

# Deposit & Copying of Dissertation Declaration



UNIVERSITY OF  
CAMBRIDGE

Board of Graduate Studies

Please note that you will also need to bind a copy of this Declaration into your final, hardbound copy of thesis - this has to be the very first page of the hardbound thesis.

1	Surname (Family Name)	Forenames(s)	Title
2	Title of Dissertation as approved by the Degree Committee		

In accordance with the University Regulations in *Statutes and Ordinances* for the PhD, MSc and MLitt Degrees, I agree to deposit one print copy of my dissertation entitled above and one print copy of the summary with the Secretary of the Board of Graduate Studies who shall deposit the dissertation and summary in the University Library under the following terms and conditions:

## 1. Dissertation Author Declaration

I am the author of this dissertation and hereby give the University the right to make my dissertation available in print form as described in 2. below.

My dissertation is my original work and a product of my own research endeavours and includes nothing which is the outcome of work done in collaboration with others except as declared in the Preface and specified in the text. I hereby assert my moral right to be identified as the author of the dissertation.

The deposit and dissemination of my dissertation by the University does not constitute a breach of any other agreement, publishing or otherwise, including any confidentiality or publication restriction provisions in sponsorship or collaboration agreements governing my research or work at the University or elsewhere.

## 2. Access to Dissertation

I understand that one print copy of my dissertation will be deposited in the University Library for archival and preservation purposes, and that, unless upon my application restricted access to my dissertation for a specified period of time has been granted by the Board of Graduate Studies prior to this deposit, the dissertation will be made available by the University Library for consultation by readers in accordance with University Library Regulations and copies of my dissertation may be provided to readers in accordance with applicable legislation.

3	Signature	Date

## Corresponding Regulation

Before being admitted to a degree, a student shall deposit with the Secretary of the Board one copy of his or her hard-bound dissertation and one copy of the summary (bearing student's name and thesis title), both the dissertation and the summary in a form approved by the Board. The Secretary shall deposit the copy of the dissertation together with the copy of the summary in the University Library where, subject to restricted access to the dissertation for a specified period of time having been granted by the Board of Graduate Studies, they shall be made available for consultation by readers in accordance with University Library Regulations and copies of the dissertation provided to readers in accordance with applicable legislation.



ANGLO-SAXON MEDICINE AND DISEASE:  
A SEMANTIC APPROACH

THESIS FOR THE DEGREE OF  
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY (PhD)  
SUBMITTED JANUARY 2011

CONAN DOYLE  
CORPUS CHRISTI COLLEGE  
CAMBRIDGE



*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.



## *Declarations*

I declare that this thesis is all my own work, that it contains no material already used for comparable purposes and that it gives full reference to sources used according to the Anglo-Saxon, Norse and Celtic Department style sheet, and that volume 1 of the thesis falls within the prescribed word-count.

Conan Doyle

4 Jan 2011

## *Acknowledgements*

I would like to thank my supervisor, Dr Debby Banham of Newnham College, for her patient encouragement and direction. I would like to thank Katherine E. Miller for her patient and thorough proofreading and James M. Doyle for proof-reading my translation of Bald's Leechbook in the Appendices. I would like to thank all the academic and administrative staff of the Department of Anglo-Saxon, Norse and Celtic, especially Prof. Russell for encouraging me to dabble in Greek when necessary.

In the Department of the History and Philosophy of Science I would like to thank Dr Lauren Kassell for encouraging me to participate in medical history and 'Generation to Reproduction' seminars. From the 'Latin Therapy' seminar I would specifically like to thank Prof. Nick Jardine and Dr Jenny Rampling, and Dr Banham again for their friendly and tireless support in grappling with technical Latin. I should also like to thank Mr Peter Jones of King's College, and Prof. Lea Olsan of the University of Louisiana Monroe.



## *Table of Contents*

Introduction	1
Chapter 1: Methodology	21
Chapter 2: The Corpus of Old English Medical Texts	35
Chapter 3: The Latin Medical Corpus	57
Chapter 4: Anatomical Vocabulary	80
Chapter 5: Old English Physiological Vocabulary	121
Chapter 6: Pathology and Disease Terminology	197
Conclusion	247
Bibliography	259

## *Bibliographic Abbreviations*

- ANQ* *American Notes and Queries*  
*ANS* *Anglo-Norman Studies*  
*ASE* *Anglo-Saxon England*  
ASPR Anglo-Saxon Poetic Records  
BDASP Bibliothek der angelsächsischen Prosa  
CCSL Corpus Christianorum series Latina  
CML Corpus Medicorum Latinorum  
CSASE Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England  
DOE *Dictionary of Old English: A to H online*, <http://tapor.library.utoronto.ca/doe/>  
DOEC *Dictionary of Old English Web Corpus*, <http://tapor.library.utoronto.ca/doecorpus/>  
EEMF Early English Manuscripts in Facsimile  
EETS OS Early English Text Society, Original Series  
EETS SS Early English Text Society, Supplementary Series  
*ES* *English Studies*  
JHM Journal of the History of Medicine  
LSLM Lateinische Sprache und Literatur des Mittelalters  
*N&Q* *Notes and Queries*  
*OEN* *Old English Newsletter*  
RS Rolls Series  
SAM Studies in Ancient Medicine  
*SHM* *Social History of Medicine*  
PL Patrologia Latina

## *Primary Source Title Abbreviations*

- BLB* *Bald's Leechbook*  
Lexical analysis in this volume is based on the *Dictionary of Old English Web Corpus* which follows T. O. Cockayne, ed., *Leechdoms, Wortcunning, and Starcraft of Early England. Being a Collection of Documents, for the Most Part Never Before Printed, Illustrating the History of Science in this Country Before the Norman Conquest*, RS 35, 3 vols. (London, 1864–6) II, 2–299.  
A new transcript, translation and Latin source study has been placed in the appendices.  
*CDM* Celsus, *De medicina* ed. Marx, F., *A. Cornelii Celsi quae supersunt*, CML 1 (Leipzig and Berlin, 1915).

- DHVL* Antonius Musa, *De herba uettonica liber*, ed. E. Howald and H.E. Sigerist in their *Antonii Musae de herba uettonica liber. Pseudoapulei herbarius anonymi de taxone liber. Sexti Placiti liber medicinae ex animalibus etc.*, CML 4 (Leipzig and Berlin, 1927).
- De moro* Treatise on the mulberry tree, anomalously inserted into *Liber medicinae ex animalibus*, text from De Vriend's parallel text of the *Medicina de Quadrupedibus*.
- Eup.* Oribasius, *Euporistes*, ed. Mollinier, A. in *Oeuvres d'Oribase*, ed. U. C. Bussemaker and C. Daremberg, Collection des médecins grecs et latins, 6 vols. (Paris, 1851–76), V, 799–VI, 402.
- Gyn.* Vindicianus, *Gynaecia*, ed. Rose, V., *Theodori Prisciani Euporiston libri III cum Physicorum fragmento et additamentis Pseudo-Theodoris, accedunt Vindicani Afri quae feruntur reliquiae* (Leipzig, 1894), pp. 427–66.
- Herb.* Pseudo-Apuleius *Herbarius*, ed. Howald and Sigerist, in *Herbarius*, pp. 22–225.
- HN* Pliny, *Historia naturalis* ed. von Jan, L. and K. F. T. Mayhoff, *C. Plini Secundi Naturalis historiae libri XXXVII*, Bibliotheca scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana (Leipzig, 1967–70)
- Lacn.* Old English *Lacnunga* ed. Pettit, E., *Anglo-Saxon Remedies, Charms and Prayers from BL MS Harley 585: the Lacnunga*, Mellen Critical Editions and Translations 6, 2 vols. (Lewiston NY, 2001).
- Leech* III *Leechbook* III, Cockayne, ed., *Leechdoms*, II, 300–60.
- LMHF* Pseudo-Dioscorides, *Liber medicinae ex herbis femininis*, Unedited, parallel text from de Vriend, ed., *Herbal*.
- LT* Pseudo-Galen, *Liber tertius*, ed. K. D. Fischer, ed., 'Galenī qui fertur ad Glauconem liber tertius ad fidem codicis Vindocinensis 109' in *Galenismo e Medicina Tardoantica Fonti Greche, Latine e Arabe Atti del Seminario Internazionale di Siena*, ed. I. Garofalo and A. Roselli, *Annali Dell'istituto Universitario Orientale di Napoli* 7 (Naples, 2003), pp. 283–346
- MDM* *Marcelli de medicamentis liber* ed. Niedermann, M., and E., Liechtenhan, CML 5 (Berlin, 1968)
- MdQ* Old English *Medicina de quadrupedibus* ed. de Vriend, *Herbarium* pp. 234–73.
- MEA* Sextus Placitus, *Liber medicinae ex animalibus*, ed. Howald and Sigerist, *Herbarium*, pp. 235–86.
- MedP* *Medicina Plinii* ed. Önnersfors, A., *Plinii Secundi Iunioris qui feruntur de medicina libri tres*, CML 3 (Berlin, 1964).
- OEH* Old English *Herbal*, ed. de Vriend, *Herbal*, pp. 1–233.
- PAL* *Practica Alexandri Latine*  
Largely unedited, selected chapters available in Langslow, D. R. *The Latin Alexander: The Text and Transmission of a Late Latin Medical Book*, Journal of Roman Studies Monograph 10 (London, 2006); segments preserving the works of Philumenus and Philagrius available in Puschmann, T., *Nachträge zu Alexander Trallianus: Fragmente aus Philumenus und*

- Philagrius etc.*, Berliner Studien 5 (Berlin, 1886), for the remaining text, one must rely on Fradin, F., ed., *Practica Alexandri yatro greci cum expositione glose interlinearis Jacobi de partibus et Januensis in margine posite* (Lyons, 1504).
- Pass.* The *Passionarius* or *Liber nosematon* of Gariopontus  
Unedited. Significant parallels noted and transcribed in Talbot, C., ‘Some Notes on Anglo-Saxon Medicine’, *Medical History* 9 (1965), 156–69; for the remaining text, one must rely on A. Blanchardus, *Galenii pergameni passionarius doctis medicis multum desideratus, egritudines a capite ad pedes usos complectens* (Lyons, 1526)
- Peri D.* Old English *Peri didaxeon* ed. Löweneck, M., *Peri Didaxeon: Eine Sammlung von Rezepten in Englischer Sprache aus dem 11./12. Jahrhundert. Nach einer Handschrift des Britischen Museums*, Erlanger Beiträge zur Englischen Philologie und Vergleichenden Literaturgeschichte (Erlanger, 1896).
- PPB* *Physica Plinii Bambergensis* ed. Önnersfors, A., *Bibliotheca Graeca et Latina suppletoria curantibus* 2 (Hildesheim, 1975).
- PPFP* *Physica Plinii Florentino-Pragensis*  
Book I ed. Winkler, J., *Physicae quae fertur Plinii Florentino-Pragensis liber primus*, Lateinische Sprache und Literatur des Mittelalters 17 (Frankfurt, 1984).  
Book II ed. Wachtmeister, W., *Physica Plinii quae fertur Florentino-Pragensis liber secundus*, Lateinische Sprache und Literatur de Mittelalters 21 (Frankfurt, 1985).  
Book III ed. Schmitz, G., *Physicae quae fertur Plinii Florentino-Pragensis liber tertius*, Lateinische Sprache und Literatur de Mittelalters 24 (Frankfurt, 1988).
- Syn.* Oribasius, *Synopsis* ed. Molinier in *Oeuvres d'Oribase*, ed. Bussemaker and Daremberg V, 799 – VI, 402.
- Taxon.* *Anonymi Liber de taxone*, ed. Howald and Sigerist, *Herbarius*, pp. 229–32.
- Ter.* *Tereoperica* or *Practica Petrocelli*  
*Practica Petrocelli Salernitani* in S. De Renzi, A. Henschel, and C. Daremberg, eds., *Collectio Salernitana* 5 vols. (Naples 1856), IV, 185–286.
- VEA* Vindicianus, *Epitome altera* ed. Rose, *Theodori Prisciani*, pp. 467–83.

## *Linguistic Abbreviations*

Gr. Greek

OE Old English

L. Latin

Ger. German

PDE Present Day English

## *Manuscript Sigla for glossed Psalters*

	Name	Shelfmark	Ker	Gneuss
A	Vespasian	London, British Library, Cotton Vespasian A. I ed. Kuhn (1965)	203	381
B	Junius	Oxford, Bodleian Library, Junius 27 ed. Brenner (1908)	335	641
C	Cambridge	Cambridge, University Library, Ff. 1.23 ed. Wildhagen (1910)	13	4
D	Royal, or Regius	London, British Library, Royal 2. B. V ed. Roeder (1904)	249	451
E	Eadwine or Canterbury	Cambridge, Trinity College, R. 17. 1, ed. Harsley (1889)	91	
F	Stowe or Spelman	London, British Library, Stowe 2 ed. Kimmens (1910)	271	499
G	Vitellius	London, British Library, Cotton Vitellius E. XVIII ed. Rosier (1962)	224	407
H	Tiberius	London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius C. VI. ed. Campbell (1974)	199	374
I	Lambeth	London, Lambeth Palace Library, 427 ed. Lindelöf	280	517
J	Arundel	London, British Library, Arundel 60 ed. Oess (1910)	134	304
K	Salisbury	Salisbury, Cathedral Library, 150 ed. Sisam and Sisam (1959)	379	740
L	Bosworth	London, British Library, Add. 37517 ed. Lindelöf (1909)	129	291
M	Blickling	New York, Pierpont Morgan Library, 776 ed. Brock (1880)	287	862
P	Paris	Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, lat. 8824 ed. Bright and Ramsay (1907) and Krapp (1932)	367	891

# 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.<sup>1</sup>

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.<sup>2</sup> 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.<sup>3</sup> 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

---

<sup>1</sup> *Dictionary of Old English Web Corpus*, ed. A. Di Paulo Healey, J. P. Wilkin and Xin Xiang, <http://tapor.library.utoronto.ca/doecorpus/> (viewed 12 September, 2017); originally based upon Cameron, A. and R. Frank, ed., *A Plan for the Dictionary of Old English* (Toronto, 1973)

<sup>2</sup> 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.

