ælfric* with a relative clause ‘ne nan ðæera *wætana* þe druncennysse styriað.’

As such, genitive plural *wætana* seems to occur three times in *Ælfric* as a classeme modified by a restrictive relative denoting drinks which can cause intoxication, each time as a gloss on L. *sicera*, implying that either *Ælfric* or his Latin sources were using a stock phrase for the translation of a relatively unfamiliar Latin term.

**Environmental Moisture and Water**

In several cases, *wæta* is used to denote either simply water, or moisture as a natural phenomenon. In item 65 (Luke VII.44) *wæta* seems to directly translate *aqua* in the context ‘thou gavest me no water for my feet.’ It is somewhat puzzling that the translator chose *wæta* over *water* in this instance. In item 66 (Luke VIII.6) the context is moisture as a naturally occurring environmental phenomenon in the parable of the sowers ‘it withered away, because it had no moisture,’ wherein the Latin lexeme is *humor*. *Ælfric’s* commentary on this parable in *Catholic Homilies* II.6 (items 11–14) uses an identical phraseology, employing *wæta* four times to denote the environmental moisture vital to the seed’s survival, and going on to explain it exegetically as denoting ‘lufu and anrædnys.’

---

Outside the gospels, *aqua* is translated as *waet*a rather than *weater* several times by Ælfric. The usage occurs twice in *Catholic Homilies* II.39 (items 23–5), where the virtue of oil to float above water is used in an exegetical exposition of the parable of the watchful maidens. However, the *aqua* of the Latin source is expanded to the general *waet*a, implying all fluids, in the Old English, probably taking as a cue for this the first occurrence of the word in item 22, which translates ‘Omnibus enim humoribus oleum supereminet.’ It could be said therefore that Ælfric is choosing to rephrase the original, keeping the sense of *humor*, rather than introducing the sense of *aqua* from his source.

The word is used to denote environmental water in Ælfric’s *De temporibus anni*, an extensive Old English paraphrase of Bede’s *De natura rerum* and *De tempore ratione* (items 41–52). Where Bede’s Latin uses *aqua* twice in describing environmental moisture involved in weather formation Ælfric’s Old English uses *waet*a ten times (items 42–52).\(^{762}\) Ælfric also uses the term to denote environmental moisture which nourishes vegetation in the *Admonitio ad filium spiritualem* (item 40) where the sense is metaphorically extended to denote spiritual nourishment, probably in an allusion to Luke VII.6. In the Old English *Martyrology* environmental moisture is again denoted by *waet*a, in the context of being the source of the spontaneous generation of life forms (item 102), here translating the word *humor*. The usage of *waet*a to denote environmental moisture necessary for vegetative life also occurs in Alexander’s *Letter to Aristotle* (item 108) where ‘for miclum *waet*a 7 regnum’ translates ‘frequentibus inbribus,’ *waet*a being part of a double gloss on L. *inber*, the primary sense of which, ‘rain shower,’ is supplied by OE *regn*.

**Fluid Internal to a Living Organism**

As we have seen from the medical evidence, *waet*a can denote fluids internal to a living organism, including vegetables as well as animals. In the Old English *Ecclesiastical History* I.27.7 *waet*a denotes sap once (item 84), translating L. *humor*. The concrete sense is metaphorically extended to imply the sin of adultery passed on to bastard children.

*Waet*a denotes a bodily fluid in the medical sense five times in non medical prose; *Pastoral Care*, chapters 11 and 41 (*Cura Pastoralis* i.11 and iii.17; items 67–8), *Gregory’s Dialogues* iv.28 (item 83), *Historia ecclesiastica* iv.19 (item 85) and Byrhtferth’s *Enchyridion* 2.3 (item 105). In each case the Latin lexeme translated is *humor*, and in three of the four texts in which the usage occurs the word is modified by a determiner specifying the pathological nature of the fluid in question: the participle *sceðþend* determines the humour which is drained from Etheldrida’s abscess in item 85, while the humours implicated in dropsy are modified by genitives either denoting the disease, such as *ðære fotadle* (item 83) or the organ from which they arise, such as *ðara innoða* (item 67).

---

\(^{762}\) It should be noted that item 41 comes from a different section than the remainder of the citations from *De temporibus anni*, on the elemental properties of matter, and that a direct parallel with Bede does not occur for that particular sentence.
Interestingly the humour which is to be expelled by a bitter drink in *Cura pastoralis* 41 (item 68) is a simplex, receiving no specific determiner, implying that this usage is widespread enough to be easily understood as pathological.

In both the *Dialogi* and the *Cura pastoralis*, the usage of the word *wæta* for humour is part of a wider metaphor in which spiritual care is defined in the terms of physical illness. It is pertinent to note then that the technical terminology of medicine is widely enough understood, both in Latin and Old English, to be unproblematically deployed in such a metaphorical context.

*Wæta* is used once as a euphemism for urine, in *Alexander’s Letter to Aristotle* (item 107) translating L. *urina*. The translator’s choice of *wæta* over one of the more salient terms for urine may have been either a stylistic choice of register or a semantic consideration given that the substance was described as being drunk.

**Relation with Latin Source Material**

Of the eight Latin lexemes we find translated by OE *wæta* we find that at least five have common, or even preferable translation equivalents. For *aqua* the standard would be *wæter*, for *potus*, *drenc*, for *sicera*, *beor*, for *uinum*, *win*, and for *urina*, we have *adela* and *hland* as well as nominal derivatives of the verb *micgan* (to urinate) listed in the *Thesaurus of Old English*.

Of these five, only *sicera* and *urina* are problematic in being either lexically difficult (*sicera*) or subject to the taboo (*urina*), the rest being common words with an obvious meaning. The choice of *wæt* or *wæta* must then be a factor of register, style and genre in many cases. The most obvious example would be the frequent collocation *æt* and *wæt*, where homoeoteleuton between the strongly declined monosyllabic rhyming stems would seem to have been deliberately employed to gloss the rhyming pair *cibus et potus* in the Latin source texts.

The choice of declension, weak (*wæta*) or strong (*wæt*), may also have been influenced by the semantic elements of the Latin morphology, the two most common source lexemes for the weak *wæta* being abstract nouns in *-or*, with the most common source lexeme for the strong *wæt* being an abstract noun in *-tus*.

According to Langslow, the Latin suffix *-tus*, as in *potus*, has a semantic component indicating the nominalisation of “an inherent, natural inalienable function,” whereas the Latin suffix *-or*, as in *humor* and *liquor* tend to be verbal or adjectival abstracts often with concrete

---

meaning describing physical (and mental) states or characteristics, and forming lexical sets of notae and signae in medical Latin, such as *calor*, *color*, *dolor* and *tumor* (the signs of inflammation).\textsuperscript{765}

Applying this to our dataset, we see that *potus* is characterised by the ‘inherent, natural inalienable function’ of being drinkable, whereas *humor* and *liquor* are physical phenomena. It is no coincidence then that throughout the Old English corpus, *potus* is translated by the strong inflection, but not the weak, whereas *liquor* and *humor* are translated by the weak inflection but not the strong. This difference is perhaps the strongest evidence that the weak and strong declensions have separate semantic ranges, and perhaps indicates that they ought to be separately lemmatised.

**Substantivisation of Latin Adjectives**

In two instances in *De consolatione philosophiae* (sc. items 71 and 73), and once in the Confessional, (item 98), Latin adjectives in -*idus* are translated by a substantive. In each case the Latin adjective had undergone substantivisation, so that *liquidus* in *De consolatione philosophiae* III met. 9 is functioning as a substantive, and is translated by the strong neuter *wæt* in item 72. In item 73 the adjective *humida* (feminine nom. sg. form of the masculine *humidus*) is similarly used with a substantive sense, but is translated by the weak masculine *wæta*. Finally, in the Confessional (ch. 34b, item 98), the odd construction ‘cibus ille liquidus’ (food that *is* liquid) from the *Poenitentiale Theodori* i.8 is translated simply as *wæta*, which shows a condensation of the sense of the Latin head (*cibus*) and its determiner (*liquidus*).

**Interim Conclusions on Old English Wæt and Wæta**

From the above study we can conclude that the weakly and strongly inflected substantives on the adjectival stem *wæt* should indeed be separately lemmatised, fulfilling different semantic functions, but that there is no demonstrable semantic difference between the masculine and feminine forms of the weakly inflected substantive.

Further to this, we can see that the weak Old English substantives *wæta* and *wæte* translate a range of Latin terms denoting moisture and liquidity in an abstract sense, but are often concretised to denote bodily humours, potable drinks and environmental moisture.

The strong neuter substantive *wæt* seems to have gradually replaced the weak when specifically referring to potable fluids in patristic prose and sermon literature, probably due to the development of the stock rhyming couplet ‘æt and wæt’ achieving a similar effect to ‘cibus et potus’. We can also note that the specific medical sense of ‘humour’ for *wæta* does extend beyond the

medical corpus, suggesting that such specialised usage was beginning to infiltrate the wider speech community. Finally we should note that the use of *wæta* or *wæte* to translate L *humor* and related physiological terms is almost always qualified by one or more adjectives which either denote that it is pathological (*yfel*) or specify its quality (*ceald*) or its type (*horheht, omig*).

Lois Ayoub essentially concludes that ‘in Old English medical writings *wæta* is used as a technical term when Latin texts refer to the doctrine of the four humours.’\(^{766}\) The evidence so far surveyed suggests that the weak *wæta* can refer to any fluid, whether one of the ‘four humours’ or not, and I am not entirely sure it is sufficiently specialised in usage to be considered a ‘technical term.’

**Other Humour Terms: OE oman**

The Old English term *oman* appears to occupy an unusual position, denoting both a form of pathological humour and a disease. The term is said to derive (in *Bosworth and Toller*) from the adjective *omig* meaning, in the first instance, rust-coloured. It almost always occurs as a feminine plural. Bosworth and Toller give the sense of ‘erysipelas, erysipelatous inflammations,’ though as we shall see this is not always a fitting definition for the word.\(^{767}\) The word occurs a total of forty-seven times in only two genres of text, that is medical prose texts and glossaries.

**Glossary Evidence**

In four glossaries, OE *oman* glosses L. *ignis sacer*, being a disease name often translated as ‘erysipelas’ or ‘erysipelatous inflammation’. The disease is sometimes referred to as ‘St Anthony’s fire.’ To avoid confusion between the medieval Latin *erysipelas* and the modern pathological term, *oman* referring to a disease term will be translated as *ignis sacer* in the following list of instances.

**Occurrences in Medical Literature**

OE *Herbal*: Table of Contents

1 139.1 Wib *homan* 7 eagena sare 7 fotadle.\(^{768}\)

‘Against *ignis sacer* and pain of the eyes and gout.’

2 144.1 Wib *homan*.\(^{769}\)

---

\(^{766}\) Ayoub, ‘Old English *wæta,*’ p. 341.  
\(^{768}\) De Vriend, ed., *Herbarium*, p. 23.  
‘Against ignis sacer.’

3 173.4 Wið oman 7 wið fotadle

‘Against ignis sacer and against gout.’

OEH  

Pseudo-Musa, LMHF

4 139.1 Wið oman.  

‘For ignis sacer.’

5 144.1 Wið oman…

… ignem sacrum sanant.

6 173.4 eac swylce þeos sylfe wyrt wið oman wel fremalp on þas ylcan wisan gemetegud.

‘Also this same herb does well with ignis sacer in the beginning applied in the same way.’

Leechbook I: Table of Contents

7 H I.39 Læcedomas wið ælces cynnes omum…

8 H I.39 wiþ utablegnedum omum…

9 H I.39 and wiþ omena geberste…

10 H I.39 and wið omum oferhatum…

11 H I.39 and wið seondum omum þæt is fic…

12 H I.39 drencas 7 sealfa wiþ eallum omum

13 H I.41 Læcedomas þry æþele wiþ innanonfealle & omum.

Leechbook I:

14 I.2.5 Eft of homena æþme 7 stieme 7 of wættan cymð eagna mist 7 sio scearpnes 7 rogoþa þæt deþ wiþ þon is þis to donne.

---

770 Ibid., p. 28.
771 Text of the Liber medicinae ex herbis femininis from de Vriend’s parallel text edition.
773 Ibid., pp. 218–19.
I.35.1 Be asweartedum 7 adeadedum lice sio adl cremdr oftost of omum æfter adle welme on weg gewitenre weorþeð hwilum lic asweartotd

Passionarius Galieni V.34

I.35.2 Be asweartedum 7 adeadedum lice sio adl cre mond 7 fangan 7 migulm mid þy þu meaht clænsian þæt omum 7 þæs geallancode þa readan. ge þeah þæt yfel cumen ne sie of þara omena welme swa þeah deah swilcum mannum se scearpas wyrt drenc

I.35.3 mid wyrt drencum utyrndenum of þe spiwlum of þe migulm mid þy þu meaht clænsian þæt omum 7 þæs geallancode þa readan. ge þeah þæt yfel cumen ne sie of þara omena welme swa þeah deah swilcum mannum se scearpas wyrt drenc

I.35.4 Gif þa omihtan wannan þing of of þe of þe syn utan cumen of wundum of þe of snendingum odde of slegym

Pass V.35 I llam vero herisipilam quam extrinsecus accidit: et causas habet euidentes ac manifestas. i.e. ex vulneribus: vel compunctionibus vel incisionibus:

I.39.1 Her sint læcedomas wiþ ælces cynnes omum 7 onfeallum 7 bancoþum

I.39.2 Wiþ omum utablegnedum.

I.39.3 Uidomum eft.

I.39.3 Lege on wiþ omena geswelle.

I.39.4 Wiþ omena geberste.

I.39.13 Wiþ hatum omum.

I.39.14 Wiþ hatum omum.

I.39.15 Wiþ hatum omum.

I.39.17 Wiþ hatum omum.

I.39.18 Wiþ seondum omum.

I.39.20 Wiþ bancoþe, þæt is oman.

Leechbook II: Table of Contents

II H.15. hu sio ablawung þæs magan cremdr of þam blacum omum.

II H.16 Læcedomas 7 tacn þas hatan omihtan magan ungemetfiesta.
II H.16 Tacn hu se hata omihta maga ungemet ðurst & swol þrowað.
II H.25 and þonne adl to þære wambe wile for þære yfelan omihtan wætan.
II H.42 Læcedomas gif omihtre blod 7 yfele wætan on þam milte syn þindende.
II H.44 þynnþ þa oman.

Leechbook II

II.1.1 and he onfinde swile 7 þæt þa oman beoð inne betynde þurh þa ablawunge.
II.1.2 and unrotnessa butan þearfe 7 oman 7 ungemetlica mete soçna 7 ungemetlice unlustas 7 cisnessa.
II.1.7 and wiþ þon þe mon sie on þam magan omigre wætan gefylled
II.1.9 Gif hie þonne cumað of oþrum biterum 7 yfelum wætum þa þe wyrcead oman.
II.3.1 and sele wermod on wearmum wætere twam nihtum ær ofgotenne þæt se þam oman stille.
II.15.2 siø ablawunge hæto cymeð of þam blacum oman

II.16.t Þis sint tacn þæs hatan magan omihtan ungemetfæstlican. 7 þæs ofercealdan.
Þæs hatan magan ungemetfæstan tacn sindon þonne he bið mid oman geswenced
II.21.1 and fefer mid speowunga omena

PAL ii.14 et tristicias sina causa, 7 timores melancolicos 7 alia multa .i. appetitiones irrationabiles cibi 7 fastidium 7 nauseas
PAL ii.37.1quibus stomachus flegmate repletus frigidus est
PAL ii.38. De nausea 7 vomitu.
Si autem ex humorum acrede fit cacochimia est.
LT 14.1 et epithematium postea id est Polyarchion aut dia spermaton aut Serapionos aut Nileos aut absinthium Ponticum in calda infusum, ut color aquae mutentur.

PAL ii.22 Curatio si ex calore nimio fuerit imbecilla cateltica virtus
Si autem ex colerico humore nimia facta fuerit distemperantia cateltice
PAL II. 58 Signa si in crita epatis flegmon fuerit.
Tunc etiam febres sunt causonides cum vomitu colerum.

45 II.25.4 Gif þæt sie omihte wæte innan onburnenu tyhte hie mon ut mid liþum mettum sincendum & ne læt inne gesittan on þam lichoman.

46 …and wyrð gegaderodu omig wæte on þære wambe.

47 II.27.12 Se þe hattre sie sio gegadraþ oman.

Oribasius, Syn. v.52 Sicci et humidis temperantia et ut crescent et conroborantur calor in eis.

48 II.30.6 oðde sio healfideade adl ôfhe fyllewære oðde sio hwite rieſfo þe mon on suſerne lepra hæt ôfde tetra ôfhe heafod hriefdo ôfhe oman.

Eup. i.16 aut aspera, qualia sunt lepre aut impetigines, alii acoras in capite, aerisipilas et aerpitas.

49 II.42.1 Gif omihte blod 7 yfel wæte on þam milte sie þindende.

PAL ii.121 Curatio phlegmones in slpene generatae.

50 II.44.1 hnesceþ þa wambe, þynnað þa oman. bitre hræcetunge aweg dep

PAL ii.142 et alvum mollit et cholerae extenuat et ructationes amputat.

51 II.56.10 and þa seaw þa beoð gemengedu of mettum wiþ blod 7 wiþ oman geondgeotaþ þonne innoþ wyrceað yfelne utgang.

PAL ii.80 Eorum enim qui in cibis accipiuntur succus dum mutantur in sanguinem refunditur in intestina 7 sic excernitur cum coleribus mixtum

et propter acredinem colerum non pone contineri cum cibo.

Lacnunga

53 87 (94) Her syndon læcedomas wið ælces cynnes ommum 7 onfeallum.774

‘Here there are treatmenst for every kind of ignis sacer and disease.’

54 88 (95) Wið ommum 7 blegnum.775 ‘For ignis sacer and ulcers’

55 89 (96) Wið ommum 7 ablegnedum.776 ‘For ulcerated ignis sacer’
As we can see, the majority of occurrences are in the two Leechbooks and the adjectival forms only occur in Leechbook II. The following table shows the distribution of both the noun omen and the related adjectives.

Table 5.8 Distribution of Orthographic Forms on the Stem om-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>OEH</th>
<th>BLB I</th>
<th>BLB II</th>
<th>Lacn</th>
<th>Peri D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[h]oman</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[h]omena</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(gen)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>omum (dat)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>om-cyn</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>omig</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>omiht</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

780 Löweneck, ed., *Peri didaxeon*, p. 5. It is unclear why Löweneck saw a parallel between the *Practica Petrocelli* 15 and *Peri didaxeon* 2.
In the above citations, OE *oman* appears to have two distinct meanings, one denoting a skin condition, the other denoting a humoral type. In the OEH, every instance of *oman* can be seen to gloss L. *ignis sacer*, a phrasal term denoting a disease of the skin characterised by a red inflammation which has been retrospectively diagnosed as erysipelas. In the Leechbook, the term *oman* is also used as a disease term to gloss Latin *ignis sacer* from the *Medicina Plinii*, though in both the source text and the Old English examples, the disease term is understood, not recapitulated.

The predominance of the dative form *omum* in instances glossing *ignis sacer* in Leechbook I may be due to the syntax of the exemplar text, probably a lost recension of the Physica Plinii, in which the construction *de* + ablative is translated as *wið* + dative, rather than the *wið* + accusative structure found in the Herbal. This is possibly due to the prevalence of the diffuse form found in the Latin *Herbarium* in which the recipe is given followed by an (accusative) + *sanat* structure, or possibly by a lost exemplar in which the archetypal capitular lists used the *ad* + accusative structure, rather than the *de* + ablative.