<sup>3</sup> Bierbaumer, P. *Der botanische Wortschatz des Altenglischen*, 2 vols., Grazer Beiträge zur englischen Philologie 1–2 (Bern and Frankfurt, 1975–6).

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.<sup>4</sup>

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.'<sup>5</sup> 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.'<sup>6</sup>

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'.<sup>7</sup>

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

---

<sup>4</sup> Nutton, V., 'The Rise of Medicine', in *The Cambridge Illustrated History of Medicine*, ed. R. Porter (Cambridge, 1996), pp. 52–81.

<sup>5</sup> Baader, G., 'Early Medieval Latin Adaptations of Byzantine Medicine in Western Europe', *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 38 (1984), 251–9 at p. 251.

<sup>6</sup> Grattan, J. H. G. and C. Singer, ed., *Anglo-Saxon Magic and Medicine Illustrated specially from the Semi-Pagan Text 'Lacnunga'* (Oxford, 1952), p. 94.

<sup>7</sup> Horden, P., 'What's Wrong with Early Medieval Medicine?', *SHM* 24 (2011), 5–55 at p. 6.

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.<sup>8</sup> 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.<sup>9</sup> This enormous collection draws together almost every extant Old English medical text, with the exception of the *Omont fragment*, discovered over a century later,<sup>10</sup> and the Wellcome fragment.<sup>11</sup> 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.<sup>12</sup> 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.<sup>13</sup> 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,<sup>14</sup> and an edition and commentary on the *Lacnunga* together with Henry Grattan.<sup>15</sup>

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

---

<sup>8</sup> Cameron, M. L., *Anglo-Saxon Medicine*, CSASE 7 (Cambridge, 1993), p. 64.

<sup>9</sup> Cockayne, T. O., ed., *Leechdoms, Wortcunning, and Starcraft of Early England. Being a Collection of Documents, for the Most Part Never Before Printed, Illustrating the History of Science in this Country Before the Norman Conquest*, RS 35, 3 vols. (London, 1864–6).

<sup>10</sup> Schauman, B. and A. Cameron, ‘A Newly-Found Leaf of Old English from Louvain’, *Anglia* 95 (1977), 289–312.

<sup>11</sup> A. Napier, ‘Altenglische Miscellen’, *Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen* 84 (1890), 395–6.

<sup>12</sup> Payne, J. F., *English Medicine in the Anglo-Saxon Times: Two Lectures delivered before the Royal College of Physicians of London, June 23 and 25 1903* (Oxford, 1904).

<sup>13</sup> Lambert, C., ‘The Old English Medical Vocabulary’, *Proceedings of the Royal Society of Medicine* 33 (1940), 137–45.

<sup>14</sup> T. O. Cockayne and C. J. Singer, *Leechdoms, Wortcunning, and Starcraft of Early England. Being a Collection of Documents, for the Most Part Never Before Printed, Illustrating the History of Science in this Country Before the Norman Conquest*, 3 vols. (London, 1961).

<sup>15</sup> Grattan and Singer, ed., *Lacnunga*.



the ‘final pathological disintegration of the great system of Greek medical thought,’<sup>16</sup> 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)’.<sup>17</sup>

These attitudes were radically, but not completely, toned down in the work of Wilfrid Bonser.<sup>18</sup> 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],’<sup>19</sup> 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’.<sup>20</sup>

The study of Old English medical texts began to accelerate from the 1970s, with Heather Stuart’s continuation of the theme of medical lexicography<sup>21</sup> 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’.<sup>22</sup> Voigts’s impressive output includes many subsequent works on the *Old English Herbal*,<sup>23</sup> as well as a more recent incipit catalogue of Old and Middle English medical texts.<sup>24</sup> After Voigts and Talbot, the study of Anglo-

---

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 94.

<sup>17</sup> Stanley, E. G., *The Search for Anglo-Saxon Paganism* (Cambridge, 1964), p. 1.

<sup>18</sup> Bonser, W., ‘Anglo-Saxon Medical Nomenclature’, *English and Germanic Studies* 4 (1952), 13–19; W. Bonser, *The Medical Background of Anglo-Saxon England: a Study in History, Psychology and Folklore* (London, 1963).

<sup>19</sup> Bonser, ‘Anglo-Saxon Medical Nomenclature’, p. 15.

<sup>20</sup> Talbot, C., ‘Some Notes on Anglo-Saxon Medicine’, *Medical History* 9 (1965), 156–69.

<sup>21</sup> Stuart, H., ‘Some Old English Medical Terms’, *Parergon* 13 (1975), 21–35.

<sup>22</sup> Voigts, L. E., ‘Anglo-Saxon Plant Remedies and the Anglo-Saxons’, *Isis* 70 (1979), 250–268.

<sup>23</sup> Voigts, L. E., ‘The Significance of the Name Apuleius to the *Herbarium Apulei*’, *Bulletin of the History of Medicine* 52 (1978), 214–27; Voigts, L. E. ‘A New Look at a MS of the Old English Translation of the *Herbarium Apuleii*’, *Manuscripta* 19 (1975), 84–5; Voigts, L. E., ‘British Library, Cotton Vitellius C.iii, f. 82’, *OEN* 12 (1978), 12–13.

<sup>24</sup> 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://ccr1.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.<sup>25</sup> 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*.<sup>26</sup> 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<sup>27</sup> and the *Old English Herbal* has been published with a parallel text of its direct Latin sources for the Early English Text Society.<sup>28</sup> In addition, facsimiles of two of the most significant Old English medical manuscripts have been published by the Early English Manuscripts in Facsimile series.<sup>29</sup>

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.<sup>30</sup>

---

<sup>25</sup> Cameron, M. L., 'The Sources of Medical Knowledge in Anglo-Saxon England', *ASE* 11 (1982), 135–55; Cameron, M. L., 'Bald's *Leechbook*: Its Sources and their Use in its Compilation', *ASE* 12 (1983), 153–82; Cameron, *Anglo-Saxon Medicine*.

<sup>26</sup> See, for example, Banham, D., 'A Millennium in Medicine? New Medical Texts and Ideas in England in the Eleventh-Century', in *Anglo-Saxons: Studies Presented to Cyril Roy Hart*, ed. S. Keynes and A. P. Smyth (Dublin, 2006), pp. 230–42; D'Aronco, M. A., 'How 'English' is Anglo-Saxon Medicine? The Latin Sources for Anglo-Saxon Medical Texts', in *Britannia Latina: Latin in the Culture of Great Britain from the Middle Ages to the Twentieth Century*, ed. C. Burnett, N. Mann, et al., Warburg Institute Colloquia 8 (London and Turin, 2005), pp. 27–41; Nokes, R. S., 'The Several Compilers of Bald's *Leechbook*', *ASE* 33 (2005), 51–76; Meaney, A. L., 'Variant Versions of Old English Medical Remedies and the Compilation of Bald's *Leechbook*', *ASE* 13 (1984), 235–64; Meaney, A., 'The Anglo-Saxon View of the Causes of Disease', in *Health, Disease and Healing in Medieval Culture*, ed. S. Campbell, B. Hall, et al. (Houndsmills, 1992), pp. 12–33; Maion, D., 'The Fortune of the So-Called *Practica Petrocelli Salernitani* in England: New Evidence and some Considerations', in *Form and Content of Instruction in Anglo-Saxon England in the Light of Contemporary Manuscript Evidence*, ed. P. Lendinara, L. Lazzari, et al. (Turnhout, 2007), pp. 495–512.

<sup>27</sup> Pettit, E., ed., *Anglo-Saxon Remedies, Charms and Prayers from BL MS Harley 585: the Lacnunga*, Mellen Critical Editions and Translations 6, 2 vols. (Lewiston NY, 2001).

<sup>28</sup> De Vriend, H. J. ed., *The Old English Herbarium and Medicina de Quadrupedibus*, EETS OS 286 (London, 1984).

<sup>29</sup> D'Aronco, M. A. and M. L. Cameron, *The Old English Illustrated Pharmacopoeia: British Library Cotton Vitellius C. III*, EEMF 27 (Copenhagen, 1998); Wright, C. E., ed., *Bald's Leechbook: British Museum Royal Manuscript 12. D. XVII, with appendix by R. Quirk*, EEMF 5 (Copenhagen, 1955).

<sup>30</sup> Brennessel, B., M. D. C. Drout and R. Gravel, 'A Reassessment of the Efficacy of Anglo-Saxon Medicine', *ASE* 34 (2006), 183–95; For a more recent example which received significant press coverage, see Harrison, F., A. E. L. Roberts, R. Gabriliska, K. P. Rumbaugh, C. Lee, and S. P. Diggle, 'A 1,000-year-old antimicrobial remedy with antistaphylococcal activity,' *mBio* 6(4) (2015), <http://mbio.asm.org/content/6/4/e01129-15> (Viewed 14 January, 2017).

## 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,<sup>31</sup> Carol Biggam<sup>32</sup> and Peter Kitson,<sup>33</sup> whilst a more general survey of plant-name semantics has been carried out by Hans Sauer.<sup>34</sup>

Work on other aspects of medical terminology tend to focus on specific disease terms, such as Cameron's article on OE *þeor*<sup>35</sup> and Liberman's work on terms for 'leprosy'.<sup>36</sup> A more general study has been published by Juhani.<sup>37</sup> James T. McIlwain has recently published on those diseases described in the *Leechbook* which he interprets as relevant to his specialization as a neurologist,<sup>38</sup> whilst Lois Ayoub has briefly described the use of OE *wæta* in humoral theory.<sup>39</sup>

## 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'.<sup>40</sup> 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.<sup>41</sup>

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

---

<sup>31</sup> Cameron, M. L. 'What Plant was Attorlothe (atorlape)?', *Parergon* 10 (1992), 27–34.

<sup>32</sup> Biggam, C. P., 'Hæwenhnydele: an Anglo-Saxon Medicinal Plant', *Botanical Journal of Scotland* 46 (1994), 617–22.

<sup>33</sup> Kitson, P., 'Two Old English Plant-Names and Related Matters', *ES* 69 (1988), 97–112.

<sup>34</sup> Sauer, H., 'Towards a Linguistic Description and Classification of Old English Plant Names', in *Words, Texts and Manuscripts: Studies in Anglo-Saxon Culture Presented to Helmut Gneuss on the Occasion of his Sixty-Fifth Birthday*, ed. M. Korhammer, K. Reichl, et al. (New York, 1992), pp. 381–408.

<sup>35</sup> Cameron, M. L., 'On *þeor* and *þeoradl*', *Anglia* 106 (1988), 124–9.

<sup>36</sup> Liberman, A., 'Gothic *þrutsfill*, Old English *þrustfell* "Leprosy," and the Names of Some Other Skin Diseases in Germanic' in *Germanisches Altertum und christliches Mittelalter: Festschrift für Heinz Klingenberg zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. B. Brogyanyi and T. Krömmelbein, *Schriften zur Mediävistik* 1 (Hamburg, 2006), pp. 197–211.

<sup>37</sup> Juhani, N., 'Notes on the Study of English Medical Vocabulary from the Historical Point of View', in *Neophilologica Fennica*, ed. L. Kahlas-Tarkka, *Mémoires de la Société Néophilologique de Helsinki* 45 (Helsinki, 1987), pp. 335–50.

<sup>38</sup> J. T. McIlwain, 'Brain and Mind in Anglo-Saxon Medicine', *Viator* 37 (2006), 103–12; J. T. McIlwain, 'Theory and Practice in the Anglo-Saxon *Leechbooks*: the Case of Paralysis', *Viator* 39 (2008), 65–73.

<sup>39</sup> Ayoub, L., 'Old English *wæta* and the Medical Theory of the Humours', *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 94 (1995), 332–46.

<sup>40</sup> Bonser, *The Medical Background of Anglo-Saxon England*, p. 54.

<sup>41</sup> Voigts, 'Anglo-Saxon Plant Remedies', p. 252.

‘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.’<sup>42</sup>

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’.<sup>43</sup> 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.’<sup>44</sup> 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.<sup>45</sup> This was hardly, then, a tradition which ‘left no legitimate successor.’<sup>46</sup>

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

---

<sup>42</sup> M. Gretsch, *The Intellectual Foundations of the English Benedictine Reform*, CSASE 25 (Cambridge, 1999), p. 44.

<sup>43</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>44</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 28.

<sup>45</sup> Franzen, C., *The Tremulous Hand of Worcester: A Study of Old English in the Thirteenth Century* (Oxford, 1991), pp. 66–7.

<sup>46</sup> 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,<sup>47</sup> 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.'<sup>48</sup> 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,<sup>49</sup> 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*.'<sup>50</sup> 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).

---

<sup>47</sup> Langslow, *Medical Latin*.

<sup>48</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 21–2.

<sup>49</sup> Heller, K., 'Der Wortschatz unter dem Aspekt des Fachwortes: Versuch einer Systematik', in *Fachsprache*, ed. W. von Hahn (Darmstadt, 1981), pp. 218–38.

<sup>50</sup> Langslow, *Medical Latin*, pp. 13–14.

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’.<sup>51</sup> 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.<sup>52</sup> 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*’,<sup>53</sup> 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

---

<sup>51</sup> Langslow uses precisely this example in *Medical Latin*, p. 17.

<sup>52</sup> Fischer, K. D., ‘Der Pseudogalenische “Liber tertius”’, in *Galenismo e Medicina Tardoantica Fonte Greche, Latine e Arabe Atti del Seminario Internazionale di Siena*, ed. I. Garofalo and A. Roselli, Annali Dell’istituto Universitario Orientale di Napoli 7 (Naples, 2003), pp. 101–32.

<sup>53</sup> Adams, J. N. and M. Deegan, ‘Bald’s *Leechbook* and the *Physica Plinii*’, *ASE* 21 (1992), 87–114.

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.<sup>54</sup>

<i>Leechbook</i>	<i>PPB</i>	<i>PPFP</i>	Parallel Source
I.1.4	1.23	I.1.23	
I.1.14–15	8.9–10	I.8.9–11	
I.1.16–17	8.16–17	I.8.17–18	
I.1.24	<b>I.1, I.4</b>	<b>I.1.1, I.1.4</b>	
I.1.27	1.5	I.1.5	
I.1.28–9	1.26–7	I.1.26–7	
I.1.30	1.8	I.1.8	
I.2.2	17.27	I.18.25	<b><i>Herb 90.1</i></b>
I.2.5–6	17.1	I.18.1	
I.2.7	17.3	I.18.2	
I.2.8–9	17.8	I.18.7	
I.2.10	17.11	I.18.10	
I.2.12	13.9	I.14.8	
I.2.13	18.3	I.18.48	<b><i>MEA</i> α 3.7, β 3.8</b>
I.2.21	17.10	I.18.9	<b><i>Herb 35.2, MDM 136.10</i></b> <sup>55</sup>
I.2.33 <sup>56</sup>	17.5	I.15.5	<b><i>Herb 116.1</i></b>
I.3.4–5	9.7, 9.9	I.10.7, 9	
I.3.8	11.3	I.12.3	
I.4.5	48.19	I.50.10	

<sup>54</sup> Adams and Deegan, ‘Bald’s *Leechbook* and the *Physica Plinii*’, pp. 87–114.

<sup>55</sup> Parallel suggested in Cameron, *Anglo-Saxon Medicine*, p. 88.

<sup>56</sup> *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.

I.4.6	48.21	I.50.13	
I.4.7	n/a	III.29.1	<b>MDM 15.50</b>
I.7.1	61.9	I.63.8	<b>DHVL 30</b>
I.39.5	n/a	III.34.4	<b>MP III.24.1–4, 7<sup>57</sup></b>
II.2.7–8	70.3–4	II.5.7–8	
II.2.9	72.2	II.7.2	
II.7.3	68.5	II.4.6	
II.8.1	68.6	II.4.7	
II.8.2	70.1	II.5.3	
II.10.1	71.2	II.6.2	
II.11.1	71.1	II.6.1	
II.12.1	75.2	II.10.2	
II.12.2	75.4	II.10.4	
II.14.2	77.1	II.12.1	

### *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*,<sup>58</sup> 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.<sup>59</sup> 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.<sup>60</sup>

<sup>57</sup> This includes parallels for *Leechbook* I.39.6–9 which are not found in the *Physica Plinii*.

<sup>58</sup> Fischer, K. D. 'Galenī qui fertur ad Glauconem liber tertius ad fidem codicis Vindocinensis 109', in *Galenismo e Medicina Tardoantica Fonti Greche, Latine e Arabe*, ed. I. Garofalo et al., pp. 283–346.

<sup>59</sup> Cameron, 'Bald's *Leechbook*', pp. 164–5.

<sup>60</sup> 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 Banham<sup>61</sup> 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*

<i>Leechbook</i>	<i>Pass</i> (Talbot) <sup>62</sup>	<i>Ter</i>	Other	where published <sup>63</sup>
I.4.8–9 <sup>64</sup>	I.21	34	<b>LT 75.1</b>	Cameron 1983
I.4.18	-	35	<b>LT 76.1</b>	Cameron 1983
I.35.1 <sup>65</sup>	V.34	-	<i>Ad Glauconem</i> II.6	Cameron 1993
I.35.2–3	-	-	<i>Ad Glauconem</i> II.6	Cameron 1993
I.35.4	V.35		<i>Ad Glauconem</i> II.7	Cameron 1993
II.2.1	-	-	<b>LT 9.2</b>	<b>new</b>
II.2.3	-	-	<b>LT 12.1</b>	<b>new</b>
II.3.1–2	II.44	-	<b>LT 14.1–2</b>	
II.4.1	II.28	-	<b>LT 18.1, 16.1–2</b>	
II.5.1	II.28	-	<b>LT 18.1–2</b>	

<sup>61</sup> Talbot, 'Notes on Anglo-Saxon Medicine', pp. 156–69; Banham, D. and C. T. Doyle, 'An Instrument of Confusion: the Mystery of the Anglo-Saxon Syringe', in *Recipes for Disaster* ed. D. Banham, J. Rampling and N. Jardine (Cambridge 2010), pp. 27–38.

<sup>62</sup> All parallels in this column are suggested in Talbot, 'Notes on Anglo-Saxon Medicine'.

<sup>63</sup> 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*.

<sup>64</sup> Noted by Cameron in 'Bald's *Leechbook*', pp. 179–180 (he numbers this section 4.4).

<sup>65</sup> 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	-	<i>LT 20.1</i>	
II.7.1–2, 4	II.49	-	<i>LT 22.1–2, 21.1</i>	
II.9.1	II.48	-	<i>LT 23.2</i>	
II.16.2, 6	II.20,	-	<i>PAL II.22, 15</i>	
II.16.4–5	II.31	-	-	
II.17.2	II.52–53, 59,	88	<i>LT 36.1–38.1</i>	
II.18.1–2	II.53	-	<i>LT 40.1–3</i>	
II.19.1–2	II.59	-	<i>LT 38.1 41.1–2</i>	
II.19.3	-	-	<i>LT 39.1–3</i>	<b>new</b>
II.19.4–5	II.59		<i>LT 41.1–2</i>	
II.20.1–4	II.63	-	<i>LT 42.1–6</i>	Cameron 1983
II.21.1	II.55	-	<i>LT 48.1</i>	
II.22.1–5	II.58–59	95 <sup>66</sup>	<i>LT 44.1–45.1</i>	
II.22.6–7	II.61		<i>LT 46.1, 7</i>	
II.22.8–10	II.61		<i>LT 47.1–4</i>	
II.22.12	-	-	<i>LT 47.4</i>	<b>new</b>
II.26.1	-		<i>LT 28.1</i>	<b>new</b>
II.26.2–4	-		<i>LT 29.1–4</i>	<b>new</b>
II.31.1–4	-	-	<i>LT 69.1–4</i>	<b>new</b>
II.32.3			<i>LT 70.8, 70.11</i>	
II.32.4			<i>LT 70.13</i>	
II.32.5			<i>LT 70.16</i>	
II.36.1–2	III.1	-	<i>LT 49.1–2</i>	
II.46.1–8	II.44–46	-	<i>LT 34.1–5</i>	

<sup>66</sup> Noted in Banham and Doyle, ‘An Instrument of Confusion’, p. 34.

II.46.6–8	-	-	<b>LT 35.3</b>	<b>new</b>
II.47.2–3	-	-	<b>LT 35.5–6</b>	<b>new</b>
II.56.7–9	-	-	<b>LT 71.1–2</b>	<b>new</b>
II.59.2	-	-	<b>LT 79.3</b>	Cameron 1993 (vaguely) <sup>67</sup>
II.59.3	-	-	<b>LT 80.1</b>	
II.59.14–16	-	-	<b>LT 79.1–2</b>	

### *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.<sup>68</sup> 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.<sup>69</sup> 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*

<i>Leechbook</i>	<i>PAL</i>	Edition <sup>70</sup>	First noted by
I.1.18	I.45–46	Fradin	<b>new</b>

<sup>67</sup> 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.

<sup>68</sup> See Cameron, *Anglo-Saxon Medicine*, pp. 22, 66, 69, 83, 98.

<sup>69</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 97–98.

<sup>70</sup> The *Practica Alexandri latine* has never been completely edited. In this table 'Fradin' refers to the 1504 printing, F. Fradin, ed., *Practica Alexandri yatroz greci cum exposition glose interlinearis Jacobi de partibus et Januensis* (Lyons, 1504). A few chapters have been edited in Langslow, D., *The Latin Alexander: the Text and Transmission of a Late Latin Medical Book*, Journal of Roman Studies Monograph 10 (Oxford, 2006). Those chapters which preserve the works of Philagrios and Philumenus are edited in Puschmann, T., ed., *Nachträge zu Alexander Trallianus: Fragmente aus Philumenus und Philagrius, etc.*, Berliner Studien 5 (1886).

I.15.1	II.1.1–2	Langslow	Pettit
I.87.3	I.7	Fradin	Cameron 1993
II.1.2–3	II.14	Fradin	Cameron 1993 <sup>71</sup>
II.1.4–7	II.36–37	Langslow	*Cameron 1993 <sup>72</sup>
II.1.8–11	II.38	Fradin	<b>new</b>
II.15.1	II.48	Fradin	<b>new</b>
II.15.2–3	II.32	Fradin	<b>new</b>
II.16.2	II.22	Fradin	<b>new</b>
II.16.3	II.15	Fradin	<b>new</b>
II.16.4–5	II.31	Fradin	<b>new</b>
II.16.8	II.23	Fradin	<b>new</b>
II.21.2–5	II.57–59	Fradin	<b>new</b>
II.23.1–6	II.61–65	Fradin	<b>new</b>
II.24.2–3	II.67	Fradin	<b>new</b>
II.36.6–10	II.105–106 (Philagrius)	Puschmann	<b>new</b>
II.37.1–2	II.107–108 (Philagrius)	Puschmann	Cameron 1983
II.38.1–6	II.111 (Philagrius)	Puschmann	<b>new</b>
II.39.1–4	II.115–116 (Philagrius)	Puschmann	<b>new</b>
II.42.1–2	II.121 (Philagrius)	Puschmann	<b>new</b>
II.43.1	II.135 (Philagrius)	Puschmann	<b>new</b>
II.43.2	II.135, 128 (Philagrius)	Puschmann	<b>new</b>
II.44.1	II.142 (Philagrius)	Puschmann	<b>new</b>

<sup>71</sup> 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.

<sup>72</sup> Cameron correctly identifies OE *heortcōpu* as a translation of L. *cardiaca passio* but did not actually point out the relationship between *Leechbook* II.1.4–11 (\*wiþ heartcōpe) and *PAL* II.36–38 *De cardiaca passio*. See his *Anglo-Saxon Medicine*, pp. 97–8.

II.56.10–12	II.80 (Philuminus)	Puschmann	<b>new</b>
-------------	--------------------	-----------	------------

### *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*

Leechbook	Oribasius	First Noted by
I.2.3	<i>Syn</i> <sup>73</sup> V.37	Cameron 1993
I.2.22	<i>Eup</i> <sup>74</sup> IV.16	Cameron 1983
I.4.16	<i>Syn</i> III.175	Cameron 1983
I.18.1–4	<i>Syn</i> VI.42	<b>new</b>
II.27.1–4	<i>Syn</i> V.47	<b>new</b>
II.27.5–9	<i>Syn</i> V.53	<b>new</b>
II.27.10	<i>Syn</i> V.52	<b>new</b>
II.28.1–2	<i>Syn</i> V.38	<b>new</b>
II.29.1	<i>Syn</i> V.30	<b>new</b>
II.30.1–7	<i>Eup</i> I.9	Cameron 1983
II.59.1	<i>Syn</i> VIII.14	Cameron 1983

### *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.

<sup>73</sup> Molinier, A., ed., *Synopsis* in *Oeuvres d'Oribase*, ed. Bussemaker, U. C. and C. Daremberg, Collection des médecins grecs et latins, 6 vols. (Paris, 1851–76), V, 799 – VI, 402.