In Leechbook II.30.6 *oman* translates *aerisipelas* from Oribasius’ *Euporistes* i.16 in a list of potential consequences of ignoring dietary regimen and phlebotomy according to the seasons. In the other instances in the Leechbook, the sense of *oman* is either obviously a disease term or could be ambiguously interpreted as either a disease term or a corrupt humour type. Potentially ‘humoural’ instances of *oman* occur in the above list at items 15 (*BLB* I.35.1), 16 (I.35.3), 32 (II H.16), 35 (II H.44), 36 (II.1.1), 37 (II.1.2), 39 (II.1.9), 40 (II.3.1), 41 (II.15.2), 45 (II.21.1), 48 (II.27.12), 50 (II.44.1), 51 (II.56.10) and 52 (II.56.10).

Of these instances, we only find a small number of definite translation equivalents. It is often difficult to determine precisely what term is being translated by *oman* and it seems that the source texts were often either misunderstood, paraphrased or existed in different recensions to those available now. A simple example is the chapter on ‘erysipelas’ in the Passionarius. The therapies listed in this chapter are very close to those found in Leechbook I.35 (items 15 and 18 above), but the opening sentences of the respective chapters differ greatly. In the Old English the disease term clause seems to be ‘Be asweartedum and adeadedum lice’ which is presumably a very loose translation of *De erisipelate*, whereas OE *oman* in the context seems to be the cause of the disease not the disease itself, where the cause in the Latin is ‘ex sanguine felle rufo commisto et in temperato fit ex sanguine feruenti tantum et tenui’ (It comes from blood and red bile having been mixed and so much thin boiling blood), the only part of which surviving in the Old English would be *oman* itself. It would seem, comparing these sentences against each other that they have no relation whatsoever, yet the cures and treatments that follow are identical. This can be explained in one of two ways. Firstly, the source for this chapter, which was almost certainly not the Passionarius, but
as pointed out by Cameron, was most likely the Galenic *Ad Glauconem II.6–7*, or secondly, that the compiler of Bald’s Leechbook simply paraphrased and condensed the source Latin before him.

In item 37 (BLB II.1.2), *oman* would appear to translate *timores melancholices*, in the *Practica Alexandri* ii.14. In item 39 (BLB II.1.9) OE *oman* translates a Greek loanword *cacochimia* (*κᾰκόχῡμια*) in the original Latin (PAL ii.38), meaning ‘an unhealthy state of the humours.’ It would seem then that *oman* directly translates this concept into Old English in this specific context, despite occurring in a relative clause in place of the simple verbal clause ‘cacochimia fit’. A further parallel can be identified in item 44 (BLB II.21.4) where OE *mid speowunga omena* translates OE *cum vomitu colerum*, suggesting a link between *coler* and *oman*. In item 37 (BLB II.i.7, PAL ii.37.11), however, it would appear that *flegma* is translated by *omig wæte*. From this evidence alone it would seem that *oman* has the capacity to translate any humour term, specifically denoting a harmful humour.

Looking at the adjectives on the same stem we can develop a slightly clearer picture. In item 18 (BLB I.35.4), *omihtan wannan þing* (ruddy inflamed thing) seems to translate *herisipilam* much more directly than in the previous parallels between Leechbook I.35 and the Passionarius.

In the chapter heading, Leechbook II.16.1 ‘þæs hatan omihtan magan ungemetfæsta’ (item 42), the Latin term in operation seems to be ‘distemperantia cateltice ex colerico humore’ (a *cateltic* intertemperance from the choleric humour) where *omiht* would seem to translate the adjectival *colericus*, with the genitive plural *omena* seeming to translate *colerum* in item 44 (BLB II.21.4). In item 49 (BLB II.42.1), ‘omihте blod and yfel wæte… þindende’ appears to be an interpolated gloss on L. *phlegmone* (a type of inflammation), whereas OE *oman* in item 50 seems to translate L. *choler* directly.

**Resolving the apparent polysemy of *oman***

As a humour term, *oman* seems capable of denoting any harmful humour, whether it be choleric or phlegmatic, but the crucial thing is that it is normally an admixture of one of these humours with blood. Since *ignis sacer* or *erysipelas* was thought to come from a rising to the surface of such a toxic mixture of blood and other humours, it is no surprise that the word for the visible symptom, and the perceived underlying cause became one and the same term.

That the word for a pathological cause of disease and the word for a disease overlap may seem to be a problematic case of polysemy in the assessment of technical vocabulary. However, it must be remembered that the semantic extension of cause to effect is a common feature of Latin

---

781 Cameron, *Anglo-Saxon Medicine*, p. 43; since no transcription of this text existed at the time of writing, this particular parallel has not been taken into account and the parallel reading from the *Passionarius* has been reproduced in its place.

782 I have been unable to determine the meaning of this term.
medical term formation according to Langslow. Langslow points out several analogous cases in medical Latin, wherein ‘disease terms appear to take their name from that of their supposed cause.’ The most obvious and pertinent example is the disease term bilis atra, which means ‘black bile’ but denotes a disease caused by black bile in Celsus.783

Reconstructing the Four Humours in Old English

Although the four humours are specifically named by two authors, Byrhtferth of Ramsey and the anonymous twelfth-century translator of the Peri didaxeon, there seems to be no consistent terminology with which four distinct humours are defined in Old English.

We have so far established that the term wæta or wæte can act to translate L. humor and a number of other terms, and can denote a specific humour when modified by a determiner. However these determiners (such as yfel) often do little more than specify it as a bodily humour, without narrowing its sense further to a specific humour.

Essentially, there are three texts in which Old English humour terms are used with sufficient complexity for us to attempt to determine the meanings and translation equivalents of specific terms for blood, black bile, red bile and phlegm. These texts are: Byrhtferth’s Enchiridion, Bald’s Leechbook and the Peri didaxeon.

Table 5.9 Specific Humour Terms in Old English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Enchiridion</th>
<th>Peri D</th>
<th>Leechbook</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sanguis</td>
<td>blod</td>
<td>blod</td>
<td>blod</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fel/choler niger</td>
<td>sweart incōdān</td>
<td>swerta gealle</td>
<td>oman / yfele wæte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fel/choler rubea</td>
<td>read incōda</td>
<td>ruwa gealla</td>
<td>oman / yfele wæte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phlegma</td>
<td>hraca oððe geposu</td>
<td>wæte</td>
<td>slipig wæte / oman</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From this very brief summary, it would seem that the Leechbook does not have stable translation equivalents for given humour terms in Latin, but in fact, as demonstrated above, the broad humour term wæte tends to be modified by qualitative adjectives which refine its meaning to conform to humoral aetiology. What this table does perhaps illustrate is that OE geall is not used in early medical texts to describe the human bodily humor, but rather tends to be used to refer to animal gall.

783 Langslow, Medical Latin, pp. 55–6.
Anglo-Saxon Humoral Theory in Practice

From an onomasiological perspective, Old English lacks a humoral vocabulary insofar as there is not a stable set of terms used with total translatability and absolute synonymy to translate the four humours of the human body, even within a given text. In light of this deficiency, we may be tempted to agree with M. L. Cameron’s conclusion that the Anglo-Saxons paid ‘only lip-service’ to the humoral theory underpinning their Latin sources.\(^{784}\)

In analysing the uses of the substantives \textit{wæta} and \textit{oman}, it nonetheless becomes clear that although there was no sense of a unified vocabulary of the four humours, namely there were not four stable terms for the four humours, the translators of Latin medical texts into Old English did their best to retain as much of the humoral information retained therein as possible, and even to explicate it by using circumlocutive phrases, describing the nature of the humour involved, rather than giving it a technical name.

This runs contrary to Lois Ayoub’s findings. She states that ‘the Old English word \textit{wæta} in Anglo-Saxon medical texts is consistently chosen to render references in Latin sources to the doctrine of the humours.’\(^{785}\) While \textit{wæta} is indeed so chosen, its lack of total translatability with a specific Latin technical term makes it clear that the Anglo-Saxons were using a ubiquitous word to translate the concept of humoral pathology, without attempting to coin a specific technical term for it. Unfortunately, Ayoub’s statement that ‘in Old English writings the humours seem to be viewed primarily in the context of disease’\(^{786}\) seems to ring false, given that there is no specific term for ‘humour’ in Old English, just as there is none in Latin,\(^{787}\) \textit{wæta} referring to any kind of fluid from blood to tree-sap to honey in both the medical and non-medical prose surveyed above.

From the broadest perspective of intellectual history, the very use of sources in the Bald’s \textit{Leechbook} points to an attempt to synthesise the best theoretical basis for diagnosis and treatment available at the time, including the theory of humours and temperaments. Furthermore, the evidence from the medical texts suggests the correct physiological interpretation of some very challenging vocabulary which was borrowed freely from Greek into Latin, suggesting that the scholars who undertook the translation of these Byzantine sources were both excellent linguists and keenly concerned with the accurate vernacular interpretation of the most complex medical theories of their day.

\(^{784}\) Cameron, \textit{Anglo-Saxon Medicine}, p. 64.
\(^{785}\) Ayoub, ‘Old English \textit{wæta}’, p. 341.
\(^{786}\) \textit{Ibid.}, p. 341.
\(^{787}\) L. \textit{humor} seems to be as semantically broad as OE \textit{wæta}, referring to any kind of moisture or fluid.
CHAPTER 6: PATHOLOGY AND DISEASE TERMINOLOGY

The largest single problem in translating disease terms from corpus languages is the problem of retrospective diagnosis. While it may be possible to unpack the etymology or semantics of a word, either through internal linguistic evidence alone, or through comparison with parallel texts in other corpus languages, that does not mean that it can be identified confidently with a modern disease concept, given how radically the systems of modern and ancient disease classification differ in how they generate an operational definition of a given disease. For example, while it may be possible to realise that OE oman translates L. ignis sacer and erysipelas, and etymologically implies a ruddy or rust-coloured pigmentation of the skin, it is highly problematic to assume that either OE oman or L. ignis sacer or even erysipelas should be translated as the modern medical term erysipelas, since the modern disease term is defined by a completely differing set of criteria to the medieval and antique terms.

As such, no attempt will be made to diagnose a disease term from Old English texts in this study, as to do so would be anachronistic and would detract from the main point of this present exercise, that is, to understand how Old English technical vocabulary functions. A retrospective diagnosis here would impose a misleading set of presumptions about disease causation and classification upon that technical vocabulary and obfuscate the internal consistency of the physiological system, which was outlined in the previous chapter.

Differential Diagnosis in Old English and Latin medical texts.

One of the characteristics of early medieval medical compendia tends to be the lack of detailed descriptions of diseases, their symptoms and presentation, and the Old English medical corpus is no exception to this rule. The most extreme example of this characteristic of medieval medical texts can be found in the enlarged Herbal, which was translated into the Old English Herbal and Medicina de quadrupedibus, where cures are listed under the plant or animal species in which they occur, and little or no description is given of the diseases for which these cures are held to be efficacious. Part of the reason for the lack of explanation of disease terms in these texts is that many of the terms are immediately self-evident. Terms such as muþes wund (‘wound of the mouth,’ OEH 2.20 translating ulcera oris at Herbarius i.21) or heafdes sare (‘pain of the head,’ OEH 3.4, translating capitis dolorem at Herbarius ii.4) would not require further explication. Where terms are not self-evident in their meaning, the compiler or compilers of Bald’s Leechbook drew from many and various sources to find the information necessary to aid the diagnosis of disease and the differentiation between confusabilia in medical terminology.
When we examine Bald’s *Leechbook* for instances in which disease terms are given a set of diagnostic criteria we actually find a wealth of terms. In BLB I.1, *heafodwærc* and *heafodece* are not disambiguated as it would seem that they were transparent to their intended readership, though we will see below that the terms were not necessarily synonymous. The phrasal term *healfes heafdes ece* (ache of half the head), glossing *emigranea* is, however, given a list of symptoms (*tacr*) in I.1.18, which seem to be taken directly from the *Practica Alexandri latine* (i.45–46). The humoral aetiology of dimness of the sight (*eagna mist* I.2.5) is taken from the *Physica Plinii*, while the regimem for the avoidance of the condition (*BLB* I.2.3) is taken from Oribasius, *Synopses* v.37. Moving on to conditions of the neck, a prognostic to diagnose *healsgund* from the *Physica Plinii* occurs at I.4.2, while the twofold nature of the disease is explicated in a differential diagnostic passage from the pseudo-Galenic *Liber Tertius* at I.4.8–9, with subjunctive conditional clauses (*Gif þonne...*) beginning the next three sections (I.4.10–12), also taken from the *Liber tertius*, which specify the treatment to be undertaken if certain symptoms present.

Surveying the whole two books of Bald’s *Leechbook* we actually find an uncharacteristic wealth of diagnostic criteria and humoral aetiology given for each disease. This increases greatly in *Leechbook* II, given that it is this book which treats internal medicine, and therefore a high degree of disambiguation is required for correct diagnosis, as well as a thorough explication of medical theory, which is precisely what we get.

In the sources for the most sophisticated diagnostic passages in Bald’s *Leechbook*, six pathological terms are used to define the conditions of various internal organs. We first see them most clearly explicated in the first chapter on the liver. In the following section we will consider how these six Greek pathological terms are translated, and then attempt to assess whether there is a consistent use of the translation equivalents for these six Greek terms followed in the rest of the *Leechbook*.

*Leechbook* II.17.2

Be sex þingum þe þone liferwærc wyrcead ærest geswel þat is åfundenes þære lifer. Oþer is þæs geswelles toberstung. Þridde is wund þære lifre. Feorþe is welmes hæto mid gefelnesse 7 mid sare geswelwe. Fifte is aheardung þæs magan mid gefelnesse 7 mid sare. Sexte is aheardung þære lifre butan gefelnesse 7 butan sare.

*LT* 36.1 Epar una res est, id est iecur, quae ex nomine causam designat periculosam, sed habet causas sex. Quae causae diuersis signis suis agnoscentur uel demonstratur, id est: Apostema in iecore, syrrexis id est ruptio apostematis, helcosis id est ulceratio, phlegmone hoc est feror uel tumor, scleria hoc est duritia cum sensu et dolore, scirrosis id est nimia duritia sine
Concerning the six things that may create liver disease: first is swelling, that is puffing up of the liver, second is the bursting of that swelling, third is a wound of the liver, fourth is hot inflammation with sensitivity and with painful swelling, fifth is hardening of the stomach with sensitivity and with pain. Sixth is hardening of the liver without sensitivity and without pain.

The liver (epar) is a single thing, that is the liver (iecor), which denotes a perilous thing in name, but has six causes. Those causes may be revealed or demonstrated by diverse signs, that is: *Apostema* in the liver, *syrrexis*, that is rupture of the *apostema*, *helcosis*, that is a wound, *phlegmon* that is heat or swelling, *scleria* that is hardness with sensation and pain, *scirrhosis* that is excessive hardness without pain and without sensation, because it is held in the liver.

These six terms, *apostema*, *syrrexis*, *helcosis*, *phlegmon*, *scleria* and *scirrhosis* occur again and again in various medical tracts in addition to the pseudo-Galenic *Liber tertius*, being ultimately derived from Galenic pathological theory. The terms are used not only of the liver, where they are most clearly expounded in the *Liber tertius*, and their translation equivalents seen in Old English, but they are also found in relation to the stomach, spleen and intestines.

**i. *apostema* (ἀπόστημα)**

Greek *apostema* meaning ‘abscess’ or ‘collection of morbid matter’ occurs both as a simple disease term in Latin texts as in pseudo-Apuleius, *Herbarius* 124.1 *ad apostema*, and as a genitival compound with an anatomical term, as in *apostema iecoris* (LT 38.1).

In *OEH* 125, which translates pseudo-Apuleius 124.1, *ad apostema* is translated ‘Wið ealle gegaderun ga þæs yfelan wætan of þam lichoman,’ a very accurate representation of the concept, but a rather cumbersome phrase. In the *Leechbook*, we must search a little harder to discover how often the term is translated faithfully.

II.17.2 *apundenes* þære lifer

II.17.2 *geswelles* toberstung

II.19.2 oððe se *apundena* swa aswollen gebij… swa se *swile* ne geberstep

---

788 Fischer, ed., *Liber tertius*, p. 311
The term *apostema* in the *Liber tertius* is translated by three terms in *Leechbook* II, *apundena*, *geswel* and *swile*, all indicating swelling or inflammation, and is once paraphrased with the participle *geswollen* meaning ‘swollen.’ Although the term can refer to an abscess anywhere on the body, the only Latin parallels located for the *Leechbook* seem to confine the usage of the term to the liver.

**helcosis (ἕλκωσις)**

The Greek term *helcosis*, defined as ‘ulceration’ by Liddle and Scott, is not attested as current in Latin by any of the authors studied in Langslow,\(^{791}\) so probably entered the Latin medical lexis later in the Middle Ages.

The term is consistently translated as *wund*, ‘wound,’ although it is also conspicuous that every instance which occurs in the Latin sources of the *Leechbook* is also glossed ‘*uulnera*’ or ‘*uulneratio*,’ so the translator need not have known the meaning of the word.

**phlegmone (φλεγμονή)**

The term *phlegmone*, meaning ‘an inflamed tumour’\(^ {792}\) is one of the few Greek pathological terms employed widely beyond the scope of the liver in the sources for the *Leechbook*, as in II.3.t.

---

\(^{791}\) The term is certainly absent from Langslow’s index and glossary of Greek pathological terms in *Medical Latin*, pp. 477–94.

\(^{792}\) Langslow, *Medical Latin*, p. 489.
II.17.2 Welmes hæto mid gefelnesse 7 mid sare geswelle. LT 36.1 phlegmone hoc est feruor uel tumor.

II.17.3 Þære lifre geswel oþþe apundenesse LT 37.1 Phlegmone, id est tumor iecoris, intelligitur sic.
þu meaht þus ongitan.

II.18.1 Viþ Þære lifre swile oððe LT 40.1 Phlegmonen autem curabis sic. aþundenesse.

The one thing which may become immediately apparent is that phlegmone and apostema are both translated geswel or apundenesse, basically both being truncated to the idea of ‘swelling’ or ‘inflammation.’ However there may be a degree of contextual differentiation which is not apparent on such cursory examination.

iv scirrhosis (σκίρρωσις)
The Greek term scirrhosis, giving the PDE medical term cirrhosis is noted by Langslow as meaning ‘induration of an internal organ, cirrhosis.’

793 The term is translated twice in the Leechbook as OE aheardung ‘hardening’ and aheardodre ‘hardened.’

II.17.2 aheardung Þære lifre butan LT 36.1 scirrosis id est nimia duritia sine gefelnesse dolore

II.21.t Her sint tacn aheardodre lifre LT 48.1 Incipit de scirrosi, id est duritia iecoris794

v scleria (σκληρία) and sclerosis (σκλήωσις)
Neither scleria or sclerosis are attested as Latinised medical terms in Langslow’s index.795 The terms literally mean ‘hardness’ and ‘hardening’ respectively according to Liddle and Scott. The latinised forms sclerosis and scirrhosis seem to be confusibilia in the medieval medical Latin corpus, with the Passionarius reading sclerosis where the Liber tertius reads scirrhosis. Obviously, the modern medical categories of cirrhosis and sclerosis cannot be seen to apply in these cases, although the definitions are similar, in that both refer to a process of hardening.

II.17.2 aheardung Þæs magan mid LT 36.1 scleria hoc est duritia cum sensu et gefelnesse 7 mid sare. dolore.

793 Ibid., p. 492.
794 The Passionarius has ‘scleriosis, idest duritia’ suggesting a confusion between the similar sounding scirrhosis and sclerosis. See Talbot, ‘Notes on Anglo-Saxon Medicine,’ pp. 163–4.
795 Langslow, Medical Latin, pp. 477–94.
The related term *scleroma* meaning ‘hardness’ occurs at *LT* 15.1 dealing with hardness of the stomach. Problematically, *Leechbook* II.4 here conflates two chapters of the *Liber tertius* into one, giving two cures from *LT* 18.1, ‘Empneumatosis, id est inflatio,’ at *Leechbook* II.4, followed by two cures from *LT* 16.1–2, which deal with ‘Scleroma, id est duritia,’ a condition described in *LT* 15. It is probable that the title of *Leechbook* II.4, ‘Wīþ heardum swile þæs magan’ translates *scleroma* rather than *empneumatosis*.

**vi syrrexis** (σύρρηξις)
The term is not attested in Langslow. It literally means ‘an internal rupture’ according to Liddle and Scott.

*Leechbook* II.22.5 siþþan þæt geswel biþ gehweled 7 tobyrst 7 wyrð unsarre

As we can see, these six Greek pathological terms do not appear to have direct one-to-one translation equivalents; however they are intelligently translated in the Old English, and their sense preserved. For example, the same OE terms, *geswel* and *ahunden*; translate both *phlegmone* and *apostema* in *Leechbook* II. The precise meaning of the term in context is retained through more cumbersome phrases and clauses, differentiating a hot painful swelling from a painless unfeeling swelling. In this way the translators of the *Leechbook* appear to have engaged with the technical vocabulary of their sources in a way that implies comprehension, but perhaps a lack of pretension and a desire to simplify the often complex language involved.

**Latin and Greek Disease Terms in Old English.**

Latin and Greek disease terms are almost never borrowed into Old English to create fully lexicalised terms. Where Latin and Greek terms are borrowed from the source literature, they are much more often unlexicalised and flagged as foreign terms through the use of relative clauses such as ‘þe mon hæt on læden’ (which one calls in Latin) or through the use of OE *supern* to denote foreignness.
Latin and Greek terms in Bald’s Leechbook

i  sycosis (ςύκωσις) [cimosis]

The disease term cimosis appears in Leechbook I.2.51: ‘Wiþ þeoradle on eagum þe mon gefigo hæt on læden hatte cimosis’ (for þeor-disease in the eyes which one calls cimosis in Latin). The term is flagged as a foreign disease term through a relative clause and given two Old English synonyms þeor adl on eage and gefigo. The Dictionary of Old English796 define OE gefigo as L. trachoma, based on the appearance of sycosis in Cassius Felix De medicina, 29 ‘ad trachomata id est asperitates palpebrarum et ad sycosin, quam nos ficitatem dicimus, siquidem similis granis fici in palpebris versatis asperitas reperiatur.’

Whether or not we can assume Cassius Felix as a source for the Anglo-Saxon text, Langslow notes the meaning of the term, sycosis, from Greek ςύκωσις, as meaning ‘an ulcer resembling a ripe fig,’ which can pertain to the eye.797 Here we see then that both L. ficitatem and OE gefigo gloss cimosis as figurae etymologiae.

ii  lepra (λέπρα)

The term lepra is flagged as a foreign term in a relative clause using OE suþern to denote its foreignness, and given the OE meaning ‘sio hwite riefþo’ (the white scab) in BLB II.30.6. The whole phrase can be seen to translate a sentence in Oribasius Euporistes I.9 ‘et alii pati uidentur exantematas similia aut aspera, qualia sunt lepre aut impetigines.’798

It cannot be stressed enough that in the tenth century the Latin term lepra did not necessarily denote Hansen’s disease as it later did, but rather a range of skin conditions. It has been suggested by Demaitre that it was only in the translations of Constantinus Africanus in the eleventh century that elephantiasis, a degenerative and terminal skin disorder, became classified as a type of lepra, although Demaitre notes that Galenic and pseudo-Glaenic sources frequently use the terms indiscriminately.799

To understand this passage we will need to examine the greater context in which the clause occurs, and the Latin source text from which it has been translated.

797 Langslow, Medical Latin, p. 493.
798 ‘And other are seen to suffer either exantematas or similar roughness, such as lepra or impetigo,’ Molinier, ed., Oeuvres d’Oribase, VI, 413.
In this passage we see direct one-to-one Old English translation equivalents for four Greek disease terms and one Latin term: OE *sio healfdeade adl* for Gr. *paralysis* (παράλυσις), OE *fyllewærc* for Gr. *apoplexia* (ἀποπληξία), OE *tetra* for L. *impetigo*, OE *heafod hriefðo* for Gr. *achoras* (ἄχωρ, ἄχώρ) *in capite* and OE *oman* for Gr. *erysipelas* (ἐρυσίπελας).

The relative clause in the Old English occurs at the same point as a relative clause in Latin but with a markedly different sense, where ‘the white scab that is called *lepra* in the south’ is translated rather loosely from ‘*et alii pati uidentur exantematas similia aut aspera, qualia sunt lepre*’.

---

800 Molinier, ed., *Oeuvres d’Oribase*, VI, 413.
801 All four of these Greek terms have been noted by Langslow as having been borrowed into medical Latin. See Langslow, *Medical Latin*, pp. 477–94.
aut impetignes’ and replaces the notion of ‘a disease such as lepra’ with ‘a disease that is called lepra.’

Yet what is puzzling about this particular relative clause, ‘þe man on suþe lepra hæt,’ is that it is glossing a word with which both the translator and intended readership should have been familiar, in that the Latin word lepra appears many times in the Vulgate bible, and that there were established translation equivalents for it in glossed Psalters and biblical translations. The Latin substantive lepra was normally translated by OE hreofl and the adjective leprosus was translated licþrower when the Latin term was used substantively to refer to sufferers, but as hreof in agreement with another substantive indicative of a sufferer.802 This rule is not absolute, however, as the adjective hreof is used almost exclusively for leprosus in the Rushworth Gospels, whether or not the adjective is used substantivally, the only exception I have found in the Rushworth Gospels being Mark I.40.

Table 6.1 Glosses on lepra and leprosus in Old English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>lepra &gt; hreof</th>
<th>leprosus &gt; hreof(lig)</th>
<th>leprosus &gt; licþrower</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ælfric’s Glossary</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindisfarne Gospels</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rushworth Gospels</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OE hreofl in Medical Literature

Although it digresses somewhat from the current discussion of borrowings in Old English disease terminology, it is necessary to consider the medical usage of the native words normally used to translate L. lepra.

OEH

Herb.

804 Rushworth and Lindisfarne Gospels from Skeat, ed. The Four Gospels in Anglo-Saxon. Old English chapter headings have not been included in this survey.
92.2 Wið hreoflan.\textsuperscript{805}  
110.3 Wið hreoflan.\textsuperscript{807}  
146.4 Wið hreoflan; genim þas ylcan wyrt  
7 meluw 7 eced, cnuca togedre, lege to þam hreoflan, he bið gelacnud.\textsuperscript{809}  

‘For herofl, take this same herb, and meal and vinegar, grind together, apply to the hreofl, he will be healed.’

\textit{MdQ}  

7.10 Wið hreofle 7 wið toflogen lic.\textsuperscript{810}  
v.11 Ad peduclosos.\textsuperscript{811}  

\textit{Bald’s Leechbook}  

I.H.32…7 wiþ hreofum lice 7 wið adeadedum lice bæþ 7 sealfa wiþ þon  
I.H.88 Læcedomas wiþ horses hreofle  
I.32.6 Læcedom wiþ hreofum lice  
I.32.9 Wiþ hreofle  
I.32.10 Wiþ hreofle eft  
I.32.11 Bæþ wiþ hreofle  
I.88.1 Wiþ horses hreofle  
I.88.2 gif sio hreofol sie micel  

\textit{Lacnunga}  

36. Wið hreofum lice… þæt bið god sealf wið hreofum lice\textsuperscript{812}  
135. Wið poccum & sceapa hreoflan\textsuperscript{813}  

\textsuperscript{805} De Vriend, ed. \textit{Herbarium}, p. 134.  
\textsuperscript{806} Howald and Sigerist, ed., \textit{Herbarius}, p. 164.  
\textsuperscript{807} De Vriend, ed. \textit{Herbarium}, p. 154.  
\textsuperscript{808} Howald and Sigerist, ed., \textit{Herbarius}, p. 192.  
\textsuperscript{809} Old English and Latin from de Vriend, ed., \textit{Herbarium} pp. 188–9.  
\textsuperscript{810} De Vriend, ed., \textit{Herbarium}, p. 256.  
\textsuperscript{811} Howald and Sigersit, ed., \textit{Herbarius}, p. 252.  
\textsuperscript{812} Pettit, ed., \textit{Lacnunga} I, 20; this recipe is the same as \textit{Leechbook} I.32.6.  
\textsuperscript{813} Pettit, ed., \textit{Lacnunga} I, 98.
It is unfortunate that no sources have yet been identified for any of the recipes ‘wið hreofle’ outside of the *OEH*. Within the *OEH*, we see OE *hreof* translating five separate Latin disease terms: *elefantiosos* (elephantiasis), *licenas* (given as a species of *lepra*), *peduclosos* and *lepra* itself.

**OE hriefþo in Bald’s Leechbook**

**Leechbook II**

II.30.6 sio hwite *riefþo* ... oþþe heafod *hriefþo*.\(^{814}\)

II.41.4 þonne deah þis wiþ hunige geyced ge wið miltæ adle. ge wið magan. ge wið hrean. ge wiþ þon þe mon blode spiwe. ge wiþ callum innan adlum. eac þon *riefþo* & giçþa sona aweg deþ.

II.41.5 Þes læcedom deah ge wiþ *hriefþo* wyrc of ecede weexsealfc. genim þæs ecedes .v. cucler mæl...

‘Mixed with honey, this helps against spleen-disease, and for the stomach, and for wasting\(^{817}\) and in case one vomits blood, and for all diseases of the innards, and it also soon does away with scab and itch. This medicine helps against scab: make a wax salve from vinegar, take five spoonfulls of the vinegar…’

**Latin Parallel**

Euporistes I.9 *exantematas* … alii *acoras* in capite

*PPFP* II.18.29 et hoc non solum spleneticis saluberrimum est, sed et stomaticis et ptysicis\(^{815}\) plurimum prodest nec non et sanguinem exscreeantibus; sed et contra omnes morbos interaneos facit et *scabiem* ac pruriginem statim tollit. Fiet autem sic: mittes ex ipso aceto in ollam nouam coclearia V… \(^{816}\)

‘And that is not only most beneficial for splenetics but is also good for consumptives and those vomiting blood, and against all internal diseases and it makes *scabies* and itching stop.’

---

\(^{814}\) The text and translation are given at the start of this section above, pp. 214–15.

\(^{815}\) Gr. *φθισικός* (*pthisikos*) meaning ‘atrophy, emaciation, consumption.’ The Greek term *φθίσις* (*pthisis*) literally means ‘wasting.’ See Langslow, *Medical Latin*, p. 491


\(^{817}\) OE *hrean*. Bosworth and Toller give ‘indigestion’ as the meaning based on cognate evidence from Icelandic, rejecting *pithesis* as the source term, and suggesting a link with OE *hreaw* meaning ‘raw’ but also ‘un-digested.’
II.41.5 …do þonne of fyre 7 hrere 7 siþþan smire mid þy þa hriefþo 7 þone gicðan.

‘…then place on a fire and stir, and after that smear the scab and the itch with that.’

Postea tolles et agitabis et ex eo infundes scabiem et pruriginem perunges. 818

‘Afterwards you will lift it and stir it and pour over the scab from it and anoint the itch.’

To demonstrate the relationship between the Old English and its Latin parallels it has been necessary to give a longer extract than a single clause. We notice that in the beginning of the recipe (II.41.5), the efficacy of the salve against hriefþo is restated in the Old English, whereas there is no such restatement in the Latin parallels.

As we can see the adjectival and nominal forms on OE hreof- are already showing a blurring of the distinction between lepra and elephantiasis in the eleventh-century translation of the Herbal. Looking at the tenth century Leechbook, however, we see that the term is used frequently in Leechbook I, but is not found in Leechbook II, where the term hriefþo predominates, translating a variety of terms for skin disorders, including exantematas, acoras, physicis and scabies, but not, as far as current evidence suggests, elephantiasis.

In four glosses found in the prose De virginitate, the term elephantinosus is glossed by OE hreoflige, one of which gives the synonym wærrehte. Since OE hreofl could translate L. lepra or elephantiasis, this shows that there may at this point have been a blurring of the semantic distinctions between these two Latin disease terms independent of the dissemination of Arabic medical texts from Montecassino.

iii  paralysis (παράλυσις)

The disease term paralysis is used in Leechbook I.59, the heading for which reads ‘Læcedomas wið paralisin þæt is on englise lyft adl 7 wiþ neurisne þry.’ (I.H.59).

The text of the I.59.1 begins ‘Wiþ lyft adle’ showing that the synonymy between paralysis and lyft-adl was implicit to the compiler, or that the rubric which initially contained L. paralysis was removed from the main body of the text when the table of contents was compiled.

In texts which translate L. paralysis, however, we see a broader, and somewhat more confusing range of terms: In Leechbook II.59, Wið þære healf deadan adle 7 hwanon seo cume reconstructed from the Leechbook Fragment (Harley 55) we have two separate sources contributing to the Old English chapter, Oribasius, Synopses viii.14 De paralysin and Liber Tertius 79–80. In Synopses viii.14, the Latin term apoplexia is presented as synonymous with paralysis, and provides

the initial aetiological cause of þære healf deadan adle in Leechbook II.59.1, whereas the rest of the chapter seems to be drawn from the pseudo Galenic Liber Tertius 79–80, in which text paralysis and apoplexia are defined as completely different conditions with different causes.

**Translation equivalents for L. paralysis in the Leechbook**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leechbook II</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II.7.4 Þis synd tacn adeadodes magan.</td>
<td>LT 21.1 Paralysis stomachi ita cognoscitur.819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘These are the signs of the deadened stomach.’</td>
<td>‘Paralysis of the stomach is to be recognised thus’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.59.14 Soðlice seo adl820 cymð on monnan æfter feowertigum ðððe fiftigum wintra.</td>
<td>LT 79.1 Omnis paralysis non nascitur, nisi cum aetas coeperit declinare, id est post quadragesimum et quintum annum.821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Truly, the disease comes on one after forty or fifty winters.’</td>
<td>‘All paralysis is not produced until the lifetime begins to decline, that is after forty or fifty years.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.59.16 Ne bið hit seo healfdeade adl ac hwilec &lt;hw&gt;æthwega yfel wæte bið gegoten on þæt lim.</td>
<td>LT 79.2 sed non est paralysis, sed cuiuscumque humoris deriuatio, qui partem corporis tenet.822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘It is not the half-dead disease, but some other harmful humour is engendered in the limb.’</td>
<td>‘But that is not paralysis, but the derivation of some humour, which holds that part of the body.’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When we examine the source for Leechbook II.59.1, we find something of a confusion in terminology, however:

**Leechbook II.59**

II.59.t Wið þære healf deadan adle 7
hwanon seo cume.

**Oribasius Synopses**

VIII.14 De paralysis
Apoplexia haec passio nominatur; in

820 Understand healfdeade.
821 Ibid., p. 337
822 Ibid.
II.59.1 Seo adl cymð on þa swiðran healfe þæs lichoman. oððe on þa wynstran. þæs þa sina toslupað 7 beoð mid slipigre 7 þiccere wætan yfelre 7 yfelre þiccere 7 micelre. Þa wætan man sceal mid blodlæsum 7 drençum 7 læcedomum onweg adon.

'sConcerning the half-dead disease and where it comes from. That disease comes on the right side of the body or the left where the sinews congest, and become thicker and bigger with a slippery and thick harmful humour. One should do away with those humours with phlebotomy and drinks and medications.'

singulis autem partibus aut dextra aut sinistra si contingat hoc, paralysin vocant illa scilicet partem in qua resoluti sunt nervi. Contingit ergo haec passio ex humoribus glutinosis et pinguissimis constipantis nervus, per quos secundum voluntaria motionem faciunt. Manifestum est ergo quia evacuari oportit tales humores.\textsuperscript{823}

In his analysis of the sections of the \textit{Leechbook} on \textit{lyftadl} and \textit{sio healfdeade adl}, McIlwain attempts to retrospectively differentiate between \textit{apoplexia} and \textit{paralysis}, as disambiguated by the \textit{Liber tertius}, suggesting that \textit{apoplexia} ‘seizes all parts’ while \textit{paralysis} ‘comes unperceived and kills quickly.’\textsuperscript{825} When we realise that this semantic differentiation in the Latin terms was only operative in one of the two of the sources probably used by the compiler, we see a problem in attempting to disambiguate the two Old English terms. Essentially, medieval Latin medical vocabulary was not necessarily consistent enough to support such a distinction between \textit{apoplexia} and \textit{paralysis}, since the precise technical meaning of the term varied from text to text.

It would seem, however, that despite this confusion in the terminology of the Latin sources, \textit{lyftadl} and \textit{seo healfdeade adl} meant considerably different things. Unfortunately, we only have a description of the humoral aetiology of one of the two, so it is difficult to know how the conditions may have been differentiated.

\textsuperscript{823} Molinier, ed., \textit{Synopsis in Oeuvres d’Oribase}, ed. Bussemaker and Daremberg, VI, 222–3.
\textsuperscript{824} L. \textit{nerua} can also mean ‘sinew’.
The presumably Greek term *neurisne* occurs in the same sentence as *paralysis* in Leechbook I.H.59, and recurs in a single recipe, I.59.2: ‘Wiþ neurisne banwyrt do on sure fletan 7 on hunig æges geola meng tosomne smire mid.’ It is only the fact that the term occurs in the same sentence as *paralysis* that leads us to believe it is intended to imply some form of loss of volitional movement. All three of the Greek pathological terms which resemble it in form, ἀνεύρυσμα, ἀνεύρυνσις and ἀνευρυσμός mean ‘dilation,’ with the modern medical meaning of aneurism being a specialisation of this meaning to refer only to blood-vessels in specific organs. There could, however be some confusion with the etymology of the word, and a term based on Gr. νεῦρον (neuron) meaning ‘sinew’ or ‘nerve’ could be implied.

**Greek Disease Terms in the Enlarged Herbal**

In addition to the three disease terms occurring within Bald’s *Leechbook*, we find a plethora of terms introduced, normally within restrictive relative clauses with Old English synonyms in later compilations. The following terms are noted in the *Herbal* and *Medicina de quadrupedibus*: *achoras, frenesis, paronychia, pyturas, hysterica pnix, lethargos, ragadas*, and in the *Lacnunga, podagra*. The terms are given in context below, with sources where available.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OEH</th>
<th>Herb.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>43.3 Wið Ḟa adle Ḟe Grecas paronichias nemnað</td>
<td>42.3 Herba scilla: Ad panaricia.826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘For the disease that the Greeks call paronychia.’</td>
<td>‘For paronychia,’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91.5 Wið Ḟa adle Ḟe man litargum hateð, Ḟæt ys on ure ġepeode ofergytnyns cweden.</td>
<td>90.9 Herba ruta hortensis: Ad litargos excitandus.827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘For the disease that one calls lethargy, that is in called forgetfulness in our language.’</td>
<td>‘The herb ruta hortensis, for the waking of lethargics’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96.2 Wið Ḟa adle Ḟe Grecas frenesis nemnað, Ḟæt is on ure ġepeode gewitleast Ḟães modes…</td>
<td>95.2 Herba peucedanum: Ad freneticos828</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘For the disease that the Greeks call frenesis, that is witlessness of the mind in our language.’

‘The herb peucedanum: For frenetics’

LMHF

(Herba viola aurosa) Folias eius tunsa et ceroto mixta ragadas curant.830

‘For the many injuries of the anus that are called ragadas.’

‘Its leaves beaten and mixt with a wax salve cure ragadas.’