<sup>74</sup> 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

<i>Leechbook</i>	Source	Alternative	Noted by
I.1.11	<i>MDM</i> 1.61	-	Cameron 1983
I.1.15	<i>MDM</i> 11.18	-	Cameron 1983
I.1.20	<i>DHVL</i> 1	-	*
I.1.25	<b><i>MDM</i> 5.7</b>	-	<b>new</b>
I.2.1	<i>Herb.</i> 74.2	-	*
I.2.14	<i>HN</i> 29.119	-	Cameron 1993
I.2.15	<i>MDM</i> 138.9	<i>HN</i> 32.69	Cameron 1993
I.2.17	<i>MDM</i> 136.5	-	Cameron 1993
I.2.18	<i>Herb</i> 35.2	-	*
I.2.31	<i>Herb</i> 74.1	-	*
I.2.48	<i>Herb</i> 31.1	-	*
I.2.51	Cassius Felix, <i>De medicamina</i> 29.55.1	-	Cameron 1988
I.3.1	<i>DHVL</i> 3	<i>MDM</i> 9.75	*
I.3.9	<b><i>MDM</i> 9.1</b>	-	<b>new</b>
I.3.10	<i>MDM</i> 9.66		
I.3.21	Paulus Aegineta III.125	-	*Cockayne
I.4.1	<i>MDM</i> 15.53	-	Cameron 1983
I.4.2	<i>MDM</i> 15.55	-	Cameron 1983
I.4.4	<i>MDM</i> 15.54		
I.4.5–6	<i>MDM</i> 15.50–51	-	Cameron 1983

I.4.15	<i>MDM 15.45</i>	-	Cameron 1983
I.4.17–18	<i>MP I.17.1, 5</i>	-	Cameron 1983
I.6.1	<i>DHVL 7</i>	-	*
I.6.12	<i>Herb 89.1</i>		
I.9.1	<b><i>MDM 10.65</i></b>	-	new
I.11.1	<b><i>MDM 11.5</i></b>	-	new
I.15.3	<i>Herb 44.1</i>	-	Pettit
I.21.3	<i>DHVL 14</i>	-	*
I.22.1	<i>DHVL 46</i>	-	*
I.26.3	<b><i>Herb 11.2, 12.2</i></b>		new*
I.27.2	<b><i>Herb 76.3</i></b>		new*
I.27.4	<b><i>Herb 11.4</i></b>		new*
I.27.5	<b><i>Herb 45.9</i></b>		new*
I.29.1	<b><i>DHVL 40</i></b>		new*
I.29.2	<b><i>Herb 102.1</i></b>		new*
I.29.3	<b><i>Herb 122.1</i></b>		new*
I.31.4	<b><i>Herb 45.8</i></b>		new*
I.31.9	<b><i>Herb 124.1</i></b>		new*
I.38.1	<b><i>Herb 1.16</i></b>		new*
I.38.2	<b><i>Herb 1.6</i></b>		new*
I.39.5–9	<i>MP III.24.1–7</i>	PPFP III.34.4	Cameron, A&D, Pettit
I.39.10	<i>HN 28.190</i>	-	Pettit
I.43.1	<i>DHVL 25</i>	-	*
I.45.6	<b><i>Herb 1.8</i></b>		new*
I.45.7	<b><i>DHVL 42</i></b>		new*

I.45.8	<i>Herb 2.7</i>		new*
I.48.3	<i>Herb 93.2</i>		new*
I.62.5	<i>DHVL 21</i>		new*
I.62.6	<i>Herb 1.12</i>		new*
I.62.7	<i>DHVL 20</i>		new*
I.69.4	<i>Herb 1.23</i>		new*
I.71.1	<i>MEA α 5.3</i>		new*
I.78.1	<i>DHVL 37</i>		new*
I.79.1	<i>DHVL 36</i>		new*
I.80.1	<i>DHVL 31</i>		new*
I.82.1	<i>Herb 53.3</i>		new*
II.2.4	<i>Herb 1.2</i>	-	*
II.6.3	<i>Herb 93.3</i>		new*
II.17.1	<i>VEA 19</i>	-	Cameron 1983
II.25.1	Paulus Aegineta III.189	-	*Cockayne
II.30.17	<i>MEA α 1.17</i>	-	*
II.33.1	<b>Celsus 4.20</b>	-	new
II.33.8	<i>Herb 89.4</i>	-	*
II.34.8	<i>Herb 93.2</i>	-	Pettit
II.36.3	<i>VEA 20</i>	-	Cameron 1983

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.<sup>75</sup>

It is fitting to begin with the father of modern semantics, Ferdinand de Saussure, whose posthumously published *Course in General Linguistics* formed the basis for much of the linguistic inquiry of the twentieth century.<sup>76</sup> 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’.<sup>77</sup> 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.<sup>78</sup>

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.<sup>79</sup>

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

---

<sup>75</sup> Ullmann, S., *The Principles of Semantics* (Glasgow, 1957), pp. 4–6.

<sup>76</sup> De Saussure, F., *Course in General Linguistics*, trans. W. Baskin (London, 1974).

<sup>77</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 68.

<sup>78</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 67–70.

<sup>79</sup> Especially since Saussure also defines the sign as ‘mutable.’

position.’<sup>80</sup> 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 *ὕστερικός* 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.’

---

<sup>80</sup> 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 Latine* II.14, where ‘epileptias 7 spasmos 7 casus 7 tristicias sine causa’<sup>81</sup> is translated as ‘fylle wære 7 fienda adl. 7 micla murnunga 7 unrotnessa butan þearfe’.<sup>82</sup> *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’( $\phi$ )<sup>83</sup> 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.’<sup>84</sup> 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 warrantedly assertible in Archimedes’ time and is not warrantedly assertible today.”<sup>85</sup>

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.

<sup>81</sup> ‘Epilepsy and convulsions and falling and sorrows without cause.’ Fradin, ed., *Practica Alexandri*, 34v.

<sup>82</sup> ‘Falling sickness and fiends’ disease and great grieving and sadness without cause.’

<sup>83</sup> I use the ( $\phi$ ) symbol to denote a technical term in philosophical semantics which has a different meaning in historical linguistics.

<sup>84</sup> Putnam, H., ‘The Meaning of “Meaning”’ in *Language, Mind and Knowledge*, ed. K. Gunderson, Studies in the Philosophy of Science (Minnesota, 1975), pp. 215–272, esp. pp. 235–7.

<sup>85</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 236.

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.<sup>86</sup>

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.<sup>87</sup>

---

<sup>86</sup> Timofeeva, O., *Non-Finite Constructions in Old English with Special Reference to Syntactic Borrowing from Latin*, Mémoires de la Société Neophilologique de Helsinki 80 (Helsinki, 2010), pp. 8–10. Her estimates are more rigorously defended in O. Timofeeva, ‘Anglo-Latin Bilingualism before 1066’, in *Interfaces Between Language and Culture in Medieval England: A Festschrift for Matti Kilpiö*, ed. A. Hall, O. Timofeeva, Á. Kirisci and B. Fox, The Northern World 48 (Leiden, 2010), pp. 1–36.

<sup>87</sup> Loveday, L. J., *Language Contact in Japan: A Sociolinguistic History* (Oxford, 1996), pp. 19–20.

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.'<sup>88</sup>

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.'<sup>89</sup> 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.'<sup>90</sup>

It is important to note, as Timofeeva does, that 'these same people produced most of the written Old English that we know of.'<sup>91</sup> 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.<sup>92</sup> 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.<sup>93</sup>

---

<sup>88</sup> Timofeeva, *Non-Finite Constructions in Old English*, p. 9.

<sup>89</sup> Timofeeva, 'Anglo-Latin Bilingualism', p. 15.

<sup>90</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 16.

<sup>91</sup> Timofeeva, *Non-Finite Constructions in Old English*, p. 10.

<sup>92</sup> Pogatscher, A., *Zur Lautlehre der griechischen, lateinischen und romanischen Lehnworte im Altenglischen*, (Strassburg, 1888), pp. 1–15.

<sup>93</sup> Timofeeva, L., 'Anglo-Latin Bilingualism', p. 3.

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.<sup>94</sup> 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 *abbod*, *antefn* 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.<sup>95</sup>

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.<sup>96</sup>

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.

---

<sup>94</sup> Gneuss, H., ‘Anglicae linguae interpretatio: Language Contact, Lexical Borrowing and Glossing in Anglo-Saxon England’, *Proceedings of the British Academy* 82 (1992), 107–48.

<sup>95</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 114–15.

<sup>96</sup> Timofeeva, ‘Anglo-Latin Bilingualism’, p. 24.

- 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*”.’<sup>97</sup> 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).<sup>98</sup>
- 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.<sup>99</sup>

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.’<sup>100</sup> Gneuss’s findings are perhaps best represented in tabular form:

<sup>97</sup> Gneuss, ‘Anglicae linguae interpretatio’, p. 139.

<sup>98</sup> Timofeeva, ‘Anglo-Latin Bilingualism’, p. 25.

<sup>99</sup> This particular case is discussed at length in Chapter 5 (below), and also in Lois Ayoub ‘Old English *wæta*’, pp. 332–46.

<sup>100</sup> Gneuss, ‘Anglicae linguae interpretatio’, p. 141.



Table 1.1 Classes of Verbs Borrowed from Latin into Old English<sup>101</sup>

Weak I	Weak I & II	Weak II
<25%	>75%	75%

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

49%	34%	16.7%
‘ <i>ā</i> -declension’ <sup>102</sup> (m >66 %, n >14%)	weak (mostly feminine) <sup>103</sup>	feminine ‘ <i>ō</i> -declension’ <sup>104</sup>

Gneuss points out that ‘more than 40 per cent of the borrowed nouns are found in the most common inflexional type of Old English.’<sup>105</sup> 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 inflexional 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.

<sup>101</sup> The weak verb classes I and II are described in Campbell, A., *Old English Grammar* (Oxford, 1959), §§748–61.

<sup>102</sup> *a*-declension nouns are described in *Ibid.*, §§570–84.

<sup>103</sup> Weak nouns are described in *Ibid.*, §§615–19.

<sup>104</sup> *ō*-declension nouns are the primary form of the ‘strong’ feminine declension, described in *Ibid.*, §§585–98.

<sup>105</sup> Gneuss, ‘Anglicae linguae interpretatio’, p. 141.

## *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.<sup>106</sup>

[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.<sup>107</sup>

A more schematic model for this process is summarised by Timofeeva from Heine and Kuteva:<sup>108</sup>

- 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 fultomiendum*, etc.’<sup>109</sup> 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.’<sup>110</sup>

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*

---

<sup>106</sup> Thomason, S., *Language Contact*, (Edinburgh, 2001), pp. 142–6.

<sup>107</sup> Timofeeva, *Non-Finite Constructions in Old English*, p. 11.

<sup>108</sup> Heine, B., and T. Kuteva, ‘On Contact-Induced Grammaticalization’, *Studies in Language* 27 (2003), 529–72.

<sup>109</sup> Timofeeva, *Non-Finite Constructions in Old English*, pp. 73–4.

<sup>110</sup> *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 ongieltanne* and *is to understandenne*.<sup>111</sup> 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* (blood 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*).’<sup>112</sup> Old English, by

<sup>111</sup> Rissanen, M., ‘Latin Influence on an Old English Idiom’, in *Inside Old English: Essays in Honour of Bruce Mitchell*, ed. J. Walmsley (Oxford, 2006), pp. 222–41.

<sup>112</sup> Langslow, *Medical Latin*, pp. 383–93, esp pp. 383–4.

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 uomitum> cacochimia est.’<sup>113</sup> This is translated into Old English in *Leechbook* II.1.9 as ‘Gif hie þonne cumað of oþrum biterum 7 yfelum wætum þa þe wyrceað oman.’<sup>114</sup> Here the Greek noun *κακόχμια* which is transliterated as *cacochimia* is not translated by a noun but explained more diffusely with ‘þa þe wyrceað 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 wætan of þam lichoman,’<sup>115</sup> 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 *wyrcean* 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.<sup>116</sup>

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 wyrð þe hatte on superne

<sup>113</sup> ‘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.

<sup>114</sup> ‘If (nausea and vomiting) then come from other bitter and harmful humours which create unhealthy mixed humours.’

<sup>115</sup> ‘For all gatherings of the harmful fluid of the body’; de Vriend, ed. *Herbarium*, p. 164.

<sup>116</sup> Langslow, *Medical Latin*, p. 81.

*terebintina*,<sup>117</sup> 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’<sup>118</sup> 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*

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

<sup>117</sup> ‘Take that herb which is called turpentine in the south’.

<sup>118</sup> ‘Take centaury, that is earth-gall, some call it *hyrdewyrt*’.

II.30.3 nim ða wyr̥t þe <b>hatte</b> on <b>superne</b> <i>terebintina</i>	R
II.30.6 sio hwite rief̥o þe mon on <b>superne</b> lepra <b>hæt</b>	R
II.34.2 <i>Olisatrum</i> <b>hatte</b> wyr̥t	simple
II.39.3 <i>gitte</i> <b>hatte</b> <b>superne</b> wyr̥te sio is god on hlafe to þicgenne	simple
II.39.5 on þam <b>supernan</b> læcedome þe <b>hatte</b> <i>oxumelle</i>	R
II.40.1 wið <i>oxumeli</i> þone supernan eced drenc	appositive
II.43.1 on hatum wætere 7 oxumelle	simple

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 *supern* (literally 'southern') implies foreignness, or a Mediterranean origin, but also marks a loanword as in Bald's *Leechbook* I.4.5 '*galbanum* hatte superne wyr̥t' (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 hlafe to þicgenne'<sup>119</sup> 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 *supern* 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.<sup>120</sup>

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

<sup>119</sup> 'That is good to eat on bread'.

<sup>120</sup> 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.<sup>121</sup>

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.’<sup>122</sup>

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.’<sup>123</sup> 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.’<sup>124</sup>

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.

---

<sup>121</sup> For a survey of known physicians in Anglo-Saxon England see Rubin, S., *Medieval English Medicine* (Newton Abbot, 1974), pp. 98–100.

<sup>122</sup> Langslow, *Medical Latin*, p. 19.

<sup>123</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 22.

<sup>124</sup> *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.<sup>125</sup>

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

Siglum	Manuscript	Ker	Gneuss	saec.
B	Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 76	328	633	xi med
Co	Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 41	32	39	xi <sup>1</sup>
F	London, British Library, Cotton Faustina A. X	154		xii <sup>1</sup>
H585	London, British Library, Harley 585	231	421	x/xi
H55	London, British Library, Harley 55	225	412	xi <sup>1</sup>
Ju	Oxford, Bodleian Library, Junius 85	336		xi med
O	London, British Library, Harley 6258B	n/a		xii med
OF	Louvain-la-Neuve, Université Catholique de Louvain, Centre General de Documentation, Fragmenta H. Omont 3; the ‘Omont Fragment’	n/a	848	ix <sup>2</sup>
Ot	*London, British Library, Cotton Otho B. XI.	180	357	x med- xi <sup>1</sup>
Nw	London, British Library, Additional 43703, the ‘Nowell Transcript’ (copy of lost segments of above)	180	357	

<sup>125</sup> Voigts and Kurz, ed., *Scientific and Medical Writings*.



R	London, British Library, Royal 12 D. XVII	264	479	x med
T	London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius A. III	240	363	xi med
V	London, British Library, Cotton Vitellius C. III	212	402	xi <sup>1</sup>
W	London, Wellcome Historical Medical Library, 46	98 <sup>126</sup>	523	xi

## *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.<sup>127</sup> 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*)<sup>128</sup>
- 2) B21.1.1.2 The Old English *Herbal* (*OEH*)<sup>129</sup>
- 3) B21.1.1.3 The Old English *Medicina de quadrupedibus* (*MDQ*)<sup>130</sup>
- 4) B21.1.2 Plant Names<sup>131</sup>

<sup>126</sup> 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.

<sup>127</sup> Di Paulo Healey, et al., ed., *DOE Web Corpus*.

<sup>128</sup> De Vriend, ed., *Herbarium*, pp. 1–29.

<sup>129</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 30–233.

<sup>130</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 234–73.

<sup>131</sup> Ker, N. R., ed., *Catalogue of Manuscripts Containing Anglo-Saxon*, (Oxford, 1957), p. 357.

- 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*.<sup>132</sup>
- 6) B21.2.1.1.1 Table of Contents to *Leechbook I (BLB I)*<sup>133</sup>
- 7) B21.2.1.1.2 *Leechbook I (BLB I)*<sup>134</sup>
- 8) B21.2.1.2.1 Table of Contents to *Leechbook II (BLB II)*<sup>135</sup>
- 9) B21.2.1.2.2 *Leechbook II (BLB II)*<sup>136</sup>
- 10) B21.2.1.3.1 Table of Contents to *Leechbook III (Lch III)*<sup>137</sup>
- 11) B21.2.1.3.2 *Leechbook III (Lch III)*<sup>138</sup>
- 12) B21.2.3 Medical recipes from London, British Library MS. Addit. 43703, 261r.18–262r.1, 262r.2–5, 15–24.<sup>139</sup>
- 13) B21.2.4 ‘Leechbook Fragment,’ *Leechbook II.59* as reconstructed from Harley 55.<sup>140</sup>
- 14) B21.3 *Lacnunga*.<sup>141</sup>
- 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.<sup>142</sup>
- 16) B21.5.1 ‘Wið eah wærce’ A single recipe for an ear salve from Cambridge, Corpu Christi College 41, p. 288. The eleventh-century manuscript contains the Old English version of Bede’s *Historia Ecclesiastica*.<sup>143</sup>
- 17) B21.5.2 Five medical recipes from a single leaf now held in London, Wellcome Medical Historical Library, Manuscript 46.<sup>144</sup>
- 18) B21.5.3 Single recipe *to wensealfe* (for a wen-salve) from London, British Librar, Cotton Domitian I, 55v.<sup>145</sup>
- 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.<sup>146</sup>

---

<sup>132</sup> Printed in Cockayne, ed., *Leechdoms I*, 380–2.

<sup>133</sup> *Ibid.*, II, 1–16.

<sup>134</sup> *Ibid.*, II, 18–156.

<sup>135</sup> *Ibid.*, II, 158–74.

<sup>136</sup> *Ibid.*, II, 175–299.

<sup>137</sup> *Ibid.*, II, 300–4.

<sup>138</sup> *Ibid.*, II, 304–58.

<sup>139</sup> Torkar, R., ‘Zu den ae. Medizinaltexten in Otho B.xi und Royal 12. D. XVII, mit einer Edition der Unica (Ker, No. 180 art. 11a-d)’, *Anglia* 94 (1976), 319–38.

<sup>140</sup> Cockayne, ed., *Leechdoms II*, 280–88.

<sup>141</sup> Grattan and Singer, ed., *Lacnunga*. This edition has been superseded by Pettit, ed., *Lacnunga*.

<sup>142</sup> Cockayne, ed., *Leechdoms III*, 146. The text has been reedited twice by Chardonnens, L. S. ‘A New Edition of the Old English “Formation of the Foetus”’, *Notes and Queries* 47 (2000), 10–11 and Chardonnens, L. S. *Anglo-Saxon Prognostics, 900–1100* (Leiden, 2007), p. 229.

<sup>143</sup> Ker, *Catalogue*, no. 32.8, pp. 43–5. The text is printed in Cockayne, ed., *Leechdoms I*, 382.

<sup>144</sup> Napier, ‘Altenglische Miscellen’, pp. 323–7.

<sup>145</sup> Cockayne, ed., *Leechdoms I*, 382.

<sup>146</sup> *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.<sup>147</sup>
- 21) B21.5.6 Recipes transcribed by Humphrey Wanley.<sup>148</sup>
- 22) B21.5.7 A single eleventh-century recipe *Wip þa blegene* (for blains) added in a blank space to London, British Library Cotton Titus D. XXVI, 16v.<sup>149</sup>
- 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.<sup>150</sup>
- 24) B21.5.9.1 A marginal veterinary remedy for lung disease in cattle from Cotton Vitellius E. XVIII. f. 15v.<sup>151</sup>
- 25) B21.5.9.2 A marginal veterinary remedy for sheep from Cotton Vitellius E. XVIII. 15v.<sup>152</sup>
- 26) B21.5.10 The Omont fragment.<sup>153</sup>
- 27) B21.6.1 Medical and botanical Texts in Dresden Sächsische Landesbibliothek, Dc. 187.<sup>154</sup>
- 28) B21.6.2 Medical and botanical Texts in Dresden Sächsische Landesbibliothek, Dc. 185.<sup>155</sup>
- 29) B21.6.2 *Peri didaxeon* (*Peri D*)<sup>156</sup>

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:

---

<sup>147</sup> Also printed in Cockayne, ed., *Leechdoms* III, 292.

<sup>148</sup> Wanley, H ‘*Librorum veterum septentrionalium catalogus*’, in *Linguarum veterum septentrionalium thesaurus grammatico-criticus et archæologicus*, ed. G. Hickes (Oxford, 1703–5), II, 231.

<sup>149</sup> Ker, *Catalogue*, no. 202.c, pp. 202–6. Text printed in Cockayne, ed., *Leechdoms* I, 380.

<sup>150</sup> 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.

<sup>151</sup> Ker, *Catalogue*, no. 224.n, printed in Cockayne, ed., *Leechdoms* I, 388.

<sup>152</sup> Ker, *Catalogue*, no. 224.o, printed in Cockayne, ed., *Leechdoms* I, 388.

<sup>153</sup> Schauman and Cameron, ‘A Newly-Found Leaf’, pp. 289–312.

<sup>154</sup> Manitius, M., ‘Angelsächsische Glossen in Dresdner Handschriften’, *Anglia* 24 (1901), 428–35 at pp. 428–31.

<sup>155</sup> *Ibid.*, 432.

<sup>156</sup> Löweneck, M., ed., *Peri Didaxeon: Eine Sammlung von Rezepten in Englischer Sprache aus dem 11./12. Jarhundert. Nach einer Handschrift des Britischen Museums*, Erlanger Beiträge zur Englischen Philologie und Vergleichenden Literaturgeschichte 12 (Erlanger, 1896).

135.1 Wyþ nyrwyt 7 banece 7 wið **wæt** man earfoþlice gemigan mæge.<sup>157</sup>

The word is *wæt* in the *DOEC*, either mistranscribed, or based on Cockayne's reading,<sup>158</sup> but read as *þæt* by de Vriend,<sup>159</sup> 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 banece 7 wið **þæt** man earfo þlice gemigan mæge.'<sup>160</sup>

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)<sup>161</sup>

A43.2 'The Nine Herbs Charm' (*Lacnunga* 76)<sup>162</sup>

A43.3 'Against a Dwarf' (*Lacnunga* 86).<sup>163</sup>

A43.4 'For a Sudden Stitch' (*Lacnunga* 127)<sup>164</sup>

A43.5 'For Loss of Cattle' (*Lacnunga* 149)<sup>165</sup>

A43.6 'For Delayed Birth' (*Lacnunga* 161–3)<sup>166</sup>

<sup>157</sup> 'For narrowness [of breath] and bone-ache and for urine one may urinate painfully.'

<sup>158</sup> Cockayne, ed., *Leechdoms* I, 50.

<sup>159</sup> De Vriend, ed., *Herbarium*, p. 22.

<sup>160</sup> D'Aronco and Cameron, *Old English Illustrated Pharmacopoeia*, 16va.

<sup>161</sup> Dobbie, E. V. K., ed., *The Anglo-Saxon Minor Poems*, ASPR 6 (London, 1942), pp. 116–18.

<sup>162</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 119–21. The *DOEC* also lists Grattan and Singer, ed., *Lacnunga*, pp. 151–7. This edition has been superseded by Pettit, ed., *Lacnunga* I, 60–69. In Grattan and Singer, the text is numbered 79–82. Pettit's numbering of the *Lacnunga* chapters will be used throughout.

<sup>163</sup> Dobbie, ed., *Minor Poems*, pp. 121–2; Grattan and Singer, ed., *Lacnunga*, pp. 160–3; Pettit, ed., *Lacnunga* I, 72–5.

<sup>164</sup> Dobbie, ed., *Minor Poems*, pp. 122–3; Grattan and Singer, ed., *Lacnunga*, pp. 172–7; Pettit, ed., *Lacnunga* I, 90–5.

<sup>165</sup> Dobbie, ed., *Minor Poems*, p. 123; Grattan and Singer, ed., *Lacnunga*, pp. 182–3; Pettit, ed., *Lacnunga* I, 102–3.

<sup>166</sup> Dobbie, ed., *Minor Poems*, pp. 123–4; Grattan and Singer, ed., *Lacnunga*, pp. 188–91; Pettit, ed., *Lacnunga* I, 112–15.

A43.7 ‘For the Water-Elf Disease’ (*Leechbook* III.63)<sup>167</sup>

A43.8 ‘For a Swarm of Bees’ (Marginal Charm from Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 41)<sup>168</sup>

A43.9 ‘For Theft of Cattle’ (Marginal Charm from CCCC 41).<sup>169</sup>

A43.10 ‘For Loss of Cattle’ (Marginal Charm from CCCC 41).<sup>170</sup>

A43.11 ‘A Journey Charm’ (Marginal Charm from CCCC 41).<sup>171</sup>

A43.12 ‘Against a Wen’ (Marginal Charm from London, British Library Royal 4. A. XIV)<sup>172</sup>

Of these twelve texts, items 2–7 and 12 are specifically medical, in that they are concerned with the preservation of health.<sup>173</sup> 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.

### *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

---

<sup>167</sup> Dobbie, ed., *Minor Poems*, pp. 124–5; Cockayne, ed., *Leechdoms* II, 350–2.

<sup>168</sup> Dobbie, ed., *Minor Poems*, p. 125.

<sup>169</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 125–6.

<sup>170</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 126

<sup>171</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 126–8

<sup>172</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 128.

<sup>173</sup> On the medical nature of the Dwarf charms see C. Doyle, ‘*Dweorg* in Old English: Aspects of Disease Terminology’, *Quaestio Insularis* 9 (2009), 99–117.

not delivered because it turns into a disease deadly to her in her womb, most often on a Tuesday night.’<sup>174</sup>

In its *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 *De gynaecia*.<sup>175</sup> 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 *Gynaecia* has been paraphrased and circulated as an isolated fragment of scholarly interest in an early ninth-century manuscript.<sup>176</sup>

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 *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 *Herbal*, *Medicina de quadrupedibus* and the *Lacnunga*. The *Lacnunga* is, however, problematic in that it includes many items of a non-medical nature alongside its many medical prescriptions.

Indeed, even Bald’s *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

---

<sup>174</sup> 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, *Anglo-Saxon Prognostics, 900–1100*, p. 8.

<sup>175</sup> Rose, V., ed., *Theodori Prisciani Euporiston libri III cum Physicorum fragmento et additamentis Pseudo-Theodori, accedunt Vindiciani Afri quae feruntur reliquiae* (Leipzig, 1894), pp. 452–4. See also L. Cilliers, ‘Vindicianus Gynaecia: Text and Translation of the Codex Monacensis (Clm 4622)’, *Journal of Medieval Latin* 15 (2005), 153–236.

<sup>176</sup> Bremmer, R. H. J., ‘Leiden, Vossianus Lat. Q. 69 (part 2): Schoolbook or Proto-Encyclopaedic Miscellany’, in *Practice in Learning: The Transfer of Encyclopaedic Knowledge in the Early Middle Ages*, ed. R. H. J. Bremmer and K. Dekker (Paris, 2010), pp. 19–54.