829 De Vriend, ed., Herbarium, p. 188.
830 Ibid., p. 189.
835 Pettit, ed., Lachnunga 1, 86.
We see above seven foreign terms used in six chapters of the Enlarged Herbal. Of those seven terms, three are correctly identified as being of Greek origin. Of those three Greek terms, both frenesis and pytiras seem to have been at least partially lexicalised in Latin, not being flagged as foreign terms in the source text, whilst hystem cepnizam is flagged as Greek within relative clauses in both the Latin of Sextus Placitus, and the Old English translation in the Medicina de quadrupedibus.

To simplify, the seven disease terms have been presented in the table below (Table 6.2). The meaning of each term, and how this is upheld or lost in translation, will be discussed below.

Table 6.2 Greek terms in the Old English Herbal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard Latinisation</th>
<th>Form in Texts</th>
<th>Greek Term</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>achor</td>
<td>achoras</td>
<td>ἄχωρ, ἀχώρ</td>
<td>dandruff, parasite of the scalp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phrenesis, -ticos</td>
<td>frenesis, -ticos</td>
<td>φρένιτις, φρενιτικός</td>
<td>inflammation of the brain, insanity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paronychia</td>
<td>paranichia, panarichia</td>
<td>παρωνυχία</td>
<td>an infection of the finger or fingernail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pityriasis</td>
<td>hostopyturas, pytiras</td>
<td>πιτυρίασις</td>
<td>a bran-like eruption of the skin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hysterica pnix</td>
<td>hystem cepnizam</td>
<td>ὀστερική πνίξ</td>
<td>suffocation of the womb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lethargos</td>
<td>litargos, litargum</td>
<td>λήθαργος</td>
<td>lethargy, forgetfulness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rhagades</td>
<td>ragadas</td>
<td>ῥαγάδες</td>
<td>fissures, cracks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>podagra</td>
<td>podagre</td>
<td>ποδάγρα</td>
<td>gout</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**i. achor**

The Greek term ἄχωρ, ἀχώρ is noted by Langslow as denoting a parasite of the scalp in Theodorus and Cassius Felix,\(^{836}\) and lemmatised by Liddle and Scott as meaning 'scurf, dandruff.'\(^{837}\) The term occurs with an Old English calque sceb, glossing L. scabies. The term’s meaning is quite explicit

---

836 Langslow, Medical Latin, p. 477.  
given the restrictive relative retained in both the Old English and Latin texts defining it as that scab ‘which despoils the head of hair.’ Despite the verbal similarities in the description of the disease, the Old English text here omits the method of application of the herb (*bulbus rufus*), ‘cum nitro asso trito’ (ground with burned potash).

### ii phrenesis, phreneticos

The terms *phrenesis* (*φρένιτις*) and *phreneticos* (*φρενιτικός*) both mean ‘inflammation of the brain, phrenitis, a form of madness,’ while the adjectival form in -icos has the capacity to denote the sufferer as well as the disease.\(^{838}\) Pseudo-Apuleius uses the spelling *freneticos*, while the *OEH* has *frenesis*, and provides a characteristic explanation of the meaning of the term in Old English: *gewitleast þæs modes*, ‘witlessness of mind.’

### iii paronychia

The term *paronychia* (*παρωνυχία*) is one of the few Greek terms in the Old English Herbal which is not explained in Old English. The neuter form, *paronychium* is attested in Theodorus according to Langslow, wherein it means a ‘whitlow.’ Oddly enough, the Anglo-Saxon recension of the Herbal, including the single manuscript consulted by De Vriend (Ca in Howald and Sigerist’s apparatus) has a much better reading of the term, *paranichia*, than the reading found in the majority of manuscripts of Pseudo Apuleius: *panarichia*.

### iv hysterica pnix

This Greek term, ὑστερικὴ πνῖξ meaning ‘suffocation of the womb’ is one of the most garbled Greek terms in the Old English Herbal, the word division having been misconstrued by a scribe at some point in the transmission history, and later scribes further attempting to create two new words in the accusative, resulting in the gibberish *hystem cepnizam* in Sextus Placitus α, i.7, transcribed letter for letter as such by the Anglo-Saxon scribe of the *Medicina de quadrupedibus* 3.7. The sense is not lost completely, in no small part due to the presence of the Latin gloss ‘Mulier si a uulua offocatur,’ (if a woman be blocked in the womb) translated into Old English as ‘Wið wifa earfodnyssum’ (for the tribulations of women).

### v lethargos

Confusingly, Gr. *lethargos* (*λήθαργος*) means both ‘forgetful’ and ‘drowsy’ as in PDE *lethargy* (from Gk *ληθαργία*), but the only attested pathological sense noted by Langslow is ‘lethargy.’\(^{839}\) It would appear therefore, that the translator of the Old English Herbal knew too much Greek for his own good, giving ‘þæt ys on ure geþeode ofergytulnys cweden’ (that is called forgetfulness in our language) as the explanation of *litargum* at *OEH* 91.5. The Latin of pseudo-Apuleius ‘Ad litargos

---

\(^{838}\) Langslow, *Medical Latin.*, p. 490; see also pp. 368–9 on the semantics of lexemes in the -icus / -ικός suffix.

excitandus’ (to arouse the lethargic) would suggest that the intended meaning of λήθαργος here was meant to be ‘drowsy’ or ‘sleepy,’ rather than ‘forgetful.’

vi rhagades
The term rhagades (ῥαγάδες) means ‘fissures, cracks in soft tissue’ according to Langslow. The term occurs without mention in the Latin of pseudo-Dioscorides but in the OEH (165.2) we have two distinct clauses attempting to define the disease in three ways: ‘Wiþ misenlice leahtras ðæs þæcþearmes þa ragadas hatað, þæt is swaþeah swiðost þæs blodes utryne.’ (For various injuries of the anus that are called rhagades, that is to the extent of outpourings of blood.) The three pieces of information we get are these: that it is a lesion of the anus, that it is called rhagades, and that it is haemorrhagic. None of this information is present in the extant Latin parallel, suggesting that the Old English translator is attempting to explain and expound his sources fully.

vii podagra
The Greek term podagra (ποδάγρα) is well attested in Latin authors as early as Celsus to mean gout. Interestingly, in the Lacnunga, podagra is flagged as a foreign term not by a reference to its language (Latin or Greek), but by reference to the professional lexis to which it belongs in the relative clause ‘ðe læceas hatað podagra’ (which medics call podagra), suggesting that Latin disease terms are considered proper medical parlance, even by the users of vernacular recipe collections.

Latin and Greek terms in the Peri didaxeon
The Peri didaxeon is written in a highly macaronic style, insofar as every chapter is rubricated with a Latin disease term. It would be relatively pointless to list every single Latin rubrication in the Peri didaxeon as an example of linguistic interference, but in the Old English text itself we see a relatively high frequency of foreign words in non-restrictive relative clauses, often comparing Latin, (purportedly) Greek and Old English synonyms for the same disease. This text, probably translated in the twelfth century, is at the opposite end of the spectrum from Bald’s Leechbook, which was translated in the late ninth or early tenth, in the sheer volume of Latin borrowings for pathological conditions. The following extract from chapter 64 is a good example of this macaronic style:

64 Ad emoptoycos, latine dicitur reiectatio.
In Chapter 64 we see the full macaronic character of the text in practice, with the rubric repeated in the main body of the text which begins in Latin, but continues in Old English, and is expanded to include an Old English synonym for the disease.

Looking at the frequency of the use of Latin and Greek disease terms over the whole corpus, we notice very few in the oldest texts, with only four borrowed disease terms in Bald’s Leechbook, rising rapidly over the course of the eleventh century with seven Mediterranean disease terms employed in the OEH, and every chapter of the Peri didaxeon containing a Latin chapter heading, and many further instances of Latin and Greek disease terms in the body of the text. This general tendency is in keeping with Banham’s observation of the differences between Anglo-Saxon medical texts before and after the year 1000.844

When we examine the sources for the texts in question we realise that the shift is more of linguistic preference than one of ignorance of technical terminology, however. Where the translators of Bald’s Leechbook preferred to coin Old English terms to translate the arcane, often Greek, disease terminology in their sources (as we shall see further below), eleventh-century and later translators preferred to borrow the arcane vocabulary directly, and with increasing frequency into the twelfth century.

**Disease Term Formation in Old English**

As we saw above in Chapter 4, there are four productive nominal disease terms or suffixes which may form compounds or collocations to denote a specific illness; -adl (archaic PDE ‘adle’), denoting disease; -cope, denoting pain or disease; -ece (PDE ‘ache’), denoting pain, and -werc also denoting pain. Old English also uses the adjective -seoc in collocations denoting the sufferer where Latin simply uses an adjectival form of a disease term substantively referring to the patient. The term seocness is also used, sometimes as a compounding element. In Chapter 4 these terms were considered because they frequently compound with an anatomical term to form a disease term. These compounding elements are also productive with non-anatomical terms in the formation of disease.
terminology; examples include *braecseoc* (break-sick) and *fellewærc* (fall-sick) which both seem to mean ‘convulsion’ or ‘epilepsy.’

**Compounding and Derivation**

Although the five compounding elements mentioned above have been touched upon by both Lambert and Bonser, no systematic study has ever attempted to identify whether there are any general trends which may be observed in distinguishing the semantic implications of the choice of determinatum; that is, whether this is a consistent principle which differentiates the meaning of compounds such as *heafod-ece* from *heafod-wærc*, or *heort-ece* from *heort-cope*. The five terms will be considered in turn, taking into account their meaning as simplexes, their use in adjectival or genitival phrasal terms, and their use in compounds. Only medical instances of the lexemes will be considered in the current study.

**OE adl**

*Adl* is one of the commonest disease terms in Old English, seeming to denote ‘disease’ in general. The term has been well documented by the *Dictionary of Old English*, which notes that it can be declined in a remarkably wide range of genders and forms, with the weak feminine *adle*, weak neuter *adle*, strong neuter *adl* and strong masculine *adl* all attested.

The *DOE* lists the primary sense of the term as ‘ailment, disease, illness, sickness,’ with relevant medical meaning 1c being sickness in animals, and sense 2, ‘referring to specific diseases or ailments.’ There may seem to be little point in duplicating the lexical work of the *Dictionary of Old English* project here, which is why the term will not be examined in any detail outside of the extant medical corpus. In medical prose alone, the substantive *adl* occurs 166 times, discounting its usage in compounds.

i. *adl* as a simplex

The semantics and syntax of OE *adl* are deeply interconnected. It is impossible to examine one without examining the other. The semantic-syntactic categories considered are as follows:

- a. completely unmodified, as the object of a cure
- b. as a simplex, referring to ‘disease’ in general
- c. as a simplex, referring to a predetermined term or definition

---


846 A simple search for *adl* as a word fragment reveals 321 total from medical prose in the *DOEC*: 127 simplex, 151 compound, 29 phrasal, 9 genitival, 2 instances of the adjective *adlig*, and 3 instances of the participle *adligend*. 
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d. in a restricted relative clause with a foreign disease term

e. in a restricted relative clause with a clausal disease term

In only two instances is the term used without modification as the object of a cure, in the table of contents for *OEH* 140.3 (wīþ adla 7 wīð ealle yfelu), and in *Lacnunga* 16 (wīð adle).

The term is used as a generic term for disease on 19 occasions in medical prose. The term is often modified by adjectives in these instances. The following examples from the Enlarged Herbal show how various Latin terms are translated as OE *adl* in this way.

**OEH**

140.3 Deos wyrt soðlice ealle ealde & hefige 7 unlacnigendlice adlu toferêp.

Haec autem herba omnes morbos inveteratos, graves, insanabiles destruet

‘This herb drives away all old and heavy and incurable diseases.’

**LMHF**

(elleborum album)

‘This herb, moreover, drives away all old, heavy and incurable diseases.’

**MdQ**

1.4 Mid his gelynde smyre þa hors þa þe syn on feofre ðe þe on ænigre adle.

ll.30–3 adipe quoque eius equum aegrum perungues, statim ei febres declinant.

‘Smear with its grease the horse on which there is a rfever, or any other disease.’

1.6 and þeah man sy on hwylcere ungewendendlicre adle 7 unhalwendlicre seo wise hine hæleð 7 lacnað.

ll. 47–8 et quod insanabile uidetur, remediat.

‘And though one may be in whatever chronic and incurable disease, that method heals and treats him.’

**Tax. a**

As we can see, the term is not necessarily used to translate a specific Latin term with any regularity. Sometimes, as in *OEH* 140.3, the term translates L. *morbus*, but the term can often be used to restate...
an object that is left implied in the condensed syntax of Latin medical prose, as in the *Medicina de Quadrupedibus* 1.6. The remaining examples of the usage of the term as a generic word for ‘disease’ include eleven from Bald’s *Leechbook*, and a single instance in *Peri didaxeon* 52.

By contrast, the term is used to refer to a pre-determined term 82 times. In many cases, chapters of the *Leechbook* open with a heading such as ‘tacn þære adle’ (signs of the disease) which is repeated in the Table of Contents. If this can be seen to correspond to a Latin term at all, the Latin will either name a disease specifically or else not bother to restate the fact that it is a disease which is being identified as in the following example:

II.46.1 þas læcedomas sceal mon don wip sidan sare 7 þis sindon þære adle tacn gelic lunagenadle tacnum 7 liferwærces tacnum. 

LT 34.1 [Incipit de] pleuresis id est lateris dolor, qui signa similia cum epaticis et peripneumonicis habet; sed pleuresis his signis agnoscitur.

‘One should apply these remedies for pain of the side, and these are the signs of the disease, like the signs for lung disease, and the symptoms of liver disease.’

The uses of OE *adl* in this way are various, and include describing the symptoms of an aforementioned disease (*tacn þære adle*) as above, or the aetiology of a disease as in ‘hwanan sio adl cume’ (from whence the disease comes), a formula that recurs five times in Bald’s *Leechbook* at I.H.35, II.H.46, II.H.51, II.H.56 and II.36.10.

The term can also be used when discussing the exact position of an inflammation, lesion or infection with the phrase ‘þær sio adl sie’ (where the disease is) in Bald’s *Leechbook* I.47.2, I.47.11. More generally, the term can be used with the adjective of position such as *innan*, ‘within,’ as in BLB II.41.4, translating ‘*morbos interaneos*.’

---

853 I.H.36, I.42.1, I.63.t, II.1.2, II.1.3, II.1.7, II.25.4, II.29.2, II.35.2, II.36.8, II.44.1
854 ‘þanne þu þas tacnunge seo on þan manna, þanne scealt þu him blod lætan; and gif þu ne dest, hit cym hym to nucle and stranga adle.’ Löweneck, ed., *Peri didaxeon*, p. 33.
Additionally, the term can be used with the verb willan to indicate the future course of a
disease, almost as if ascribing conscious volition to the disease entity. Examples include BLB I.65.1
‘ær þon sio adl to wille’ (before the disease strikes) and II.H.25, ‘þonne adl to þære wambe wile’
(when disease will <go> to the gut). This curious usage can also be seen in the diagnosis inspection
of the tongue in Leechbook II.59.2 ‘biô heo on þa healfe hwittre þe seo adl on beon wile’ (the tongue
is whiter on the side <of the body> where the disease, sc. paralysis, will be) which translates LT
79.3 ‘et inuenies linguam eorum in unam partem, in qua paralysin patiuntur, albidiorum esse’ (and
you will find that the tongue is whiter on one side, in which paralysis is found).

ii Phrasal terms involving OE adl

Two forms of phrasal term are common in Old English disease terminology: adjective-noun and
genitive-noun, where the genitive is normally an anatomical term. OE adl occurs in agreement with
certain adjectives sufficiently often that these collocations may be considered fully lexicalised
phrasal terms in and of themselves. These terms include *seo cynelice adl, *seo geolwe adl and sio
healfdeade adl. The phrasal term seo cynelice adl (the royal disease) occurs twice, both times in the
enlarged Herbal, and both times translating L. morbus regius.857 The phrasal term *seo geolwe adl
(the yellow disease) occurs twelve times across a broader range of texts including Bald’s Leechbook,
Leechbook III and the Lacnunga.858 The phrasal term sio healfdeade adl (the half-dead disease)
occurs very frequently (fourteen times) in Bald’s Leechbook, but, like blædran adle, every mention
of it outside of the Leechbook Fragment, i.e. the missing chapter II.59 as reconstructed from Harley
55, is actually a cross-reference to the recipe for oxymel to be found there. Where sources for this
reconstructed chapter have been identified, the term translates paralysis.

There are nine attested genitival collocations with OE -adl, all but two being anatomical
genitives creating disease-term collocations. It will be necessary to determine whether or not any of
these collocations can be considered phrasal terms. The collocations all occur in Leechbook II and
include the following genitives: blædran (bladder) four times, bregnes (brain) once, fiendra
(demons), lifre (liver) twice, magan (stomach) three times, smalpearmes (intestine) once, and wifa
(women) once. In the case of lifre adl, (disease of the liver) it is difficult to determine whether this
particular string of letters should be lemmatised as a genitival collocation or as a compound, given
the prevalence of metathesis involving the letter ‘r’ in medial position in Old English.859 For the sake
of simplicity, it will be assumed that these two instances are in fact metathesised instances of
liferadl.

858 BLB I.H.42 (twice) I.41.4, II.H.61, II.H.65, II.65.7, III.H.12, III.H.73, III.12 (twice), III.72 and Lacnunga.
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75.
Genitival collocations: *blædran adl*

II.33.8 Be late meltunge innan. nim gearwan drince on ecede þæt deah eac wið eallum *blædran adlum*

‘Concerning late digestion of the innards, take milfoil, drink in vinegar, that also helps for all diseases of the bladder.’

II.39.5 … oxumelle þe we writon wiþ þære healf deadan adle 7 *blædran adle.*

‘…oxymel, which we wrote about (in the chapter) on the half-dead disease and bladder-disease.’

II.43.1 … oxumelle þe we writon ær beforan wiþ *blædran adle* suþerne eced drence

‘…oxymel, the southern vinegar drink which we wrote about before about bladder disease.’

II.59.20 …pis sceal swiþust wið *blædran adle* 7 þam stanum þe on blæddran syn.

‘… one should (do) this especially for bladder disease and those stones that may be in the bladder.’

In the case of *blædran adl* although the term appears four times in Bald’s *Leechbook*, two of those occurrences are cross-references to the missing chapter on *oxymel*. In the *Leechbook Fragment*, the term *blædran adl* appears only once in the instructions concerning the efficacy of *oxymel*. As such, we actually only have two real pieces of evidence: one statement that oxymel is good for ‘bladder disease’ and one herbal recipe from pseudo-Apuleius in which *difficultas urinae* is translated as *blædran adl*, the other two instances being a form of cross-reference.

The genitival collocation *braegnes adl* occurs only once:

*Leechbook* II.27.4

Siowambe sido þe bið cealdre oððe wætre gecyndo oððe misbyrdo. him cymð *braegnes adl* 7 ungewitfæstnes him bið.

Oribasius, *Synopsis* V.47

*Ventris et intestine cognitio.*

Si autem frigidam est temperantiam ventris, *cerebri alienatio* sit.861

861 Molinier, ed., *Oeuvres d’Oribase*, VI, 83.
‘The gut that is of the colder or wetter kind or malformation, to them come disease of the brain and infirmity of mind.’

OE fienda adl only occurs once in the Leechbook, at II.1.2 in a list of potential complications of diseases of the stomach translating Practica Alexandri Latine II.14 Ad stomachi diversis passiones vel accidentia quem cardiacam vocant, in which OE fienda adl ‘fiends’ disease,’ appears to translate Gr. spasmòs (σπασμός), ‘spasm.’ The term directly follows fyllewærc (falling-sickness) for epileptias (epilepsy) in the list. In this light, the term seems devoid of any connotation of demonic possession.