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.<sup>177</sup>

#### Manuscript Witnesses.

R: London, British Library, Royal 12. D. XVII

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.<sup>178</sup>

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.<sup>179</sup>

---

<sup>177</sup> Cockayne, ed., *Leechdoms II*, 2–299. The text has been reproduced by Leonhardi, *Kleinere angelsächsische Denkmäler*, BDASP 6 (Kassel, 1905) pp. 1–109, though this is merely a reproduction of Cockayne's text. The text has been edited by Deegan as a PhD dissertation: M. Deegan, 'A Critical Edition of MS B.L. Royal 12. D. XVII, Bald's *Leechbook*' (Unpubl. PhD dissertation, University of Manchester, 1988). The proposed edition by D'Aronco and Cameron has been 'forthcoming' for over 20 years.

<sup>178</sup> Ker, *Catalogue*, p. 333.

<sup>179</sup> *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 placed 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,<sup>180</sup> although this text was probably compiled too late to have been available to the translators of Bald's *Leechbook*.<sup>181</sup> 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

---

<sup>180</sup> Talbot, 'Notes on Anglo-Saxon Medicine', pp. 156–69; Cameron, 'The Sources of Medical Knowledge'; Cameron, 'Bald's *Leechbook*', pp. 164–5.

<sup>181</sup> 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.<sup>182</sup> 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',<sup>183</sup> 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.<sup>184</sup>

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.<sup>185</sup> The difference between fifty and twenty-one seems to be a difference in opinion regarding what constitutes a single recipe, and

<sup>182</sup> Meaney, 'Variant Versions', pp. 238–9.

<sup>183</sup> *Ibid.*, Ker rather loosely dates the fragment to s. x med–xi<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>184</sup> Wormald, P., 'BL, Cotton Ms Otho B. XI: A Supplementary Note', *Legal Culture in the Early Medieval West* (London, 1999), pp. 71–80; originally published as an appendix to Rumble, A. R., 'The Known Manuscripts of the Burghal Hidage', in *The Defence of Wessex*, eds. D. Hill and A. R. Rumble (Manchester, 1996), pp. 59–68.

<sup>185</sup> Ker, *Catalogue*, pp. 232–3; Meaney, 'Variant Versions' p. 246.

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*.’<sup>186</sup>

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.’<sup>187</sup> 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.’<sup>188</sup>

### 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.<sup>189</sup>

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

Bald’s <i>Leechbook</i>	Variant	Latin Source
I.1.4	<i>Lacn</i> 3	<i>PPB</i> 1.23, <i>PPFP</i> I.1.23
I.1.5	<i>Lacn</i> 1	-
I.1.6	<i>Lacn</i> 2	-
I.2.33	* <i>Lacn</i> 13	<i>PPB</i> 17.5, <i>PPFP</i> I.15.5
I.2.34	<i>Lacn</i> 105	-
I.2.42	<i>Lacn</i> 6	-
I.4.1	<i>Lacn</i> 108	-

<sup>186</sup> Meaney, ‘Variant Versions’, p. 261.

<sup>187</sup> Schauman and Cameron, ‘A Newly-Found Leaf’, p. 301.

<sup>188</sup> Meaney, ‘Variant Versions’, pp. 243–4.

<sup>189</sup> Pettit, ed., *Lacnunga* I, 163–5.

I.7.1	<i>*Lacn 102</i>	<i>DHVL 30 (OEH 1.13)</i>
I.15.1	<i>Lacn 173</i>	<i>PAL 2.1.1</i>
I.15.2	<i>Lacn 173</i>	-
I.15.3	<i>Lacn 174</i>	<i>Herb. 45.1 (OEH 46.1)</i>
I.15.4	<i>Lacn 175</i>	-
I.17.1	<i>Lacn 177</i>	-
I.17.2–3	<i>Lacn 178</i>	-
I.17.4	<i>Lacn 179</i>	-
I.17.5	<i>Lacn 180</i>	-
I.21.3	<i>*Lacn 116</i>	<i>DHVL 14 (OEH 1.9)</i>
I.22.1	<i>*Lacn 109</i>	<i>DHVL 46 (OEH 1.10)</i>
I.24.1	<i>Lacn 37</i>	-
I.32.6	<i>Lacn 36</i>	-
I.34.1	<i>Lacn 140</i>	-
I.39.t–1	<i>Lacn 87</i>	-
I.39.2	<i>Lacn 89</i>	-
I.39.3	<i>Lacn 90</i>	-
I.39.4	<i>Lacn 91</i>	-
I.39.5	<i>Lacn 92</i>	<i>MP III.24.1, PPFP III 34.4</i>
I.39.6	<i>Lacn 93</i>	<i>MP 24.3</i>
I.39.7	<i>Lacn 94</i>	<i>MP 24.4</i>
I.39.8	<i>Lacn 95</i>	<i>MP 24.7</i>
I.39.9	<i>Lacn 96</i>	<i>MP 24.7</i>
I.39.10	<i>Lacn 97</i>	<i>HN 28.190</i>
I.39.11	<i>Lacn 98</i>	<i>HN 30.34</i>

I.39.12	<i>Lacn</i> 99	-
I.45.14	<i>Lacn</i> 64 ll 301–10	Latin Prayer (Canterbury Classbook)
I.45.15	* <i>Lacn</i> 25, 63	-
I.50.5	<i>Lacn</i> 138	-
I.50.6	<i>Lacn</i> 139	-
I.83.1	<i>Lacn</i> 113	-
I.88.6	<i>Lacn</i> 111	-
II.34.8	<i>Lacn</i> 122	-

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.<sup>190</sup>

### 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

<sup>190</sup> Cockayne, ed., *Leechdoms II*, 300–60; Leonhardi, *Klienere angelsächsische Denkmäler*, pp. 1–109; B. M. Olds, 'The Anglo-Saxon *Leechbook III*: A Critical Edition and Translation' (unpubl. PhD dissertation University of Denver, 1984).

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.<sup>191</sup>

## 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.<sup>192</sup> 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.

---

<sup>191</sup> De Vriend, ed., *Herbarium*.

<sup>192</sup> 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.<sup>193</sup> 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,’<sup>194</sup> 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.<sup>195</sup>

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.<sup>196</sup> 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*.

---

<sup>193</sup> Hecht, H., ed., *Bischof Wærferths von Worcester Übersetzung der Dialoge Gregors des großen*, BDASP 5 (Darmstadt, 1900–7), pp. ix–x; de Vriend, ed., *Herbarium*, pp. xx–xxiii.

<sup>194</sup> Ker, *Catalogue*, pp. xx–xxiii.

<sup>195</sup> Franzen, *The Tremulous Hand of Worcester*, pp. 66–7.

<sup>196</sup> De Vriend, ed., *Herbarium*, pp. xxiii–xxviii; Pettit, ed., *Lacnunga*.

O: London, British Library, Harley 6258B, s. xii med.

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.<sup>197</sup> 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.<sup>198</sup>

The *Herbal* has been rearranged to follow the alphabetical order of the Latin names of the plants on fols 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.<sup>199</sup> The *Medicina de quadrupedibus* occurs on fols 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 Platonius, while the remaining fifty-nine chapters are translated from the *Liber medicinae ex herbis femininis*, attributed to Pedanius Dioscorides of Anaxarbus. Of these three Latin texts, two are printed by Howald and Sigerist,<sup>200</sup> while the pseudo-Dioscorides remains unedited, with the exception of those parallels identified by De Vriend with the Old English *Herbal*.<sup>201</sup>

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

---

<sup>197</sup> Ker, *Catalogue*, p. xix.

<sup>198</sup> De Vriend, ed., *Herbarium*, pp. xxviii–xxxviii.

<sup>199</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. xxxviii–xliv.

<sup>200</sup> Howald, E., and H. E. Sigerist, ed., *Antonii Musae De herba uettonica liber. Pseudo-Apulei Herbarius. Anonymi De taxone liber. Sexti Placiti Liber medicinae ex animalibus*, CML 4 (Leipzig, 1927), pp. 1–233

<sup>201</sup> There are in fact two single-manuscript editions of the text by Hans Zotter and Heinrich Kästner respectively: Kästner, H. F., 'Pseudo-Dioscoridis de herbis femininis', *Hermes* 31 (1896–7), 587–636; Zotter, H., ed., *Antike Medizin* (Vienna, 1980).



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.<sup>202</sup> The remaining twelve chapters are a translation of the shorter  $\alpha$ -recension of the *Liber medicinae ex animalibus* as found in Howald and Sigerist.<sup>203</sup>

## 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.<sup>204</sup> The *Medicina de quadrupedibus* with its frequent prescription of animal faeces typifies the kind of medieval *Drekapothek* 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<sup>1</sup>: continuation of the charms, which, according to Ker, were not part of the original manuscript.

---

<sup>202</sup> De Vriend, ed., *Herbarium*, p. lxiv.

<sup>203</sup> Howald and Sigerist, ed., *Herbarius*, pp. 235–86.

<sup>204</sup> Voigts, ‘Anglo-Saxon Plant Remedies’, pp. 255–9 and 266–8.

## 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.<sup>205</sup>

- 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*<sup>206</sup>
- 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.'<sup>207</sup> 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.'<sup>208</sup> In contrast with the previous scholarship, which stresses the

---

<sup>205</sup> Pettit, ed., *Lacnunga* I, 161–2.

<sup>206</sup> Referred to as the *Medicina de quadrupedibus* by Pettit.

<sup>207</sup> Pettit, ed., *Lacnunga* I, 27.

<sup>208</sup> *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.’<sup>209</sup>

The text is not completely Old English, but contains significant passages in Latin, as well as some corrupt Old Irish charms.<sup>210</sup>

### 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.<sup>211</sup>

## 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 Petrocillus 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.<sup>212</sup>

## 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.<sup>213</sup>

---

<sup>209</sup> *Ibid.*, 96–97.

<sup>210</sup> *Ibid.*, 29–32.

<sup>211</sup> Cockayne, ed., *Leechdoms* III, 81–145; Löweneck, ed., *Peri didaxeon*; Maion, D., ‘Edizione, traduzione e commento del Peri Didaxeon: Cultura e tradizioni letterarie del mondo germanico antico e medievale’ (unpubl. PhD dissertation, Università degli Studi Roma Tre, 1999).

<sup>212</sup> Maion, ‘Fortune of the *Practica Petrocilli*’, pp. 397–9.

<sup>213</sup> Glaze, F. E. ‘The Perforated Wall: The Ownership and Circulation of Medical Books in Europe c. 800–1200’ (unpubl. PhD Dissertation, Duke University, 2000).

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.’<sup>214</sup>

### *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,<sup>215</sup> and a translation into modern English as well as a bibliography of relevant literature is available in the comprehensive Wellcome catalogue description.<sup>216</sup>

### 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

---

<sup>214</sup> Maion, ‘Fortune of the *Practica Petrocelli*’, p., 507.

<sup>215</sup> See B21.5.2 in the description of the *DOEC*, item 17 on p. 43 above.

<sup>216</sup> *Wellcome Library Online Catalogue of Manuscripts*, ed. J. Simpson, <http://archives.wellcome.ac.uk> (viewed 30 April, 2010); based on S.A.J. Moorat, *Catalogue of Western Manuscripts on Medicine and Science in the Wellcome Historical Medical Library* (London, 1962–73).

are catalogued by Voigts and Kurz as three separate items: 0105.00, 0167.00 and 0032.00.<sup>217</sup> 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 sona sel.’<sup>218</sup>

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 oþþe oþer lim feower cræftas 7 hu mon spelcean scyle.’<sup>219</sup>

*Leechbook* I.25.2 would be the second remedy in Chapter 25 of *Leechbook* I: ‘Gif scancan synd forode nim banwyrht gecnuwa geot æges þæt hwite meng tosomne scancforedum men.’<sup>220</sup>

---

<sup>217</sup> Voigts and Kurtz, ed., ‘Scientific and Medical Writings in Old and Middle English.’

<sup>218</sup> ‘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.

<sup>219</sup> ‘Treatments for pain of the shins and if the shins or another limb are broken, and how one should splint it.’

<sup>220</sup> ‘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.<sup>221</sup> Of great utility are Beccaria's catalogue of pre-Salernitan manuscripts and Corsetti, Sabbah and Fischer's bibliography of medieval Latin medical texts.<sup>222</sup>

### *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.<sup>223</sup> Three distinct

---

<sup>221</sup> Langslow, *Medical Latin*, pp. 60–75. The four authors analysed in his linguistic study are described in greater detail on pp. 41–60.

<sup>222</sup> A. Beccaria, *I codici di medicina del periodo presalernitano* (Rome, 1956); Corsetti, P.-P., K.-D. Fischer and G. Sabbah, ed., *Bibliographie des textes médicaux latins: Antiquité et haut moyen âge* (Saint-Étienne, 1987).

<sup>223</sup> Howald and Sigerist, eds., *Herbarius*.

recensions of the complex,  $\alpha$ ,  $\beta$  and  $\gamma$ , have been identified by Howald and Sigerist, who posit a shared archetype for  $\beta$  and  $\gamma$  given the similarity between them, while they describe the witnesses of class  $\alpha$  as preserving the text in ‘*pristinam formam*’.<sup>224</sup> Recension  $\beta$  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  $\gamma$  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  $\alpha$  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  $\beta$  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 Laurenxiana pl. LXXIII 41 (s. ix) [89], Vatican City, Bibl. Apostolica cod. Barberiniano lat. 160 (s. xi) [108], Breslau, Bibl. di Stato e dell’Unioversità 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  $\gamma$  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].<sup>225</sup>

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  $\alpha$  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  $\alpha$  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*.<sup>226</sup> The truncated  $\beta$  and  $\gamma$  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 uettonica*

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

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

<sup>226</sup> Howald and Sigerist, ed., *Herbarius*, pp. 3–11.