OE magan adl (disease of the stomach) occurs three times at Leechbook II.H.32, II.1.2 and II.32.9. Unfortunately we only have an approximate Latin parallel for one of these three instances, II.1.2, in which the rubric at PAL II.14 ‘Ad stomachi diversis passiones’ is paraphrased by ‘Eac of þæs magan adle.’ In II.32.9, and the table of contents we have ‘wiþ magan adlum,’ suggesting not just one disease, but several. The Old English term smælpearnes adl occurs only once at Leechbook II.32.9, for which no Latin source has been identified. All we can say is that it probably means ‘intestinal disease.’ In two cases adl is found in agreement with a disease term, utsiht, in BLB II.56.9 ‘Sio utsiht adl’ and Leechbook III.22 ‘Wiþ utsiht adle.’ It is possible that these two instances are artefacts of translation, wherein dysentericos morbus would normally be translated simply as utsiht, the agreement with adl being an unusual construction in Old English disease terminology.

The phrase ‘wiþ wifa adle’ (for the disease of women) occurs at a tantalising point in the Table of Contents to Leechbook II which lists the contents to a lost gathering. We have no further context to determine what this particular ‘disease of women’ may have meant to the compiler, but it is highly possible that it is the same as the ‘wifa earfodnyssum’ identified with suffocation of the womb in MdQ 3.7.

iii Compounds on OE adl

Compounding is the most common form of term formation with adl, with twenty-eight separate compounds attested, summarised in the following table.

Table 6.3 Compounds in OE -adl

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compounds</th>
<th>Herb</th>
<th>BLB</th>
<th>Leech III</th>
<th>Lacn</th>
<th>Misc</th>
<th>Totals</th>
<th>Translates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ælf</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wæterælf</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cancer</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>cancer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cealf</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ceoc</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>circul</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fefer</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>feber</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feorh</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>ficus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fot</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>podagra</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>geal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>horh(^\text{862})</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>reumaticus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hringe</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hrið</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>dolor intrinsecorum, morbus interaneos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lencten</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lenden</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>nefreticos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lifer(^\text{863})</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>(passiones) epatis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lið</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>morbum articulorum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lond</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lungen</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>peripneumonicis dolor pulmonem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lyft</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>paralysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>milt</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>spleneticus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poc</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>þeor</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>utsiht</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>*disintericos morbos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wamb</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wæter</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>ydrops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>151</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{862}\) Both instances appear with the form *hornadl* in Royal 12. D. XVII, but are emended to *horhadl* in the text employed by the DOEC.

\(^{863}\) Included are two instances of *lifre adl* in BLB II.24, which could theoretically be parsed as instances of simplexes with anatomical genitive.
The *Peri didaxeon* is conspicuous in its absence from the above table, suggesting that term formation patterns had changed significantly by the time the *Peri didaxeon* was translated.

### iv The Adjective *adlig* and Participle *adligend* (*adligan*)

The adjectival form occurs only twice in disease terminology in *Leechbook II*.1.1 ‘Þis sint taen *adlies* magan’ where *adlies* must be parsed as an adjective, and again at *Leechbook II*.27.8 ‘gif sio wambe *adlig* bið hat hwæt hwega.’

The participle form *adligend* occurs three times, once in the table of contents for chapter 81 of the OE *Herbal*, ‘Wiþ *adligende* 7 wið gicðan’ and twice in *OEH 81*.2: ‘Wið *adligende* genim þas wyrte rosmarinux, cnucæ mid cle, smyre ðone *adligandan*.’

This usage appears to preserve the syntax of the Latin participle *languens* in the *Herbarium* while being semantically less specific.

#### OE *coþu*

### i OE *coþu* as a simplex

As a simplex, the word occurs quite infrequently in medical prose,

but with a similar meaning to *adl*, in that it tends to be followed by restrictive relative clauses specifying the nature of the disease. There are four such examples in *Leechbook II* only:

II.32 be þære *coðe* hu man lyste utgang 7 ne mæg

‘concerning the disease where one wants to defecate but cannot.’

II.33 wið þære frecnan *coðe* þe se mon his utgang þurh ðone muð him fram wyrpð

‘for the terrible disease in which one ejects his faeces through the mouth.’

II.32.10 Sum *coþu* is þære wambe þæt ðone seocan monnan lysted utganges 7 ne mæg

‘there is a disease of the gut in which the sick man wants to defecate but cannot.’

II.33.1 Be þære frecnan *coþe* þe se mon his utgang þurh ðone muð him fram weorpe CDM 4.20.1 Si superior pars adfecta est,

scéal aspiwan. cibus, si inferior, stercus per os redditur.

---


865 Five times in total. Not listed is *BLB II*.H.30, which does not contain a relative clause.

866 Marx, ed., *Auli Cornelii Celsi*, p. 174. *LT* 53.1–2 may actually provide a closer parallel.
‘Concerning the terrible disease in which one shall vomit to eject his faeces through the mouth.’

‘If the upper part is affected, food, if lower, faeces is vomited through the mouth.’

There are unfortunately no direct sources for these passages yet identified, however it is likely that the disease mentioned in BLB II.32 is constipatio as described by some physician of the Methodist school, whilst the disease at II.33.1 resonates clearly with a disease description by Celsus at 4.20.1. It is difficult to determine from these four instances whether there is a specific difference between the semantics of adl and cope.

ii A possible phrasal term

In a single instance in BLB II.35.3, cope occurs in the phrase ‘þæs geallan coðe þa readan,’ where it is unclear whether cope should be considered a freestanding term modified by geallan or a compounding element upon the stem geallan-. Either way, the term is not specifically a disease term, but a humour term, similar to Byrhtferth of Ramsey’s deployment of incoða to render bile or cholera, especially given its modification by a colour lexeme.

iii Compounds

Compounds in -cope are far less common than compounds in -adl, and are largely limited to the Leechbooks. There are only eight terms occurring thirty-seven times across the medical corpus as a whole:

Table 6.4 Compounds on -copu

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BLB I</th>
<th>BLB II</th>
<th>Lacn</th>
<th>misc</th>
<th>Translates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ban</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>breost</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>heort</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>cardiacus passio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lungen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sweor</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>synanches,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>parotidis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wambe</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>uentrís dolor (uel uitia)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

867 Langslow, *Medical Latin*, p. 46.
It is difficult to tell whether *wambe-coþu* is a genitival phrase or a compound, given that word division is often unclear in manuscript sources, and the first element is a strong feminine in -e which also has a genitive singular in -e.

Two of the above terms are relatively ambiguous where the determinant in the compound is not an anatomical term: *bancopo*, defined by the DOE as a ‘pernicious disease’ and *færcoþu*, which possibly means a disease which occurs suddenly. Occurring alongside *færcoþu* in the *Leechbook* is *incoþu*, which is similarly, if not more, ambiguous. It is obviously a disease term, rather than a humour term, given the context in *BLB* II.55.2: ‘Wiþ incoþe costes godne dæl.’ The problem is that the term is not defined or described in any way. Our only clue to its meaning is that it occurs directly after a remedy for constipation, and may therefore refer to an intestinal disorder.

*OE ece*

i. **OE ece** as a simplex

Old English *ece* has a remarkably similar semantic range to PDE ‘ache,’ which may be indicative of uninterrupted usage. The term does not occur frequently without some sort of qualification, appearing as such only eight times in the medical prose corpus, often referring back to a predetermined collocation, as in *Herbal* 3.3

*OEH* 3.3 Wiþ muðes *ece* 7 wið tungan 7 wið þrotan genim fifleafan wyrtwalan, wyll on wætere; syle him supan; δonne clænsaþ hit δone muð innan 7 bið se ece litliende.

‘For pain of the mouth and of the tongue and of the throat, take roots of cinquefoil, boil in water, give to him to drink, then it cleanses the mouth within, and the pain will be reduced.’

*Herb* 2.3 Ad uitia oris aut linguæ aut gulae. Herbae quinquefolii radices ex aqua coctas dabis, gargarizet, etiam ubi sanies, tollet et arteriam purgat.668

‘For pain of the mouth or tongue or throat. You will give roots of the herb cinquefoil cooked in water. He may gargle it. It also removes pus in that place and cleanses the gullet.’

As we can see, while ‘muðes ece’ clearly translates ‘uitia oris,’ there is no direct antecedent for ‘bið se ece litliende,’ this is rather a paraphrase for a Latin *sanat* formula which describes the efficacy of a drug, normally without recourse to restating the noun mentioned in the opening *ad* or *de* clause. The other instances where *OE ece* occurs as a simplex include *OEH* 3.4, *BLB* I.2.24, I.28.2, II.36.2 (twice) and II.45.1, and once in the ‘Omont Fragment.’ In each recipe where *ece* occurs as a simplex,

---

668 Howald and Sigerist, ed., *Herbarium*, p. 26; de Vriend omits ‘ubi sanies tollet et’ in his *Herbarium*, p. 43.
the opening term, or wið clause of the Old English uses either a genitival collocation or a compound in -ece.

ii  Phrasal terms with OE ece

The term is relatively productive in both compounds and genitival collocations restricted to anatomical term elements, with eight genitival collocations on OE ece: eagen ece twice in BLB I.2, earena ece three times in BLB I.3 and its Table of Contents, heafdes heafdes ece four times in BLB I.1 and once in Leechbook III, lendena once in the OEH, mupes twice in the OEH, sceancena once in the OEH, smælpearma twice in Leechbook III, and þearma twice in the OEH. The same anatomical terms are sometimes used in both genitival collocations and compounds, such as eagece, eagen ece; heafodece, heafides ece.

Old English ece seems to have been a natural translation choice for Latin pain terms in disease term formation, but in addition to this form of verbatim translation the term is also used in expository calques, such as ‘healfes heafdes ece’ for emicranea.

iii  Compounds on OE -ece

It is surprising therefore that there are only ten compounds in ece as summarised in Table 6.5 below. Confusingly, differing compounding elements are used synonymously even within a single text, with L. sciatica variously translated as banece, hypebanece, sceancena ece and þeohece between the OEH and BLB I.

Table 6.5 OE -ece as a compounding element

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Herb</th>
<th>BLB I</th>
<th>BLB II</th>
<th>Leech III</th>
<th>Lacen</th>
<th>misc</th>
<th>Translates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bān</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>sciatica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eag</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>dolor oculorum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fōt</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>dolor pedum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>heafod</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>heort</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>cardiacos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hypeban</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>sciatica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lenden</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>dolor lumbarum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>toð</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>dolor dentium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>þeoh</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>totals</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is to be noted that bān- and ban- compounds may seem superficially to be on the same stem, however bān-ece is a compound on the noun bān meaning bone, and normally translates L. sciatica. On the other hand, ban-coþu is actually a compound on the nominal stem bana, meaning ‘slayer, killer, the agent who causes death,’ so that ban-coþu literally means ‘killer-disease’ or fatal malady. Luckily, it seems that there is no confusion within the texts between bancoþu (killer disease) and banece (bone-ache).

OE seoc and seocness.

OE seoc is interesting as it is the only productive disease term in Old English in which the adjectival form is more common than the substantive. In most cases this can be seen as an accommodation of Latin and Greek medical syntax in which the adjectival forms of a disease term in -icus (Gr. -ικός) are often used to define both the disease and the sufferer.⁸⁶⁹

i  OE seoc as a Simplex

OE seoc occurs as a simplex twenty-four times: six times as a substantive referring to the patient, five times with elision of the head, that is se seoca for se seoca mon (three times in the Herbal, and twice in the Peri didaxeon)⁸⁷⁰ and once as a substantive without demonstrative in the Lacnununga.⁸⁷¹ It occurs as an attributive, ie. in the phrase se seoca man fourteen times in the Leechbooks and Leechbook Fragment and twice in the Peri didaxeon.

The term only occurs as a predicative adjective twice in medical prose, once in Leechbook (Fragment) II.59.17 ‘Gif mon sy þære healfdædan adle seoc’ and once in the Peri didaxeon 52: ‘þe hwile þe he seoc beo.’ Compared to these twenty-four occurences of the adjectival simplex, the abstract iō-noun seocness occurs only four times as a simplex, once in the Herbal and three times in the Peri didaxeon.⁸⁷²

ii  Compounds in -seoc

Twelve disease compounds are attested in OE -seoc or -seocnes as summarised in Table 6.6 below. An interesting point that arises from this table is the fact that only in the OEH is the substantive seocnes productive in compounding disease term formation, more than twice as often as the

---

⁸⁶⁹ Langslow also notes that such terms may also be substantivized with respect to materia medica efficacious for a given disease. Langslow, Medical Latin, p. 368.
⁸⁷⁰ Herb OEH 69.1, 171.1 and 173; Peri D 63.43.27 (twice)
⁸⁷¹ Lacn. 21 ‘and drince seoca of bræmelberian gewrungene oft.’ (ed. Pettit, I, 12) The form is weak in each case.
⁸⁷² OEH 43.1, Peri D 1.3.10, 18.11.33 and 59.39.12.
adjectival seoc in the same text. In the other texts which contain such compounds, only the adjectival form appears to be productive.

Another point of note is the prevalence of abstract term formations on -seoc compared to other disease determinata. Of the twelve terms noted in Table 6.6 below, only four are anatomical. One refers to the mind, gewit, and the rest define symptoms or aspects of the disease, the compounding stems being usually alien to the discourse of disease terminology, such as fylle- (fall) and bræc- (break) both translating empilepticus, deofol- translating demoniacus (cf. fienda adl above), monad- translating lunaticus and wæter- translating ydropicus. In each case, the terms are rather literal renderings of Latin and Latinised Greek medical compounds.

Table 6.6 Compounds on OE -seoc

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>OEH &amp; MdQ</th>
<th>OEH (seocness)</th>
<th>BLB I</th>
<th>BLB II</th>
<th>Leech III</th>
<th>Translates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bræc</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(seocness)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>epilepticus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deofol</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>daemonia, daemonicos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feond</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>*diamonicos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fylle</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>epilepticus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gewit</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lenden</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>nefreticus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lifer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>epatis dolorem, epaticus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>milt</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>spleneticus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>monad</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>lunaticus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>caducos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wamb</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wæter</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>ydropicus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OE wærc

Unlike adl, OE wærc or wrec is very infrequent as a simplex in medical prose unless in collocation with an anatomical term in the genitive. The term seems to be just as productive as adl in compounds, with twenty-five separate compounds and three unambiguous genitival collocations attested. The verb wærcañ occurs in the subjunctive form wærce twice in the medical corpus at Leech. II.52.13 ‘Gif hine innan wærece’ and Leechbook III.7 ‘Gif þa þeoh wærce smire þone heals mid þære sealf’

873 The one exception is the table of contents entry for BLB II.1.62 ‘Læcedomas wiþ miclum heafodece 7 wærce 7 sealf’ in which wærce seems to take heafod as an implied compounding element.
With the exception of *ut- which is a euphemistic reference to pathological defecation, and *þeor-\(^\text{874}\), the semantics of which are unclear, all of the twenty-eight compounding elements are anatomical terms. In three cases (*eag, *milt, *wamb) the genitive collocation competes with a true compound, while *maga and *innod occur only in the genitive, without competing compound forms attested. In the case of *utwærc, the term seems to have much the same sense as, and employs similar forms of metonymy to, the related *utsiht, probably derived from *utscit wherein the nominal form of the verb sceotan implies the discharge, expression or extrusion of a substance or object.\(^\text{875}\)

Table 6.7 Compounds and Collocations on OE -wærc

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MdQ</th>
<th>BLB I</th>
<th>BLB II</th>
<th>Leech III</th>
<th>Lacn</th>
<th>Misc</th>
<th>Translates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>blædder</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>breost</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>ypocondria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ceol</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enew</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eag</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>*oculorum dolor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eagenah*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>*oculorum dolor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ear</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>*aurium dolor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fot</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>*podagra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fylle (felle)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>epilepsy, apoplexia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>heafod</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>*pituitas in capite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>heals</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>*struma, synanches, parotidas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hcort</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>innopah*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lend(en)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>*nefreticos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lifer</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>epaticus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lið</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>magan*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>milt(e)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>spleneticus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>miltan*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rysel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sculdor</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sid</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>pleuresis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{874}\) For a discussion of this term see Cameron, ‘On *þeor and *þeoradl’, pp. 124–9.

\(^{875}\) Similarly the scitefinger, (L. index), is so named due to its utility as a pointing tool.
In the above table, four terms, marked by asterisks were included which are not technically compounds, but rather uses of OE *wærc in agreement with anatomical terms in the genitive. As noted above, it is difficult to determine whether a weak noun or strong feminine -o noun is acting as a genitive with *wærc or a compounding element on -wærc. OE *wambewærc is the only problematic case of this ambiguity, where *wambe could be parsed as a genitive singular, or read as a compounding element.

### Compounds and Collocations on Anatomical Terms

There are twenty-five compounding elements which take more than one determinatum as summarised in Table 6.8 below. For clarity, genitive collocations and compounds are listed separately, but still counted as multi-element determinata. We can see therefore that the compound *blædderwærc competes with the collocation *blæddran adl, but *blædderadl and *blæddran wærc are unattested. Several questions arise with relation to this information. Firstly, are the terms on the same stem synonymous? The second question is whether there is a dialectal or temporal preference for synonymous terms using different compounding elements. The third question is possibly more general, asking whether or not there is any inherent semantic value across the range of compounding elements that influences the choice of one determinatum over another.
Table 6.8 Overlaps in Disease Term Elements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>adl</th>
<th>colb</th>
<th>ece</th>
<th>seoc(ness)</th>
<th>waer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>blædder-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1a</td>
<td>blæddran</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>breost-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>eæg-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a</td>
<td>eægena</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>ear-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a</td>
<td>earena</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>fær-/færlc</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>fæt-</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>fylle-</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>geal-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8a</td>
<td>geallan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>healfod-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9a</td>
<td>healfes healfdes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>heort-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>in-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11a</td>
<td>innan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>lenden-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12a</td>
<td>lendena*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>lifer-</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>lid-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>lungen-</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>magan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>milt-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17a</td>
<td>miltan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>sid-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>sweor-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>toþ</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>(smæl)pæarma</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>þeoh-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>þeor-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>wamb-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24a</td>
<td>wambe</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>waeter-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The basic characteristics which we can define so far for each of the terms in medical prose are as follows: OE adl occurs often as a simplex meaning ‘disease’ in general, coᵩu more rarely and wærc never. By contrast, ece occurs occasionally as a simplex referring to physical pain. OE seoc stands apart in being normally an adjective, possibly being used specifically to translate those Latin passages in which the substantivisation of the Latin disease adjective would make little sense, except in the Herbal Complex, where seocness is uniquely attested as a compounding element.

In compounding elements and collocations, twenty-five separate terms take more than one determinatum. It is difficult to notice any immediate patterns at a glance. However, the most obvious test would be to attempt to determine whether compounds and collocations in -ece and -wærc are synonymous with their collocations in -adl, -coᵩu and -seoc. Of these, there are only ten: eage(ena) (ece, wærc), ear (ece, wærc), fot (adl, ece, wærc), heafod (ece, wærc), heort (ece, coᵩu, wærc), lenden (adl, ece, seoc, coᵩu), sid (ece, wærc), top (ece, wærc), (smæl)pearmes (adl, ece) and peoh (ece, wærc).

In all cases -wærc seems to be able to form compounds on the same stems as -ece, but the reverse is not true, as -wærc is significantly more productive than -ece. To determine synonymy or polysemy between these compounds it will be necessary to compare them against the Latin terms they translate. Both the compounds eagece and earece and the collocations eagenaece and earentece are unique to Leechbook I.2, and I.3. It is relatively clear that in these instances translate dolor oculorum and dolor aurium, such as the I.3.t which translates Ad aurium vitia uel dolores from DHVL 3. The OEH uses the competing OE sar to translate dolor.876 The -wærc compounds and collocations relating to these organs are rarer, and only occur once each in the Leechbooks and not at all in the OEH, as such it is difficult to determine their precise semantic value.