*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.<sup>227</sup> This is the only text for which Howald and Sigerist used an Old English reading to improve their Latin text.<sup>228</sup> It is worth noting that recipes from the full  $\alpha$  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.<sup>229</sup>

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.<sup>230</sup> 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.<sup>231</sup> Two single-manuscript editions are extant by Hans Zotter and Heinrich Kästner respectively.<sup>232</sup>

The *Liber de taxone* is an epistle purportedly from Idpartus 'rex Aegyptiorum' to the emperor 'Octavius Augusto' concerning the medicinal uses of the various parts of the badger. Howald and Sigerist present the  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  recensions in parallel. The  $\alpha$  recension is that presented as the first chapter of the Old English *Medicina de quadrupedibus*, while the  $\beta$  recension contains additional recipes.<sup>233</sup>

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

---

<sup>227</sup> De Vriend, ed., *Herbarium*, pp. lvi–lvii; Howald and Sigerist, ed., *Herbarius*, p. xxi.

<sup>228</sup> Howald and Sigerist, ed., *Herbarius*, p. ix.

<sup>229</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 22–225.

<sup>230</sup> Langslow, *Medical Latin*, p. 71.

<sup>231</sup> Beccaria, *I codici di medicina del periodo presalernitano*.

<sup>232</sup> Corsetti, Fischer and Sabbah, ed., *Bibliographie des textes médicaux latins*, pp. 70–1; Kästner, ed., 'Pseudo-Dioscoridis de herbis femininis' and Zotter, H., ed., *Antike Medizin*. Parallel text to the Old English *Herbal* chs. 133–85 is in de Vriend, ed., *Herbarium* pp. 175–233.

<sup>233</sup> Howald and Sigerist, ed., *Herbarius*, pp. 229–32.

<sup>234</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 235–69.

<sup>235</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 270–86.



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

## 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. xi<sup>2/4</sup>), London, British Library, Harley 647 (Gneuss 423, s. ix2/4), London, British Library, Harley 2506 (Gneuss 428.4, s. xi1) 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.<sup>237</sup> 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.<sup>238</sup>

### iii. *Physica Plinii*

The *Physica Plinii* was extended from the *Medicina Plinii* in four extant recensions:

*Bambergensis*,<sup>239</sup> *Eporediensis*, *Sangallensis*, *Florentino-Pragensis*,<sup>240</sup> and an Anglo-Saxon recension

---

<sup>236</sup> De Vriend, ed., *Herbarium*, p. lxiv. Parallel text to the Old English *Medicina de quadrupedibus*, ch. 2 is presented at pp. 238–41.

<sup>237</sup> Önnorfors, A., ed., *Plinii Secundi Iunioris qui feruntur de medicina libri tres*, CML 3 (Berlin, 1964).

<sup>238</sup> Beccaria, *I codici di medicina del periodo presalernitano*, nos. 49, 51, 55, 105, 108, 115, 133 and 134.

<sup>239</sup> Önnorfors, A., ed., *Physica Plinii Bambergensis*, Bibliotheca Graeca et Latina suppletoria curantibus 2 (Hildesheim, 1975).

<sup>240</sup> Schmitz, G., ed., *Physicae quae fertur Plinii Florentino-Pragensis liber tertius*, Lateinische Sprache und Literatur des 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*.<sup>241</sup> 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* I.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*.<sup>242</sup> 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 humoralism. The whole of the *Etymologiae* has been published several times,<sup>243</sup> and the books of medical relevance have also been excerpted and subjected to separate medical-historical scrutiny.<sup>244</sup> 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*.<sup>245</sup>

---

*Florentino-Pragensis liber secundus*, Lateinische Sprache und Literatur des Mittelalters 21 (Frankfurt am Main, 1985); Winkler, J., ed., *Physicae que fertur Plinii Florentino-Pragensis liber primus*, Lateinische Sprache und Literatur des Mittelalters 17 (Frankfurt, 1984).

<sup>241</sup> Adams and Deegan, 'Bald's *Leechbook* and the *Physica Plinii*', pp. 87–114.

<sup>242</sup> See Pettit's commentary to *Lacnunga* 98 in Pettit, ed., *Lacnunga* II, 202.

<sup>243</sup> For a recent edition, see Oroz Reta, J., and M. A. Marcos Casquero, eds., *Etymologías: edición bilingüe San Isidoro de Sevilla*, Biblioteca de autores cristianos (Madrid, 1994).

<sup>244</sup> Sharpe, W. D., ed., *Isidore of Seville, the Medical Writings: an English Translation*, Transactions of the American Philosophical Society: New Series LIV/2 (Philadelphia, 1964).

<sup>245</sup> Schmid, P., *Contributions à la critique du texte de Caelius Aurelianus*, (Neuchâtel, 1942), pp. 40–2; Cilliers, 'Vindicianus *Gynaecia*', pp. 158–9.

Of the medical manuscripts catalogued by Beccaria, two manuscripts contain excerpts from multiple books of the *Etymologiae*.<sup>246</sup> A further eleven manuscripts contain extracts from Book IV,<sup>247</sup> and five further manuscripts contain extracts from Book XVI,<sup>248</sup> whilst chapter 2 of Book XV is recorded in a single Parisian medical manuscript.<sup>249</sup> 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).<sup>250</sup> Langslow dates the composition of *De medicina* to ca. 14–39 AD.<sup>251</sup> Although there are few manuscript survivals of *De medicina* from the pre-Salernitan period,<sup>252</sup> 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.'<sup>253</sup> Eliza Glaze notes that annotated copies of the text may

<sup>246</sup> Vienna, Nationalbibliothek cod. 9 & 10 [Beccaria 2] contains multiple extracts from Book IV, as well as Book XVII chapters 9–11, while Paris, Bibliothèque National, Fonds latin 11219 [Beccaria 35] contains extracts from Books XVI and XX.

<sup>247</sup> Beccaria numbers 6, 16, 50, 67, 73, 78, 84, 95, 96, 108 and 134.

<sup>248</sup> Beccaria numbers 26, 51, 66, 94 and 120.

<sup>249</sup> Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale fonds latin 11218, Beccaria 34.

<sup>250</sup> Corsetti, Fischer and Sabbah, ed., *Bibliographie des textes médicaux latins*, nos. 122–40; Langslow, *Medical Latin*, pp. 41–8. The original CML volume, Marx, F., ed., *Auli Cornelii Celsi quae supersunt*, CML 1 (Leipzig, 1915) has been superseded by Spencer, W. G., ed., *Celsus, De medicina* (London, 1938).

<sup>251</sup> Langslow, *Medical Latin*, pp. 43–4.

<sup>252</sup> Beccaria notes one manuscript containing excerpts, no. 29 and only two manuscripts of the entire text, nos. 88 and 102.

<sup>253</sup> Langslow, *Medical Latin*, p. 64; Vollmer, F., ed., *Quinti Sereni Liber medicinalis*, CML 2 (Leipzig, 1916).

have been used to teach metrics, rather than medicine.<sup>254</sup> 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 *Catalogue*: Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale lat. 4839 (Gneuss 884), copied at the turn of the eleventh century.

### 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 *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.'<sup>255</sup> Medical works ascribed to him include:

- a) *Epistula Vindiciani comitis archiatrorum ad Valentianum imperatorem*, being a collection of pharmaceutical recipes often transmitted with the works of Marcellus.<sup>256</sup>
- b) *Epistula ad Pentadium nepotem*, being an elementary account of physiology based on the theory of the four humours.<sup>257</sup> 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.<sup>258</sup>
- c) A complex of shorter works on anatomy and physiology, *De natura generis humani*,<sup>259</sup> *Gynaecia*<sup>260</sup> and *Epitome altera*<sup>261</sup> which 'must be reckoned as the standard text(s) on anatomy and physiology in the pre-Salernitan period.'<sup>262</sup> The *Gynaecia* survives in twelve of Beccaria's manuscripts,<sup>263</sup> whilst the *Epitome altera* survives in only four from the period in question.<sup>264</sup> Beccaria does not catalogue any witnesses of *De natura generis humani*.

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

<sup>254</sup> Glaze, 'The Perforated Wall', pp. 71–2 and 103. The text nevertheless survives in whole or in fragments in fourteen manuscripts catalogued in Beccaria, *I codici di medicina del periodo presalernitano*, nos. 7, 17, 18, 20, 30, 32, 52, 55, 87, 103, 104, 108, 109, 114, 120, 129 and 141.

<sup>255</sup> Langslow, *Medical Latin*, pp. 64–5.

<sup>256</sup> Niedermann, M., ed., *Marcelli De medicamentis liber*, 2nd ed. by E., Liechtenhan, CML 5 (Berlin, 1968), pp., 46–53.

<sup>257</sup> Rose, ed., *Theodorus Priscianus*, pp. 484–92.

<sup>258</sup> Beccaria numbers 2, 6, 16, 34, 40, 41, 48, 55, 70, 73, 84, 95, 96, 101, 106, 108, 117, 129, 133 and 137.

<sup>259</sup> Vázquez Bújan, M. E., 'Vindiciano y el tratado *De natura generis humani*', *Dynamis* 2 (1982) pp. 25–56.

<sup>260</sup> Rose, ed., *Theodorus Priscianus*, pp. 425–66.

<sup>261</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 467–83.

<sup>262</sup> Langslow, *Medical Latin*, p. 65.

<sup>263</sup> Beccaria numbers 5, 16, 21, 34, 73, 84, 88, 94, 95, 96, 108 and 133.

<sup>264</sup> Beccaria numbers 29, 103, 117 and 129.

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.<sup>265</sup>

As noted by Cameron, Bede paraphrases a chapter of Vindicianus' *Epistula ad Pentadium nepotem* in chapter 35 of his *De temporum ratione*, dealing with the relationship between the four elements and the four humours, and the psychological characteristic engendered by each temperament.<sup>266</sup>

#### 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).<sup>267</sup>

Chapter 48 of *De medicina* (*Ad dysenteriam*) is quoted by Bede in the *Retractio in Actus apostolorum*, according to Cameron.<sup>268</sup> 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.<sup>269</sup>

#### 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.'<sup>270</sup>

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*

---

<sup>265</sup> Bremmer, 'Leiden, Vossianus Lat. Q. 69', pp. 34–5; Chardonnens, 'A New Edition of the Old English "Formation of the Foetus"', pp. 10–11; Chardonnens, *Anglo-Saxon Prognostics*, p. 229, see also Cilliers, 'Vindicianus *Gynaecia*', pp. 154–60; Rose, ed., *Theodorus Priscianus*, pp. 452–4.

<sup>266</sup> Rose, ed., *Theodorus Priscianus*, pp. 488–9; Cameron, 'The Sources of Medical Knowledge'; Jones, C. W., ed., *Beda's opera didascalica*, CCSL 123 (Turnholt, 1975–80), 241–544.

<sup>267</sup> Langslow, *Medical Latin*, p. 57; Rose, V., ed., *Cassii Felicis De medicina: ex graecis logicae sectae auctoribus liber, translatus sub Artabure et Calepio consulibus (anno 447) / nunc primum editus a Valentino Rose.*, Bibliotheca scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana (Leipzig, 1879).

<sup>268</sup> Cameron, 'Sources of Medical Knowledge', p. 146.

<sup>269</sup> Beccaria numbers 47, 50, 64 and 130.

<sup>270</sup> Langslow, *Medical Latin*, pp. 66–7.

*temporum ratione* on equinoxes and solstices, describing the dominance of each humour in turn over the course of the seasons.<sup>271</sup> Beccaria notes only four manuscripts of Marcellus from the period in question, two of which are relatively complete.<sup>272</sup>

## 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.<sup>273</sup>

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.<sup>274</sup>

b) *Ad Glauconem 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,<sup>275</sup> and fragments of Book II by Alois Fauser.<sup>276</sup> As noted by Fischer, nineteen of the manuscripts catalogued by Beccaria transmit Galen's *Ad Glauconem*, suggesting that it was a very popular medical text at the time.<sup>277</sup> 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 Glauconem 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 Glauconem* 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 Glauconem* were not also a source, but this is difficult to verify at present.

---

<sup>271</sup> Migne, J.-P., ed., *Venerabilis Bedae Anglo-Saxonis presbyteri Opera Omnia*, PL 90 (Paris, 1850), pp. 457–62; Niedermann and Leichtenhan, ed., *Marcelli De medicamentis liber*; Cameron, 'Sources of Medical Knowledge' p. 146.

<sup>272</sup> 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.

<sup>273</sup> Langslow, *Medical Latin*, p. 71.

<sup>274</sup> Palmieri, N., ed., *L'antica versione latina del 'De Sectis' di Galeno (Pal. lat. 1090)*, Testi e studi di cultura classica proposita da Giorgio Brugnoli e Guido Paduano 7 (Pisa, 1989).

<sup>275</sup> Sigerist, H., 'Early Mediaeval Medical Texts in Manuscripts of Montpellier', *Bulletin of the History of Medicine* 10 (1941), 24–47, at pp. 36–7.

<sup>276</sup> Fauser, A., 'Ein Dillinger Fragment einer therapeutischen Schrift aus einer Unzialhandschrift des 8. Jahrhunderts', *Archiv für Geschichte der Medizin* 10 (1956), 243–50; Corsetti, Fischer and Sabbah, ed., *Bibliographie des textes médicaux latins*, pp. 85–6.