The three compounds on the OE stem fot- are an interesting case. In OEH 1.29 fotadl translates podagra in pseudo-Musa.877 In thirteen of the fifteen chapters of the OEH in which fotadl occurs it translates L. podagra in the equivalent chapter of pseudo-Apuleius or pseudo-Dioscorides, while in the OEH 12.4 and 77.3 it translates dolor pedum. By contrast, fotece seems much more common in Leechbook I, occurring four times in BLB I.27. It translates ad pedum dolorem at I.27.4 and I.27.5, taken from Herb 11.4 and 45.9 respectively but sources have not been traced for its use at I.27.1 and I.27.6. This is congruent with observations (below) that heafodece translates dolor capitis.

The compound fotwærc occurs only once in a list of diseases which are difficult to cure (uneaplacna adla) and arise from an untreated problem of the stomach in which food does not digest properly and becomes corrupted in the bowels in BLB II.29.2, the Latin source for which remains to

877 Ibid., pp. 36–7.
be located. It is likely that given the chronic (uneasplacna) nature of the disease, L. podagra was the source lexeme.

OE heafodece is a very commonly occurring compound, which seems to almost universally translate L. dolor capitis. The term occurs twenty-six times in the OEH, twice in the Medicina de quadrupedibus, four times in Leechbook I, once in Leechbook II, six times in Leechbook III, four times in the Lacnunga and three times in De Beta, a total of 46 occurrences. The term translated capitis dolor unambiguously eleven times in the Herbal and Medicina de quadrupedibus, but elsewhere there is no such direct correlation to be found, partly due to the fact that Latin texts tend not to repeat a given term in a list of recipes as often as the Old English. The phrasal term healfes heafdes ece is a specific calque on the Latinised Greek emigranea and occurs four times in three recipes from the Physica Plinii relating to emigranea in BLB I.H.1 and I.1.14–17, and once in the table of contents to Leechbook III

By contrast to OE heafodece, OE heafodwærc is limited to Bald’s Leechbook, occurring five times in BLB I.1.2–9, and the Lacnunga, where it occurs five times in chapters 1, 2, 3 and 49. The term wærc occurs once in the table of contents to Leechbook II.62, the text itself being lost, with heafod as an implied determinatum. In Leechbook I.1.4, ‘Wiþ heafodwærce’ does not directly translate a similar Latin phrasing, but ‘Item ad purgandam caput’ from the Physica Plinii, and the treatment is actually for congested sinuses, suggesting that heafodwærc here has the sense of a more tangible pathology than the ubiquitous heafodece. That heafodwærc assumes an excess of phlegm in the head is by no means certain, however, given the rest of the chapter, in which nasal purgatives are prescribed ‘Wiþ langum sare þæs heafdes’ (for chronic pain of the head), translating ‘Oportet diu permanente capitis dolore’ in the first chapter of the Physica Plinii.

The complex of terms surrounding OE heort- is an interesting one. The compound heortco ϴu is relatively rare, occurring only three times in BLB II.1, each time appearing to directly translate Latinised Greek cardiacos, suggesting that the term was specifically coined by the Leechbook translator as a calque on cardiacos, but did not gain popular acceptance. By contrast, heortece occurs three times in the Herbal, translating cardiacos at least once in OEH 18.2. The term also occurs three times in BLB I.17, from which recipes it is repeated at least once in the Lacnunga. OE heortece also appears once in Leechbook II.16 where it appears in a variation of the probatum est formula not located in the analogous Latin. OE heortwærc appears in precisely the same contexts as heortece in the same chapter cluster shared between Leechbook I.17 and the Lacnunga, with a total of five occurrences. While heortco can be seen as an attempt to calque cardiacos directly, it is safe

878 The disease is defined in BLB II.29.1, the source for which is Oribasius Synopsis V.30 ‘De his quibus in ventre conrumpitur cibus.’
880 ‘Læcedomas wiþ mielum heafodece 7 wærc‘.
to say that all three heort- compounds are synonymous, and can all confer the same rough sense, perhaps reflecting the two similarly formed terms for the condition in Latin medical literature, cardiacos and cardialgia.

The location of the heort- compounds in Bald’s Leechbook would suggest that they are mostly taken to have the sense of a stomach problem, rather than literally meaning a disease of the heart. Even in Leechbook I.17 the sentence ‘sie þonne him wychþ wind on þære heortan’ (if wind increases in him in the heart) would seem to suggest that heort and its related disease terms are being metonymically extended to mean stomach, but this is not certain. In Leechbook II there can be more certainty, as Leechbook seems to take as its basic frame for discussing these conditions PAL II.14 ‘Ad stomachi diversis passiones vel accidentia quem cardiacam vocant aliam,’881 from Leechbook II.1.2 and following. At BLB II.1.6 ‘þis deah eac on fruman þam þe þa heortcoðe’ directly translates PAL 2.37.3 ‘His ergo ab initio hunc oportet uti qui cardialgeam patiuntur.’882 The context is still one of diseases of the stomach, so that is what we must assume cardialgia / heortcoðu to be in this case. In general these sorts of heort- terms seem only to appear in Leechbook II in the chapters dealing with the upper gastro-intestinal tract (chapter 1–16), rather than in those sections dealing with the other organs of the upper thorax such as the lungs (chapters 46–51). We can thus posit that while heortcoðu and heortece may have implied a disease of the actual heart, just as the related Latin terms could do, it would seem that in Leechbook II they were used only to refer to diseases of the stomach.

The OE sid- compounds largely translate the Latin phrasal term lateris dolor. OE sidece is limited to two occurrences in Lacnunga 116 and 118,883 whilst sidwærc occurs more frequently, being deployed seven times in all across BLB I.20, II.44, II.46 and II.49, and Lacnunga 50.884 In Leechbook II.46 ‘ad pleuresis, id est lateris dolorem’ (LT 34.1)885 is directly translated as ‘wip sidan sare,’ incorporating the Latin gloss, but not the specific disease term. OE sidwærc occurs later in the chapter (twice in II.46.5) where it is an over-translation of the demonstratives and pronouns which refer back to the original titular term pleurisis in LT 34. Given this evidence, it is probable that sidece and sidwærc can be considered absolutely synonymous and both translate lateris dolor or a Latin synonym.

The collocation smælpearmes adl is rather a specific disease term and only occurs once in the entire corpus, at BLB II.32.9. The Latin source has not yet been identified, and the term appears in a list of conditions for which a recipe is efficacious in one of the usual variations of the probatum est formula. The similar smælpearma ece collocation is almost as rare, occurring only in Leechbook

881 Fradin, ed., Practica Alexandri, 34v.
883 Pettit, ed., Lacnunga, I, 84.
884 Ibid., I, 26.
885 Fischer, ed., Liber tertius, p. 309.
III.28 and its table of contents entry. In many ways it is not surprising that such an obscure term as *smælþearma* is not highly productive, as it is a highly specialised anatomical term appearing to refer to a specific portion of the bowels or intestines. The slightly more general unmodified *þearma* simplex is no more common in collocations, *þearma ece* occurring only once in the *OEH* 90.10, which seems to be an interpolation to the known recensions of pseudo-Apuleius 89.886

The compounds *topece* and *topþwærc* are more common. OE *topece* occurs twelve times in six chapters throughout the *OEH* and its Table of Contents, translating *dentium vitia* or *dentium dolor*, as well as appearing four times in the heading, rubric and body text of *BLB* I.6 on dention, as well as twice in *Leechbook* III and once in the *Lacnunga*. The compound *topþwærc*, on the other hand, is nearly limited to *Leechbook* I.6, occurring seven times in the heading, rubric and body text of that chapter, and the form *topþwæerce* occurs once in the *MdQ* 14.11. Interestingly, where the *OEH* and *Leechbook* I.6 share a source (*De herba vettonica liber*), the *Herbal* translates ‘Ad dentium vitia’ as ‘Wiþ toþece’ (*OEH* I.8), while the *Leechbook* translates it as ‘Wiþ toþwærc’ (I.6.1) suggesting that these two terms are absolutely synonymous and totally translatable. The difference in word selection between the two texts could then be ascribed either to temporal or geographical dialect, or mere preference.

The *þeohe* compounds are relatively rare, *þeohece* occurring three times, twice in *Leechbook* I.23 and its heading and once in *Lacnunga* 173,887 *þeohwærc* occurring only twice in the *MdQ* 7.19, and the Omont fragment.888 Of these only the source for the *Medicina de quadrupedibus* has been traced, where the Latin is *dolor femorum*. It would seem, however, that there is no real semantic distinction between *þeohece* and *þeohwærc* as both are formed on the pain+location formula.

It would seem that there is little semantic distinction between the -ece and -wærc compounds on the same stem in Old English, while -*adl* and -*copu* compounds may translate a different Latin term to the -ece and -wærc compounds on the same stem, referring to more chronic, disfiguring or acute problems. However, they can in many cases be synonymous with the pain+location formations. This differentiation between the pain terms and the more general disease terms in many ways bears out the observations made about the values of the simplexes *adl*, *ece* and *copu* themselves, whilst *wærc* is very unusual as a simplex.

---

886 No parallels are provided for this chapter in de Vriend’s edition. The version of the chapter as presented by Howald and Sigerist has only four recipes. See Howald and Sigerist, ed., *Herbarium*, pp. 159–60.
887 Chapter 170 according to Pettit, who rejects the reading *þeohece* in favour of *þeorece*. Pettit, ed., *Lacnunga* I, 118.
888 *Leechbook* III.7 ‘Gif þa þeoh wærce’ is not a possible instance of this compound, as *wærce* is a finite verb in this instance.
Anatomical Compounds and Collocations Excluding -ece

There are eight formative anatomical terms which are not productive with -ece, our test case above. These include: blædran, breost, lifer, lungen, magan, milt, sweor and wamb. Of these eight terms, four are specifically internal structures and four (breost, magan, sweor and wamb) more general terms which have the capacity to refer to an internal structure or the overlying surface.

Blædran adl and blædderwærc.

In the case of blædran, there are only six instances attested where the word is used as part of a compound or collocation, bladran adl and blædderwærc. The phrasal term bladran adl seems unique to Leechbook II, where it occurs only four times. In BLB II.33.8, the term occurs in a recipe analogous to Herb. 89.4 Ad urinae diffutatem, which is translated with a much more verbose circumlocution in OEH 90.5. The parallel is not precise however, as the Leechbook chapter actually states that milfoil in vinegar is a recipe ‘be latre meltunge innan’ (for slow digestion of the bowels), but later states that the same recipe is also efficacious ‘wip eallum bladran adlum’ (for all diseases of the bladder).

In Leechbook II.39.5 and II.43.1 the collocation blædran adl occurs as a cross-reference for the aid of locating the recipe for oxymel in the lost chapter II.59, while the Latin sources have no analogous internal cross referencing for such a ubiquitous Mediterranean materia medica.

Unfortunately sources for the recipe for oxymel and its administration as found in Harley 55 (Leechbook II.59.17–20) have not yet been located, so it is not possible to tell what Latin term may have been translated by blædran adl in the Leechbook Fragment (BLB II.59.19). The compound blædderwærc is unique to Leechbook III.19 and its Table of Contents entry.

Breostcoþu and breostwærc

The compound breostcoþu is very rare, limited to a single instance in Leechbook II.44.1 and repeated in the table of contents for that chapter, naming a disease for which the given recipe is deemed efficacious. By contrast, the compound breostwærc is much more common, occurring four times in Leechbook I, three times in Leechbook II and three times in Leechbook III. While the source lexemes for the occurrences of the word in BLB I.16 and I.20 have not yet been identified, in BLB II.1.7 the term occurs in a list of ailments parallel to PAL 2.37.11, wherein it seems to translate either cardialgia or ypocondriacos passio. The difference between these two Latin terms is significant, as cardialgia and cardiacos can refer to a disease of either the heart or stomach, ypocondriacos is more specific, meaning an inflammation of the ypochondrion, being the Greek term for the præcordium (roughly, the soft tissues surrounding the diaphragm).
It would be tidy to assume that *breost-* compounds translate *ypocondriacos*, denoting an inflammatory disorder of the stomach, while *heort-* compounds translate *cardialgia* or *cardiacos*, but there is at present insufficient information to make this claim on direct evidence from the corpus. If we assume the terms to be loan-translations or calques from the Latinised Greek vocabulary involved, the above binary segregation of the semantics would be sensible, but it remains to be seen if further direct evidence emerges.

**OE lifer compounds**

Old English *lifer* terms are quite straightforward. In the *OEH*, OE *liferadl* appears three times in two chapters and their table of contents headings, *OEH* 35.1 (*ad epatis dolorem*) and *OEH* 124.1, where *liferadl* occurs in the table of contents, to be replaced by the substantivized adjective *liferseoc*. Ten further instances of OE *liferadl* occur in *Leechbook* II, while one occurs in a minor text.

In *Bald’s Leechbook*, the term *liferadl* is a generic term for liver disease which competes with a number of other more specific terms. It is often restricted to chapter rubrics, such as *BLB* II.34.t ‘Wyrce mon to druncum liferseocum mannum’ (One should make as drinks for liver-sick people) and II.24.12 ‘sele to etanne liferseocum men’ (give to the liver-sick man to eat). The nominal formation *liferseocness* is unique to the *Old English Herbal*, where it occurs eight times, often glossing the nominal or adjectival *hepaticos / hepaticus* indiscriminately, but also glossing the collocation *hepatis dolorem*.

The OE compound *liferwær* is restricted to *Leechbook* II, where it occurs seven times. In the one instance where a Latin term is unambiguously translated, *BLB* II.46.1, the term is *hepaticus* in *LT* 34.1. As such *liferseoc, liferadl* and *liferwær* would all appear to be absolutely synonymous and totally translatable with *hepaticus*. The difference in deployment would appear to be more syntactic than semantic. In the *Leechbook*, adjectival usage of *hepaticus* is translated by *liferseoc man*, whereas substantivizations of the Latin disease adjective are translated with old English substantives in -*adl* and -*wær*. In the Herbal, the substantive in –*seocness* has been coined, allowing for the adjectival and substantive uses of L. *hepaticus* to be distinguished by derivational morphology, rather than by recourse to such terms as *liferwær*. 
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OE lungen compounds

OE lungenadl occurs very frequently across the corpus. It appears in four chapters of the OEH and their table of contents entries (5.7, 46.7, 127.1 and 154.2). The Latin terms translated by lungenadl are highly varied however, being iocineris vel pulmonum dolor, (pain of the lungs or liver), pulmonum extensio (distension of the lungs) and tysis and phthisicos, which are alternative transliterations of the same Greek disease term. In the OEH, then, lungenadl would appear to be a generic term for any disease of the lungs.

The term also occurs twice in Leechbook I, twelve times in Leechbook II, five times in Leechbook III and Lacnunga each and in two miscellaneous recipes. Nine of the twelve instances in Leechbook II all occur within a single chapter, BLB II.51, for which no sources have yet been found. In BLB II.46.1 a differentiation between ‘pain of the sides’ and ‘lung disease’ is made, translating a passage from LT 34.1 on pleuresis ‘signa similia cum epaticis et peripneumonicis habet,’ suggesting that lungenadl in this case translates peripneumonicis, and is different to pleuresis or OE sidan sar. Until the text of the Leechbook is fully compared to the Galen’s Ad Glauconem and the Liber Esculapii it is unlikely that further interlinguistic evidence will be found to determine the precise meaning of the lung- compounds in Bald’s Leechbook.

By contrast to the ubiquitous lungenadl, OE lungencopu is only attested once in a marginal recipe in Cotton Vitellius C. III. As such it is all but impossible to determine whether or not there was any true semantic differentiation between these two terms.

OE maga

OE maga, as we have shown above in Chapter 4, has the specific medical meaning of ‘stomach’ as opposed to its more general quotidian range, by which it can refer to the entire abdomen and surface anatomy thereof. It does not form compounds, but rather genitival collocations with disease terms, magan adl and magan wærc. Given the fact that wærc is not otherwise attested as a free standing disease term, the latter should be considered a lexicalised phrasal term.

The collocation magan adl occurs three times in Leechbook II, one instance of which is in the table of contents. From its very first appearance in Leechbook II, at II.1.2, the collocation magan adl would appear to have a relatively general sense, as it provides a list of sequelae to the disease identified in the source text as ‘Ad stomachi diversis passiones vel accidentia quem cardia cam

889 ‘it has signs similar to liver disease and pneumonia’ The Old English reads ‘wið sidan sare. 7 þis sindon þære adle tacn gelic lungenadle tacnum 7 liferwaerces tacnum’ (for pain of the sides. And these are the signs of the disease like the signs of lung-disease and the signs of liver disease).

890 The instance at Leechbook II.1.1, ‘Þis sint tacn adlies magan’ is a case of agreement between magan (genitive) and the adjective adlig.
vacant aliam’ (PAL II.14). The occurrence in BLB II.16.6 is certainly not a lexicalised phrasal term, due to the syntactic arrangement: ‘Be þære ofermiclan friclo þonne of þære selfan cealdan adle þæs magan’ which roughly translates the PAL II.15 De stomachi frigida distemperantia in something of an overdrawn circumlocution. While magan adl is limited to Leechbook II, magan wærc occurs only in Leechbook III. As such we can assume that it is most likely a choice of the original compiler rather than any deep semantic differentiation that divides these terms.

OE milt

OE milt- compounds and collocations are relatively common. The collocation milte adl (disease of the spleen) occurs only once, in BLB II.46.4, but the compound miltseoc occurs three times in Leechbook II and once in the OEH, while miltwærc is by far the most common, occurring nine times in Leechbook II, twice in Leechbook III, and once in the Medicina de quadrupedibus. The unusual collocation miltan wærce occurs once in the Lacnunga.

The unique collocation milte adl occurs where we would normally expect miltseoc, as the Latin of the Physica Plinii Bambergensis 83.43 ‘Non solum autem spleniticis saluberimum est’ is translated as ‘Þonne deah þis wiþ hunige geyced ge wið milte adle’ in Leechbook II.41.4. Elsewhere L. spleneticus tends to be translated as miltseoc, mostly to facilitate syntactical rendering of the Latin adjetival form as in Herbal II.151.3 and Leechbook II.41.4. The much more common compound miltwærc would also seem to translate spleneticus, but in those cases where the Latin adjective refers unambiguously to the disease, rather than the sufferer, as in Leechbook II.31.3 ‘Wenað unwise læcas þæt þæt s… miltewærc,’ which translates LT 69.4 ‘putant et inde spleneticum.’ In other cases, such as II.36.t, the Old English uses miltwærc, ‘be miltewærce 7 þæt he bið on þære winestran sidan 7 tacn þære adle,’ where the source Latin, LT 49.1 has only splen with a disease term inferred but not specified: ‘Incipiunt signa splenis, qui est positus in latere sinistro. Cuius signa haec sunt’.

891 Fradin, ed., Practica Alexandri, 34v.
892 Ibid.
894 ‘Then this, mixed with honey also benefits against spleen disease.’
895 ‘Ignorant doctors believe that it is spleen-disease.’
896 ‘Hence they believe him to be splenetic.’ Fischer, ed., Liber tertius, p. 328.
897 ‘Concerning spleen-disease, and that it is on the left side, and the signs of the disease.’
898 ‘Here begin the signs of the spleen, which is located on the left side, the signs of which are these.’ Fischer, ed., Liber tertius, p. 318.
Old English compounds and collocations regarding the neck and throat are among some of the most difficult disease terms to untangle. Compounds on *sweor-* compete with compounds on *heals-* such as *healsgund* for prominence in the translation of a complex of Latin disease terms including *synanchia, parotidas* and *struma*, which all appear to imply some kind of throat infection, but vary greatly in morbidity, symptoms and aetiology.

The compounds on OE *sweor-* include *sweorcopu* which occurs six times in *Leechbook* I and twice in *Leechbook* II, and *sweorwære* which occurs only once in *Leechbook* I. OE *sweorcopu* appears to translate the full gamut of the various Latin terms mentioned above, Marcellus’ *parotidis* in *Leechbook* I.4.15, Oribasius’ *synanchicos* in I.4.16, and Pliny’s *struma* elsewhere. Interestingly, the *synanchis* of the *Liber tertius* is translated as *healsgund* in I.4.8–9, whilst the *struma* of Marcellus and Pliny are also rendered as *healsgund* in I.4.1–7. By contrast, the compound *healswære* is unique to *Leechbook* III.7.

It would seem, then, that the Latin source lexeme is not a factor in determining which of the many compounds for throat-disease is used in Old English, since *parotidis, synanchicos* and *struma* are all translatable as *healsgund* or *sweorcopu*; however, there is a degree of internal consistency in which Old English term is used to translate the Latin of a given author. Pseudo-Galen’s *synanchis* is always translated as *healsgund*. When Marcellus uses *parotidis* in xv.45, it is translated as *sweorcopu* in *Leechbook* I.4.15, but his *struma* is translated with the same term as Pliny’s (*se ilca* for *healsgund* in I.4.6). There is thus some method in this seeming chaos, but it is confounded by the fact that *Leechbook* I.4 was probably compiled from the work of multiple translators who used differing ways of disambiguating the rather confusing range of Latin terms.

**OE wambe**

As mentioned above in Chapter 4, OE *wambe* specifically refers to the intestinal tract rather than the stomach or the general abdominal area in medical terminology. It is difficult to tell whether *wambecopu* is a genitival phrase or a compound, given that word division is often unclear in manuscript sources, and the first element is a strong feminine in -e which also has a genitive singular in -e. Unambiguous compounds, such as *wambseoc*, do occur. The collocation or compound *wambecopu* occurs only in *Leechbook* II, but it is very frequent within that text, appearing fourteen times.

There are three chapters of *Leechbook* II in which *wambecopu* is common, II.26, II.30 and II.31. In *BLB* II.26 ‘Be wambe copum 7 gif hio innan wund biþ’ the *wambe copu* appears to be an over-translation, as the source, *LT* 28–9 has merely ‘De uulnera si naschantur in uentre’ with no more
specific disease terms mentioned. In **BLB** II.30.8 the collocation ‘wib wambe cope and sar’ would appear to translate the titular rubric of the **PPB** 85 ‘Ad uentris dolorem uel uitia.’ In **Leechbook** II.31, wambe copu appears to translate colicus from LT 69.

As one would expect, the compound wambseoc is used to translate a Latin disease adjective substantivized with respect to the patient. The term is used only twice in **Leechbook** II.31, where wambseoc or wambseoc man translates L. colicus from LT 69 with the sense of ‘person suffering from colic.’ This particular use of wambseoc to translate colicus when it refers to the patient, but wambe copu when it refers to the disease is another example of how the Anglo-Saxons adapted to the polyvalent nature of Latin medical terms in -icus. Finally, the collocation or compound wambewærc is unique to **Leechbook** III, occurring three times over two chapters and their Tables of Contents.

**Compounds and Collocations on Non-Anatomical Terms**

There are five non-anatomical terms which can take more than one determinatum in compound formation or collocation to produce disease terms. These are færlic, fylle, in, þeor and water. It is difficult to say what these terms have in common since they encompass such abstract concepts as ‘internal’ or ‘sudden’ or denote some action (falling) or substance (water) or are just plain intractable (þeor).

**OE færlic adl and færcoþu**

The Old English disease terms on the stem fær- meaning ‘sudden’ or ‘quick’ are quite rare, færlic adl occurring only once in Lacnunga 69, while færcoþu is not much more common, appearing once in **Leechbook** II.H.55 and once in II.55.3. It is difficult to determine anything about these disease terms, except to note that in **Leechbook** II, the context is of remedies for constipation and digestive health, suggesting that rather than a ‘sudden disease’ OE færcoþu may infer a sudden onset of diahorrea or some such bowel condition.

**OE fylleseoc, fellewærc and fyllewærc**

The term fylleseoc occurs only in the **Herbal** and the **Medicina de quadrupedibus**, where it translates L. caducos, meaning ‘tottering.’ The nominalised form, fylleseocness is also attested in **OEH** 161.1. The term fyllewærc, and its alternative spelling fellewærc occur only in **Leechbook** II, where they translate the Latin disease terms apoplexia and epilepsia. The term occurs a total of four times. It is
spelled *fyllewærc* in II.1.2 and II.30.6 but *fellewærc* in II.1.7 and II.16.5. There does not seem to be any determining factor in the choice of spelling variants, since both *fyllewærc* and *fellewærc* in II.1.2 and II.1.7 translate the term *epilepsia* as used in *PAL* II.14 and II.37 respectively. One can only assume therefore that the scribe of Royal 12. D. XVII was attempting to standardise the Anglian form *fellewærc* to the West Saxon form *fyllewærc*, but did not do so completely.

The term is limited in use to those instances of loss of motor control thought to arise as a consequence of bad decoction of food, and thus occurs only in chapters on the stomach and intestines. Recipes for *epilepsia* itself tend to use compounds in -*seoc*, such as *fylleseoc* in the *OEH* and *MdQ* and *bræceseoc* in *Leechbook* I.16.1.

**OE inadl, innan adl and incoþu**

On first inspection, the plethora of terms on OE in- might seem too vague to have a determinable meaning, but in fact some of these terms have a very precise and limited semantic range. The compound *inadl* occurs only at *BLB* II.H.41, II.1.2 and II.41.4, while the related genitival collocation *innan adl* occurs but once, also in II.41.4. While the initial *inadl* in *BLB* II.41.4 appears to be an over translation, it can be seen to foreshadow the prescription of the electuary not only for splenetics but ‘et contra omnes morbos interaneos facit’\(^\text{899}\) in the *PPB* 83.43, which is rendered into Old English: ‘ge wiþ eallum innan adlum.’\(^\text{900}\) It would seem, therefore that *inadl* and *innan adl* are synonymous terms, and that they precisely translate the Latin phrasing ‘*morbos interaneos.*’

The Old English term *incoþu* is only found in one strictly medical text, *BLB* II.55.2, and its Table of Contents, where the context, a recipe ‘Wiþ incoþe’ is frustratingly vague as to the potential meaning of the term. Over the entire electronic corpus, the term occurs only nine times, seven of which are glosses. The glosses themselves are somewhat interesting as they are all medical in meaning. The potential meaning for the term is quite broad, as in the glosses to Aldhelm’s *De virginitate* alone we have ‘fibras .*id est* pulmones; þearmas uel incoþe’; ‘incommoditates, inconuenientias uel infirmitates: incoþa’ and ‘melancolias: incoþan.’\(^\text{901}\)

From these three glosses we see the three meanings to which our term can apply: the lungs, a disease in general or one of the bilious humours. It would be interesting if a source for *Leechbook* II.55.2 had been traced, to see which of these three meanings pertained to *incoþu* in that instance.

---

\(^\text{899}\) ‘It also works against all internal diseases.’ Önnerfors ed., *Physica Plinii Bambergensis*, p. 114.

\(^\text{900}\) ‘Also for all internal diseases.’

OE þeoradl and þorwærc.

OE þeoradl occurs eight times, seven times in Leechbook I and once in Leechbook II. In Leechbook I.2.51 the term is an unusual instance, as it specifically relates to the eye: ‘Wiþ þeoradle on eagum þe mon gefigo hæt on læden hatte cimosis,’ where the Old English appears to paraphrase Cassius Felix’ De medicina 29.55.1 ‘ad trachomata id est asperititates palpebrarum et ad sycosin.’

This does little to unravel the meaning of þeoradl itself, given that *þeoradl on eagum has a much more specific meaning than þeoradl by itself. The term appears four times as a simplex in BLB I.47, and twice in the Table of Contents to that chapter. This chapter is concerned with þeoradl (I.47.1–5), þeorwyrm (I.47.6–7) and þeor on fet (I.47.8). It is probable that the term refers to some kind of cutaneous disorder, and the association of þeoradl with the rough ocular lesion trachomata or sycosin would suggest that some kind of roughness (asperitas) of the skin is implied. Given the empiric nature of the remedies, the lack of an aetiological description or symptoms it is difficult to do any more than merely infer with relation to þeor- compounds in Old English.

In Leechbook II, we have but a tantalising glimpse at what the term might have meant, as the table of contents for the lost chapter II.63 tells us that it contains ‘Læcedom wiþ þeoradl 7 wiþ lungenadl 7 wiþ utwærce.’ At first this would appear to be a list of diseases completely distant to the dermitological disorders we can infer are intended by þeoradl in BLB I.47; however the lost chapter also contained recipes ‘wiþ blæce on andwlitan,’ that is, ‘for blotch on the face’, suggesting that the chapter contained rather an odd mix of dermitological and internal cures, and that þeoradl may well have been a dermitological condition in this case as well.

In the six instances of þeor as a simplex, (five in Leechbook III, and one in the Lacnunga), it would seem also to imply a cutaneous condition. Interestingly the term appears once in the Salisbury psalter (MS K) glossing prauus meaning deformed or crooked in Psalm LXXVII.8, suggesting that in wider parlance the word could act as an adjective meaning broadly ‘diseased’ or ‘misshapen.’

OE wæteradl, wæterbolla, wæterseoc and wæterelfadl

Old English disease terms on wæter- actually contain a wide variety of meanings, from linguistic calques of terms such as ydropicós (wæteradl, wæterseoc) to the more obscure in etymology such as

---

902 ‘For þeor disease in the eyes which one calls gefigo, in Latin it is called cimosis.’
903 ‘For trachomata, that is a roughness of the eyelids, and for sycosin.’ This parallel is noted in the the entry for ‘gefigo’ in DOE: A to H online, ed. Cameron et al.
904 ‘Recipe for þeor disease and for lung disease and for dysentery.’
905 Sisam and Sisam, ed., The Salisbury Psalter.
waterelfadl, which was seen at one stage as evidence of residual animism in Anglo-Saxon medical theory. Alaric Hall sees waoterelfadl as a hyponym of aelfadl, and possibly a bahuvrihi compound, ‘any associations with aelfe being forgotten’ and ‘part of a reasonably well defined association of aelfe with cutaneous ailments.’

The compound waeteradl occurs four times in three chapters of the Medicina de quadrupedibus, namely at 7.15, 10.16 and 10.18. In each case OE wæteradl translates L ydropicos. The compound adjective waeterseoc and its nominalized form waeterseocness occur very frequently in the OEH, and occasionally in the MdQ. Waeterseoc occurs nineteen times in the Herbal over nine recipes and their tables of contents. In all but two cases the term unambiguously glosses either the nominal ydropicos or the adjectival form ydropicus. The term occurs once with the same meaning in MdQ 10.16 where *se waeterseoc man glosses *ydropicus.

In the Leechbooks, waeterseoc and waeteradl are not used. However the term waeterbolla is used twice in Leechbook I and nine times in Leechbook II. Interestingly, the very first appearance of waeterbolla in Leechbook I.43.1 is a translation of DHVL 25 (Ad idropicos) which is absent from the later eleventh-century OEH. Of the seven separate recipes in Leechbook II which contain the compound waeterbolla (19.3, 21.1, 21.5, 22.11, 33.12, 36.2, 39.4) the sources for six have been traced (the sources for 33.12 being absent), and in all of those six instances waeterbolla clearly translates ydrops or ydropicos.

Interim Conclusions

The various compounding elements in Old English disease terminology do retain something of their original semantic value in compounds. OE ece, for instance, retains its sense of ‘pain’ partly by only compounding with anatomical terms. OE wærc also means ‘pain’ but can compound with a broader range of terms and in some cases suggests a more defined pathology than ece. Adl, as a free-standing term meaning ‘disease’ can compound with other free standing disease terms to represent the propensity in Latin disease terminology to use morbus or passio in agreement with nominalised disease terms. It can also form compounds with the widest range of types of term, from the anatomical to the abstract in the formation of disease terminology. There is much overlap between wærc and adl terms, suggesting that the semantics of wærc lies somewhere between these two. OE copu is very similar to adl in being a free standing term for disease in general which is capable of compounding with different types of elements, but in fact is only attested in compounds with six terms relating to internal anatomy and two abstract terms, incopu and fiercopu, the meaning of which

is difficult to determine. Finally, *seoc* seems to be productive as a means of accommodating Latin medical syntax, wherein it forms compounds with anatomical terms or other disease terms to form adjectives in response to the demands of translating Latin passages such as ‘Non solum autem spleniticis saluberimum est’ (it is not only better for splenetics) where the Latin disease adjective is substantivised.

The plethora of synonymous disease terms in Old English can be explained by two processes. The first process is that of syntactic accommodation whereby a *-seoc* adjective replaces a nominal form in another determinatum for ease of translation. The other process is one of dialectal and diachronic change. In a significant number of cases above, terms were used consistently within a text or group of texts, but a different term coined by an independent translator. In this respect the Old English Herbal is by far the most distant from all the other texts, taking a completely new step in coining nominalizations on the OE *-seoc* compound adjectives. The idiosyncracy of the OEH is not surprising given that it was translated at least a century after the Leechbooks, whereas the Lacnunga is linguistically closer to the Leechbooks because it shares a great deal of material with them, despite its sole witness being roughly contemporaneous with the Herbal.

Overall there are far fewer synonymous disease terms within a given text than the initial data might suggest. Furthermore, there is a startling degree of agreement between the Latin disease terms and their Old English translation equivalents within a given text, suggesting that a great deal of care was taken in establishing a coherent body of technical disease terminology by the many translators of Old English medical texts.
CONCLUSION

The research project which led to this thesis began with the perhaps overly vague intention of ascertaining the extent to which Anglo-Saxon medicine synthesized or incorporated classical medical theory or innovated on the basis of a native tradition. The wealth of scholarship by Audrey Meaney, Malcolm Cameron and others highlighting the Latin sources of the Old English medical corpus soon made this question virtually redundant. The question changed from exploring whether Old English medical texts were reliant on Late Antique Latin sources to asking how well such texts were understood and translated.

The corpus of Old English medical texts was first brought to scholarly attention by Thomas Oswald Cockayne when he published the vast majority of the extant corpus in the Rolls Series between 1864 and 1866. Since that time, twentieth-century scholarly attitudes to the corpus have ranged from the derision of Charles Singer, who viewed the corpus, and the Lacnunga in particular, as a ‘final pathological disintegration’ of classical Greek medicine, to the apologetic scientific positivism of Malcolm Cameron, who was not alone in suggesting that uniquely Anglo-Saxon recipes could be analysed for efficacy under the standards of modern medicine, with the latter trend continuing into the present.

The fundamental intention of the present thesis was to compare Old English medical texts to their Latin sources and to analyse the extent to which the language of these texts could be described as a technical language, not to attempt measurement by the yardstick of twenty-first century medical and biological science. I am not suggesting that paleoethnopharmacology is a discipline without merit, but rather that it is irrelevant to the questions at hand. Similarly, attempts at retrospective diagnosis were generally avoided in discussion of disease terms. The reasons for this are more fully explained above, but it may be said in brief that constant references to modern disease taxonomy would confuse rather than elucidate the wholly different taxonomical criteria by which disease entities and the human body were understood in pre- and proto-scholastic European medicine.

Since most Old English medical texts which comprise the corpus are compiled from multiple sources, rather than translations of single Latin texts, it is not easy to discuss a continuity of style or level of engagement with theoretical principles within a single work. Instead, this thesis chose to investigate how consistently Old English medical terminology functioned as a technical lexis, using David Langslow’s seminal study of medical Latin as a template.

Cockayne, ed., Leechdoms.
Grattan and Singer, Anglo-Saxon Magic and Medicine, p. 94.
See, for example, Brenessel, Drout and Gravel, ‘A Reassessment of the Efficacy of Anglo-Saxon Medicine’; see also Harrison, et al., ‘A 1,000-Year-Old Antimicrobial Remedy’.
Langslow, Medical Latin, pp. 12–16.
Since exhaustive studies of the sources and analogues of the Old English *Herbal* and the *Lacnunga* had been completed by de Vriend and Pettit respectively, a significant corpus existed to allow direct comparison of medical Latin with medical Old English. However, while many sources had been identified for Bald’s *Leechbook*, in many ways the most significant compilation in the corpus, these source studies were published in multiple places with no single index. As such the compilation of the appendices in this dissertation began as an attempt to collate all such identified parallels for Bald’s *Leechbook* in one place for ease of reference. The full texts of these Latin medical works were then examined against a transcription of Bald’s *Leechbook* allowing the identification of further parallels.

The compilation of these appendices shed new light on the fortunes of certain Latin medical texts. Tables 0.1–0.5 above illustrate the range of sources used in the compilation of Bald’s *Leechbook* and note which parallels were expanded or found by the present author, rather than compiled from other studies. The work of F. E. Glaze was influential in suggesting that the pseudo-Galenic *Liber tertius* was more likely to have been a source for Bald’s *Leechbook* than later compilations, namely the *Passionarius* and *Tereoperica*, which may not even have existed in their extant forms when Royal 12. D. XVII was copied. Nevertheless, these later compilations occasionally provide readings closer to the Old English than the *Liber tertius* as it survives, suggesting some degree of interference between the sources for these later compilations.911

With the compilation in the appendices of Latin parallels and potential sources for Bald’s *Leechbook*, it was then possible to analyse the medical corpus with contact interference as a potential factor in term formation, borrowing and syntax.

**Characteristics of Technical Language**

In assessing the characteristics of technical vocabulary, there were three principal aspects examined, based on Heller’s definition of technical language, used in Langslow’s description of medical Latin in the Roman Empire:

1) the extent to which a word is generally understood in the linguistic community as a whole;
2) the extent to which a word is related to a particular specialist or technical discipline;
3) the extent to which a word is normalized or standardized in its usage.912

---

911 On the specific dating of the *Passionarius*, see above p. 80 and Glaze, ‘The Perforated Wall’ and ‘Galen Refashioned.’
Furthermore, I followed Langslow’s statement that ‘absolute synonymy and total translatability can be used as a means of identifying technical terms, above all in a language that is copying the science and therefore mirroring the terminology of another language.’

Syntactically, Langslow described medical Latin as developing a nominal or compact style in which finite verbs are nominalised and replaced with semantically uninteresting verbs; for example *sonant aures* in Celsus, the oldest text surveyed by Langslow, becomes *tinnitus aurium* in Cassius Felix, the youngest, resulting in a language that is ‘typified by a syntax that is much less varied in construction, to the point of being seriously impoverished, thanks to a more-or-less normalised terminology based on nouns and their adjectival and verbal derivatives.’

**Stylistic Features of the Latin Corpus**

The Latin medical corpus that seems to have survived in active use in Anglo-Saxon England can be broken down into four groupings: Early Imperial, Late Imperial, Byzantine and Proto-Scholastic.

**Early Imperial Texts**

Latin translations of the Greek pharmacopoeia include pseudo-Musa *De herba vettonica liber* (DHVL), the *Herbarius* of pseudo-Apuleius (*Herb.*), pseudo-Dioscorides *Liber medicinae ex herbis femininis* (LMHF), *Anonymi de taxone* (Taxon) and Sextus Placitus *Liber medicinae ex animalibus* (MEA). The original encyclopaedic works of Caelius Aurelius and Pliny date from this period, but in the case of Pliny, multiple recensions formed by accretion around the medical section of his *Historia naturalis*, namely the *Physica Plinii* and *Medicina Plinii*.

The Latin *Herbal Complex*, excluding the *Liber medicinae ex animalibus*, presents a utilitarian list of herbal cures in a formulaic fashion that conforms to an extreme example of the compact style described by Langslow. This is in part due to its utilitarian nature, simply listing diseases and their cures, rarely mentioning diagnostic criteria, signs, symptoms, aetiology, or prognosis. The vast majority of recipes follow a simple formula as follows:

*Herb* 1.1: ‘Ad capitis dolorem. Herbae plantaginis radix in collo suspensa capitis dolorem tollit mirifice.’

---

916 ‘For pain of the head. Root of the herb *plantago* suspended on the neck wonderfully removes pain of the head.’ Howald and Sigerist, ed., *Herbarius*, p. 22.
Herb 1.7 ‘Ad morsum serpentis. Herba plantago trita ex uino et sumpta commoda erit.’

There is only one finite verb in each recipe above, unnecessary for the understanding of the recipe. In general this recipe style can be reduced to ‘for X (disease) [take] Y (materia medica), method clause, efficacy statement.’ Finite verbs can occur in the method clause or efficacy statement or both, but are often of little semantic interest, whereas nominalisation and participles proliferate, as in suspensa, trita, sumpta above. Other texts exhibiting this style frequently include the imperative recipe (take) as a bridge between the disease clause and the method clause, and the efficacy statement is not universally employed.

Other texts in the pharmacopoeia conform more or less to these stylistic conventions. The Anonymi de taxone liber is the most verbose of the compilation due to its epistolary form, followed by the Liber medicinae ex animalibus, while De herba uettonica liber is very similar in style and syntax to the Herbarius. Because these pharmacopoeia were translated from Greek a large number of Greek loanwords occur throughout. The circulation of these texts in Anglo-Saxon England can be inferred from their translation in toto as the Old English Herbal (OEH) and medicina de quadrupedibus (MdQ). Parallel recipes found in the Leechbooks and Lacnunga also exist, suggesting that the texts had circulated in Anglo-Saxon England long before the eleventh-century translation was undertaken (see Tables 0.1 and 0.5 above).

The medical works attributed to Pliny, namely the Medicina Plinii and Physica Plinii contain a more diffuse or verbose style, partly because the original author deliberately wrote for laypeople, rather than medics. The a capite ad pedem organisation of these texts allows for recipes to be interspersed with diagnostic signs and symptoms and some aetiological theories which tend to a diffuse prosaic style with fewer nominalizations of finite verbs. Individual recipes, by nature, tend to conform to the compact formulae described above. That at least one such compilation was known in Anglo-Saxon England, most likely a version of the Physica Plinii as evidenced by its use in the compilation of Bald’s Leechbook, was demonstrated by Adams and Deegan (see table 0.1).

The works of Celsus and Quentus Serenus seem not to have had a direct influence on the Old English medical corpus.

Late Imperial Texts

The extracts from Vindicianus Epitome Alter, though only two in number, are significant as they provide detailed physical and functional descriptions of two internal organs, the liver and spleen. A
small number of medical recipes are taken from Marcellus and Cassius Felix, as well as some passages dealing with the diagnosis of specific conditions as summarised in Table 0.5 above.

Byzantine Compilations and Translations

The Latin translations of later Byzantine compilations such as the Practica Alexandri Latine, the pseudo-Galenic Liber tertius, and the Synopsis and Euporistes of Oribasius contain the most complex theoretical discussions of disease aetiology and differential diagnosis by signs and symptoms with fortunes in Old English, and together form a significant proportion of Bald’s Leechbook as detailed in tables 0.2–0.4 above. Treatments can include surgery and more complex regimen as well as the simple and compound medicines found in earlier works. The theoretical nature of these texts often precludes the use of simple recipe formulae, but all three exhibit a condensed syntax nonetheless, with a heavy reliance on nominalisation and participles rather than finite verbs. Unsurprisingly these texts contain a great deal of Greek terminology which seems relatively standardised in it use.

Proto-Scholastic and Salernitan Compilations

The Liber Passionalis (Oxea et chronia passiones Ippocratis, Gallieni et Urani), the Terioperica (Practica Petrocelli) and the Passionarius (Liber nosematon) of Gariopontus are related texts compiled between the ninth and eleventh centuries from pre-existing sources. While the Liber Passionalis, and the Terioperica or Practica Petrocelli date from the ninth century, and could theoretically have informed the compilation of Bald’s Leechbook, the Passionarius of Gariopontus could not be a direct source for Bald’s Leechbook if we are to take its attribution to Gariopontus seriously, as the man in question was born after Royal 12. D. XVII was copied. All three texts share material in common with the Practica Alexandri and the Liber tertius and other texts from the Byzantine period. The complex transmission history of these compilations means that the Passionarius can yield closer textual parallels to Bald’s Leechbook than parallel passages in the older texts such as the Liber tertius, so it cannot be ignored. The Practica Petrocelli survived in a somewhat redacted version in the twelfth-century English Peri didaxeon.

Stylistic Features of the Old English Corpus

Bald’s Leechbook and Leechbook III are the oldest Old English medical texts, comprising three discrete books copied together in Royal 12. D. XVII, each listing diseases and their cures in head-to-foot order. Leechbook II is the most linguistically and theoretically complex text, pertaining to internal medicine and thus relying heavily on signs and symptoms for differential diagnosis. The texts are compiled from multiple sources. Linguistically, these oldest texts are characterised by very low levels of direct borrowing from Latin or Greek. Where code switching does occur it is noted as such.
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in verbose constructions such as ‘ða wyrt þe hatte on superne terebintina.’ A few lexical idiosyncrasies set the texts apart. OE wæta, -e (fluid / humour) is predominantly inflected as a weak feminine, with a much smaller number of instances of the term inflected as a weak masculine. Stylistically and syntactically, Bald’s Leechbook is the most diffuse or verbose, but this can be the result of incorporated glosses for technical terms, such as the consistent use of gegaderung þæs wætan for apostema, which, though wordier than the Greek loanword used in the Latin corpus, nonetheless shows deverbalisation consistent with incorporated glosses in the Latin tradition, such as collectio humoris for apostema. The skin disease term hriefþo occurs in preference to hreofl.

In general, however, the Old English texts mimicked the style, and therefore the condensed syntax, of Latin texts, as noun phrases were needed to fully qualify many disease terms, or to incorporate a gloss from Latin or Greek. More importantly, this gloss-like style has left some interesting artefacts in Bald’s Leechbook, namely the approximation of the predicative use of the Latin gerundive with the inflected infinitive with OE wesan / beon where Latin uses the gerundive and esse, as in is to sellanne < danda est (he is to be given).

The Lacnunga, surviving alongside the Old English Herbal in London, British Library, Harley 585, has often been derided or examined for its relatively high proportion of syncretic charms containing names like Woden alongside Christian elements. As demonstrated by Audrey Meaney, the text has a significant amount of material in common with the Leechbooks, suggesting compilation from shared Old English sources. This means that the text shares stylistic and lexical similarities with the Leechbooks, but also contains later material, possibly indicated by a single instance of a -seocnes compound. It contains a very low number of borrowed terms. OE wæta, -e predominantly inflects as a weak masculine. The skin disease term hreofl occurs in preference to hriefþo.

The Old English Herbal and Medicina de quadrupedibus were translated and transmitted in the eleventh century. The condensed syntax of their sources is mostly retained, though borrowed Greek disease terms in the Latin texts can be expressed as longer noun clauses, and synonyms for plant names are often provided. There is a very low level of complexity in anatomical vocabulary. OE wæta is universally inflected as a weak masculine. The Old English abstract feminine seocnes is highly productive in disease compounds. The skin disease term hreofl occurs in preference to hriefþo.

---

919 ‘The herb that is called terebinthina in the south.’ See table 1.3 above for a list of such occurrences.
921 Rissanen, ‘Latin Influence on an Old English Idiom’.
922 See table 2.2 above, and Meaney, ‘Variant Versions’.
The *Peri didaxeon* is somewhat macaronic in style. English chapter titles have been rubricated in Latin quite literally\(^{923}\) and disease terms are almost always accompanied by a Latin gloss. The text displays features of transitional Old/Middle English. The text retains scholastic elements from its Latin source, displaying the beginnings of a closer interaction between natural philosophy and medicine, such as the ontological differentiation between tooth and bone at *Peri D.* 33.\(^{924}\) Linguistically, the text is harder to classify. Nominal and article declension is often defective if parsed under the standard rules of Old English, making it harder to track markers such as the gender of OE *wæta*, though that term does seem masculine where inflected. The text seems absent from the discussion of compound formation found in Chapter 6 above, and this may indicate that where such compounds occurred, their morphology and orthography were so far removed from the language of the other texts in the corpus that they were not returned by searches of the electronic corpus.

**General Trends in Abstract Noun Formation**

Latin and Greek disease terminology has a tendency towards the use of adjectives in *-icus* / *-iκος* to denote disease, sufferer and even cure with frequent substantivization, but also in competition with nominal forms, e.g. *cardiacus* / *cardialgia*. Old English medical texts tended to mimic the syntax of their sources requiring a slightly different approach.

Direct substantivization of a strong neuter adjective seems to have been a feature of early Old English when confronted with a neuter Latin substantivized adjective. This was noticed in the Old English translation of Boethius where strong neuter OE *wæt* consistently translated L. *inriguum*. Eleventh-century usage of OE neuter *wæt* seems limited to the phrasal term *æt and wæt* translating Latin *cibus et potus*. Similarly disease compounds in OE *-seoc* can appear as strong neuter adjectives when substantivized in prepositional phrases at the beginning of recipes.

Feminine *io*-nouns in *-nes* is are limited to abstract states (normally in genitival collocations with anatomical terms) in the *Leechbooks*, but later texts, especially the *OEH*, exhibit the productivity of concrete disease term compounds in *-seocnes*.

The transition of the abstract weak noun *wæte* (f.) to *wæta* (m.) seems to have begun before the compilation of Bald’s *Leechbook*, in which both forms occur, but with the feminine form predominating, while it seems complete by the time of Ælfric in non-medical prose and the translation of the *OEH* in medical prose.

\(^{923}\) These rubrics are actually written in red ink throughout the text as recorded in London, British Library Harley 6258B.

Technical Term Formation

Old English anatomical vocabulary (excluding the *Peri didaxeon* on the grounds of its date) was mostly found to comprise widely understood or quotidian terms generally not unique to the field of medicine, such as *heafod* (head), *lifer* (liver), *lung* (lung), and heart (*heort*) which have survived into present day English, though similarly quotidian terms such as *neb* (nose), *andwlita* (face), *milt* (spleen) and *maga* (stomach) have been superseded by Latin and Anglo-Norman terms. The surviving cognate *maw* < OE *maga* exhibits significant semantic shift to mean ‘mouth’ in archaic Modern English.

More specific terms occur mostly in the *Leechbook*, where relatively common terms such as *maga*, *wambe* or *innoð* became specialised within the medical language of Bald’s *Leechbook* to a point of absolute synonymy and total translatability with specific Latin terms. Borrowing and code switching were not used for anatomical terms in the Old English corpus, but neologisms were coined via compound production for a set of terms found very rarely outside of medical texts including *neweseopa*, *rægereorse* and compounds in -*pearm* and -*hrif*. These more arcane terms refer to internal structures and divisions of the gastro-intestinal tract, explaining their scarcity outside of Bald’s *Leechbook*.

Anatomical terminology tended to be relatively standardised in its translation of Latin anatomical terms: *maga* for *stomachus*, *wamb* for *uenter*, *lenden* and *lendenbread* for *lumbus* or *renes*, neweseoða for *ilium*, and *bæþearm* for *anus*. OE *innoð* could translate a much broader range of terms including *intus*, *uenter*, *uiscus* and *intestinus*. Many of these translation equivalents are maintained not just within medical texts but across the entire corpus including psalter glosses and gospel translations. The Latin terms operate in a much less specialised way, exhibiting a much greater deal of metonymy in the metaphorical and figurative language of the Vulgate and psalter traditions. Thus while OE *wamb* or *womb* continues to exclusively gloss L. *uenter*, the meaning of *uenter* expands to include the *matrix* or *uterus* as well as the bowel, while the term never refers to reproductive organs in medical prose, where *innoð* takes that function.

Also of note is that Bald’s *Leechbook* is the only text which includes anatomical descriptions of any organs, namely the liver and spleen taken from Vindicianus. These anatomical vignettes state some of the central concepts of physiology that remained in place until the theories of William Harvey were accepted and a concept of the shape of the liver that was not challenged until the acceptance of Andreas Vesalius’ observations. Regrettably and conspicuously absent from the Old English medical corpus are any such anatomical vignettes on the form or function of the heart, brain,

---

925 This form of metonymy from surface structure to underlying organ is relatively common in Latin medical vocabulary according to Langslow, *Medical Latin*, p. 151.
lungs, matrix, or other vital organs, though one may infer that they would probably have agreed with Vindicianus had they existed.

One of the most striking features of Leechbook II is the consistent and clear translation of Greek pathology terms found in pseudo-Galen, that is apostema, syrrexis, helcosis, phlegmon, scleria and scirrhosis. The Old English terms for apostema (apundenes, geswel, swile), helcosis (wund), phlegmone (apundenes, swile), scirrhosis (aheardung butan gefelnesse), sclerosis (aheardung mid gefelnesse) and syrrexis (geswelles toberstung) are highly accurate, but insufficiently specialised to meet the criteria of technical vocabulary per se. The Old English terms alone are simple and easy to understand without recourse to hermeneumata or lists of Greek loanwords, while clearly communicating concepts vital to differential diagnosis. The translator of these passages avoids strict nominalisation and occasionally employs a more diffuse style than the Latin source in which finite verbs carry more semantic weight. There is no absolute synonymy or total translatability between Latin and Old English terms here, but the vital meaning of the arcane vocabulary involved is perhaps more clearly imparted as a result.

Possible Humour Terms

The strong neuter wæt was used in early texts to translate substantivized Latin adjectives liquidus and inriguus, before being lexicalised in a phrasal term aet and wæt to translate cibus et potus, maintaining the ‘inherent, natural inalienable function’ of terms like potus. The weak feminine or masculine abstract noun wæta, -e, often translating L. humor or liquor, was a catch-all term for any substance that was liquid, translating Latin verbal or adjectival abstracts in -or often with concrete meaning describing physical (and mental) states or characteristics.

Although the theory of four humours equating to the Platonic elements was known in Anglo-Saxon England, different iterations of that theory do not employ a consistent vocabulary. Even within the medical corpus, weak waeta, -e can denote fluids other than bodily fluids, as can Latin humor. The term only related to humoral theory in any meaningful way when qualified by one or more adjectives which either denote that it is pathological (yfel) or specify its quality (ceald) or its type (horheht, omig).

The weak plural oman and the related adjective omig are similarly vague in meaning. The nominal form seems to gloss the disease terms ignis sacer or erysipelas, while both nominal and adjectival forms can seem to translate a very wide range of specific humour terms that occur in the Latin texts of Byzantine origin essentially including all four humours and the pathological state

926 Langslow, Medical Latin, p. 375.
cacochimia (a disorder of the humours). OE oman and omig then, though certainly more specialized than wæta completely fail to meet the criteria for technical lexis, failing to display even approximate synonymy or general translatability with a given Latin term, having far too broad a set of potential meanings, and only being relevant to the discipline of medicine insofar as they impart a general sense of pathogenicity. Humoral theory is then the one lexical area in which Old English medical vocabulary failed to impart the sense of the Latin sources it was translated from.

**Disease Terms**

It is in the field of disease terms and pathology that the greatest differences can be seen between the translation styles of the *Leechbooks* and the *Herbal*. The most obvious difference is that when faced with Greek loanwords in Latin the translators of Bald’s *Leechbook* were far less likely to employ code switching or glossing than the translator of the *Herbal*. A subtler difference is found in the derivational morphology and compound formation. While both early and late texts have a similar range of compounds on the adjective -seoc, the abstract feminine nominalizations in -ness (-seocnysse) are largely limited to the *Herbal* texts, while substantivisation of the adjectives occurs throughout the medical corpus.

The majority of Old English disease terms throughout the medical corpus were formed as compounds on a small number of compounding elements, -adl, -copu, -ece, -seoc, -wærc and -sar,927 or by collocations of anatomical terms in the genitive with one of these terms. Across the corpus, synonymous disease terms seem to have existed for two reasons. Firstly, the demands of the syntax of the Latin sources: when substantivized Latin adjectives in -icus are translated by a compound noun in -adl, -copu, -ece, or -wærc, an adjective in -seoc or -sar may be required to translate the same Latin adjective where it later occurs as an attributive. It should also be noted that disease terms may have specialised meaning within a given text, but may not be used in precisely the same way across all medical texts. As such most disease terms in Old English can be seen as totally translatable and absolutely synonymous with Latin terms at the level of a given text, but not beyond that.

**General Conclusions**

Medical Old English had much in common with later technical languages insofar as it draws heavily on Latin and Greek terminology. Some of the lexis seems to have been so obscure as to have probably been impenetrable even among the literate elite; it is certainly proper to the discipline of medicine, and it tends to be normalised or standardised within a given text, if not across the entire

927 The author greatly regrets having omitted a thorough discussion of OE sar and its compounds.
corpus. Thus the texts analysed seem to fit with all three of Heller’s criteria for a technical language discussed by Langslow.\textsuperscript{928}

The existence of a such a Fachsprach must surely, moreover, be seen as evidence for the existence of a body of practitioners, even if the size of said body was vanishingly small. That such a body of practitioners was highly educated can be inferred from the Latinity of the language they read and wrote. Indeed, it would have been very difficult for anyone not educated in a monastery to have understood much in these texts. In sum, the sheer scope of scholarly resources in the translation and transmission of medical texts in Anglo-Saxon England, combined with the technical nature of their language, serves to prove that these texts could not have been mere exercises in monkish philology or ‘uncritical copying’ as suggested by Wilfred Bonser,\textsuperscript{929} but must have arisen from practical necessity or pragmatism due to the sheer economic cost of their production alone.\textsuperscript{930}

In general, four conclusions can be drawn from this dissertation as a whole. In the first instance, the existence of significant parallels between Bald’s Leechbook and Late Antique or Byzantine medical texts such as the pseudo-Galenic Liber tertius or the Practica Alexandri latine suggest that these texts may have circulated in Anglo-Saxon England despite their absence from extant libraries or book-lists. Secondly, it should be noted that these texts were intelligently and diligently translated over a long period of time, from the ninth to the eleventh centuries. Thirdly, it can be stated that medical Old English shares many features with medical Latin as described by David Langslow. Finally, it can be stated that the extant texts were compiled using a functional technical lexis that often clarified and explained the more arcane aspects of medical Latin with its propensity to borrow from Greek.

In terms of the transmission history of Latin medicine before the rise of Salerno, this thesis has barely scratched the surface of a little understood and largely understudied corpus. Many of the Latin texts involved remain unedited, or only partially edited, and every new critical edition of such Latin texts may have a significant impact on our understanding of Anglo-Saxon medicine as well as the continental tradition in which they survive. On the other hand, a new critical edition of Bald’s Leechbook is desperately needed, and its completion could have significant impact on the understanding of the continental medical texts it draws upon. It is hoped that the appendices to this thesis may inform such future work.

The degree of syntactic interference between the Latin sources and their Old English descendants has created a language with some interesting phenomena which may warrant further scrutiny, and may, moreover, be relevant to the study of syntactic and semantic trends in Old English

\textsuperscript{928} Langslow, Medical Latin, pp. 12–16.
\textsuperscript{929} Bonser, The Medical Background of Anglo-Saxon England, p. 54.
\textsuperscript{930} Voigts, ‘Anglo-Saxon Plant Remedies’, p. 252.
as a whole. These include the use of the inflected infinitive to translate the Latin gerundive, substantivisation patterns of adjectives, and the formation of abstract nouns. Some consistent anomalies can be seen in the declension of substantivized strong adjectives, for example, which may warrant further study but have not been quantitively discussed above.\textsuperscript{931}

\textsuperscript{931} Specifically the strong neuter dative singular in \textit{-e} rather than \textit{-um}.
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