<sup>277</sup> Fischer, 'Der Pseudogalenische "Liber tertius"' in *Galenismo e Medicina Tardoantica Fonte Greche*, pp. 101–32, at p. 102.

## ii. Pseudo-Galen, *Liber tertius*

The pseudo-Galenic *Liber tertius* was composed ‘of apparently ancient but as yet unidentified material’ according to Langslow.<sup>278</sup> 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,’<sup>279</sup> although the earliest manuscripts of the text noted by Fischer are of the late eighth or early ninth century.<sup>280</sup> 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.<sup>281</sup> The *Liber tertius* has been edited by Fischer, who uses the eleventh century manuscript Vendôme, Bibliothèque Municipale, 109 as his base text.<sup>282</sup> 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*!’<sup>283</sup>

## 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 *Epistola 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*.<sup>284</sup>

---

<sup>278</sup> Langslow, *Medical Latin*, p. 71.

<sup>279</sup> Fischer, K.-D., ‘Dr Monk’s Medical Digest’, *SHM* 13 (2000), 139–251, at p. 248, n. 17; Langslow, *Medical Latin*, p. 71.

<sup>280</sup> Specifically Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale lat. 11218. See Fischer, ed., *Liber tertius*, p. 289, and Fischer, ‘Der Pseudogalenische “Liber tertius”’, pp. 101–2.

<sup>281</sup> Glaze, F. E. ‘Galen Refashioned: Gariopontus in the Later Middle Ages and Renaissance’, in *Textual Healing: Essays on Medieval and Early Modern Medicine*, ed. E. L. Furdell, Studies in Medieval and Reformation Traditions: History, Culture, Religion, Ideas 110 (Leiden, 2005), pp. 53–75. See specifically the discussion of the early Salernitan prologue on p. 65 at n.27, and the list of sources on pp. 53–4.

<sup>282</sup> Fischer, ed. *Liber tertius*; Beccaria no. 45.

<sup>283</sup> ‘In every tenth specifically pre-Salernitan early-medieval medical manuscript we find the *Liber tertius*.’ Fischer, ‘Der Pseudogalenische “Liber tertius”’, p. 102.

<sup>284</sup> 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.<sup>285</sup>

#### 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.<sup>286</sup> 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.<sup>287</sup>

##### 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.<sup>288</sup> 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 *Synopses* survive in Old English translation in Bald’s *Leechbook*. Molinier published the two separate recensions of the text in parallel.<sup>289</sup>

---

<sup>285</sup> Beccaria nos. 9, 10, 16, 36, 63, 94, 95, 100, 103, 108, 117 and 129.

<sup>286</sup> Molinier, ed., *Synopsis* in Bussemaker and Daremberg, ed., *Oeuvres d’Oribase*, V, 799–VI, 402.

<sup>287</sup> 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.

<sup>288</sup> The complete witnesses are Beccaria nos. 14, 59 and 66, whilst the fragmentary witnesses are 6, 118 and 136.

<sup>289</sup> 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.<sup>290</sup> 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.<sup>291</sup>

### *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.'<sup>292</sup> 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, a Methodist physician of the late fourth and early fifth century whose translations of Soranus include materials no longer extant in Greek.<sup>293</sup>

- a) *Celeres siue acutae passiones* together with *Tardae siue chronicae passiones* translate the *Περὶ ὀξέων καὶ χρόνιων παθῶν* of Soranus of Ephesus.<sup>294</sup>
- b) *Gynaecia* is a translation of Soranus' *Γυναικεία* which survives only in fragments. It has also been edited and translated by Drabkin and Drabkin.<sup>295</sup>

---

<sup>290</sup> Biographical sketches of him are available in English and French. See Langslow, *The Latin Alexander*, pp. 1–4; Brunet, F., *Œuvres médicales d'Alexandre de Tralles: Le dernier auteur classique des grands médecins Grecs de l'Antiquité* (Paris, 1933–6), pp. 1–90.

<sup>291</sup> 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*.

<sup>292</sup> Langslow, *The Latin Alexander*, pp. 75–83.

<sup>293</sup> Langslow, *Medical Latin*, pp. 65–6.

<sup>294</sup> I. E. Drabkin, ed., *Caelii Aureliani Methodici Siccensis celerum vel acutarum passionum* (Chicago, 1950).

<sup>295</sup> I. E. Drabkin and M. Drabkin, eds. *Caelius Aurelianus, Gynaecia: Fragments of a Latin version of Soranus' Gynaecia from a Thirteenth-Century manuscript*, Supplements to the Bulletin of the History of Medicine 13 (Baltimore, 1951).

- 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.<sup>296</sup>

#### *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.<sup>297</sup>

##### b) *Liber Aurelii de acutis passionibus* and *Liber Esculapii de chronicis passionibus*

Essentially these two compilations are based upon the lost *Περὶ ὀξείων καὶ χρόνιων 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.<sup>298</sup>

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

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

<sup>296</sup> Rose, V., ed., *Anecdota Graeca et Graeco-Latina*, 2 vols. (Berlin, 1864–70) II, 161–240. For a more complete bibliography of Caelius Aurelianus, see Corsetti, Fischer and Sabbah, ed., *Bibliographie des textes médicaux latins*, pp. 43–7.

<sup>297</sup> Langslow, *Medical Latin*, p. 73.

<sup>298</sup> Schmid, *Contributions*, pp. 42–66; Cameron, ‘Sources of Medical Knowledge,’ p. 141; Only the *Liber Aurelii* has been published in full: Daremberg, C., ‘Liber Aurelius’, *Janus* 2 (1847), 468–99, 690–731.

<sup>299</sup> ‘A general agreement’ Schmid, *Contributions*, p. 60.

<sup>300</sup> ‘Some changes to the order of the chapters’ Schmid, *Contributions*, p. 60.

<sup>301</sup> ‘It is composed of 47 chapters dedicated to the diagnosis and treatment of chronic diseases.’ Schmid, *Contributions*, p. 60.

<sup>302</sup> ‘The analysis of the various chapters reveals profound differences,’ Schmid, *Contributions*, p. 60.

presented in question and answer form,’ according to Langslow.<sup>303</sup> Some of the more difficult vocabulary in the text was selected and versified in an *aenigma* falsely attributed to Aldhelm of Malmesbury, demonstrating that it may have been used in monastic medical education in Anglo-Saxon England.<sup>304</sup>

b) *De pulsibus* or *Peri sfigmon*

*De pulsibus* is a tract on diagnosis and prognostication from the pulse. It has been edited by Rose.<sup>305</sup>

c) *Isagoge*.

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

## Medical Compilations

i. *Liber passionalis*

The *Liber passionalis*, given the whimsical byname ‘Dr Monk’s Medical Digest’ by K. D. Fischer, is the earliest of the compilations based on the *Ad Glauconem-Aurelius-Esculapius* complex, the oldest manuscript of which dates ‘to the first half of the ninth century’ according to Fischer.<sup>308</sup> It follows a structure very similar to that of the *Liber tertius*, from which it borrows heavily. According to Fischer’s summary table, only twelve of the eighty chapters of the *Liber tertius* are not contained within the *Liber passionalis*.<sup>309</sup> There are also significant parallels between the *Liber passionalis* and the *Practica Alexandri Latine*.<sup>310</sup> Beccaria does not index the text under the title *Liber passionalis*, but rather under the manuscript title *Oxea et chronia passiones Yppocratis, Gallieni et Urani*.<sup>311</sup> 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.

---

<sup>303</sup> Langslow, *Medical Latin*, p. 73.

<sup>304</sup> M. Lapidge, ‘The Hermeneutic Style in Tenth-Century Anglo-Latin Literature’, *ASE* 4 (1975), 67–111 at pp. 103–5; Rose, ed., *Anecdota Graeca et Graeco-Latina* II, 243–74; Walter, G., ed., ‘Zu PseudoSoran Quaestiones: Ein griechisch-lateinisches Glossar in Versform. Codex Leninopolitanus Lat. F. v. VI. fol. 39r’, *Archiv für Geschichte der Medizin* 28 (1935), 267–78; Fischer, K.-D., ‘Beiträge zu den Pseudosoranischen Quaestiones medicinales’, in *Text and Tradition: Studies in Ancient Medicine and its Transmission*, ed. K.-D. Fischer, D. Nickel, et al., *Studies in Ancient Medicine* 18 (Leiden, 1998), pp. 1–54.

<sup>305</sup> Rose, ed., *Anecdota Graeca et Graeco-Latina*, II, 275–80.

<sup>306</sup> Langslow, *Medical Latin*, p. 73.

<sup>307</sup> Corsetti, Fischer and Sabbah, ed., *Bibliographie des textes médicaux latins: Antiquité et haut moyen âge*, p. 145.

<sup>308</sup> Fischer, ‘Dr Monk’s Medical Digest’ p. 240.

<sup>309</sup> Table 1 in Fischer, ‘Dr Monk’s Medical Digest’, p. 250.

<sup>310</sup> Langslow, ed., *The Latin Alexander*, pp. 54–7.

<sup>311</sup> Beccaria, *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., *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.<sup>312</sup> 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.<sup>313</sup> 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.<sup>314</sup>

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*.<sup>315</sup> Cambridge, University Library G. g. 5. 35 contains a short dialogue on the four humours which may also predate the full *Tereoperica*.<sup>316</sup>

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.<sup>317</sup>

## iii. Gariopontus of Salerno

The *Passionarius* or *Liber nosematon* 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.<sup>318</sup> 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

---

<sup>312</sup> 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.

<sup>313</sup> Maion, 'Fortune of the *Practica Petrocelli*', pp. 496–8.

<sup>314</sup> Glaze, 'The Perforated Wall', pp. 297–308.

<sup>315</sup> Beccaria, *I codici di medicina del periodo presalernitano*, p. 262.

<sup>316</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 238.

<sup>317</sup> Maion, 'Fortune of the *Practica Petrocelli*', p. 495.

<sup>318</sup> Glaze, 'Galen Refashioned', p. 54. Fischer notes that these texts 'liegen dem schon erwähnten Passionarius Galieni bzw. "Gariopontus" zugrunde. In ihm hat ein Redaktor, möglicherweise eben Gariopontus, den Versuch unternommen, thematisch Zusammengehöriges aus dem obigen Ensemble auch physisch nebeneinander anzuordnen, so, wie es beispielweise Oribasius tut.' Fischer, 'Der Pseudogalenische "Liber tertius"', p. 110.

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.<sup>319</sup>

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.’<sup>320</sup> 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,<sup>321</sup> 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*.<sup>322</sup> Nevertheless, the usage of the *Passionarius* as a source for Bald’s *Leechbook* was first proposed by Charles Talbot.<sup>323</sup> 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*.<sup>324</sup> 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

---

<sup>319</sup> F. E. Glaze, ‘Gariopontus and the Salernitans: Textual Traditions in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries’, in *La Collectio Salernitana di Salvatore De Renzi*, ed. D. Jacquart and P. Bagliani, Edizione Nazionale La Scuola Medica Salernitana 3 (2008), pp. 149–90.

<sup>320</sup> ‘Dicam quod mihi Garimpotus senex vir videlicet honestissimus, adprime litteris eruditus ac medicus.’ Glaze, ‘Gariopontus and the Salernitans’, p. 154 after *Die Briefe des Petrus Damiani*, ed. K. Reindel, *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*, 2 (Munich, 1988), p. 318.

<sup>321</sup> See Glaze’s appendix of manuscripts of the *Passionarius* copied ca. 1050–1225 in ‘Gariopontus and the Salernitans,’ pp. 185–90.

<sup>322</sup> Specifically Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, lat. 11218, see Fischer, ed., *Liber tertius*, p. 289.

<sup>323</sup> Talbot, ‘Notes on Anglo-Saxon Medicine’, pp. 156–69.

<sup>324</sup> 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*<sup>325</sup> as well as Augusto Beccaria's *Catalogue*.<sup>326</sup> 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.<sup>327</sup> 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.<sup>328</sup> 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.<sup>329</sup> 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*

---

<sup>325</sup> H. Gneuss, *Handlist of Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts: A List of Manuscripts and Manuscript Fragments Written or Owned in England up to 1100*, Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies 241 (Tempe, Az., 2001).

<sup>326</sup> Beccaria, *I codici di medicina del periodo presalernitano*.

<sup>327</sup> 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.

<sup>328</sup> 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).

<sup>329</sup> 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,<sup>330</sup> although the influence of Byrtferth of Ramsay has been suggested. The entire codex is described as a 'computistical commonplace book,' by Cameron, who dates the manuscript to ca. 1086.<sup>331</sup> N. R. Ker dates the manuscript to the beginning of the twelfth century, some several decades later than Cameron.<sup>332</sup> Faith Wallis dates the manuscript to 'ca. A.D. 1110'.<sup>333</sup> 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.'<sup>334</sup>

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

---

<sup>330</sup> Cyril Roy Hart ascribes the work to Byrhtferth of Ramsey, although Wallis maintains that it is essentially Bedan.

<sup>331</sup> Cameron, 'Sources of Medical Knowledge', p. 150.

<sup>332</sup> Ker, *Catalogue*, no. 360, p. 435.

<sup>333</sup> F. Wallis, 'Medicine in Medieval Calendar Manuscripts' in *Manuscript Sources of Medieval Medicine: A Book of Essays*, ed. M. R. Schleissner (New York, 1995), pp. 105–44 at p. 122.

<sup>334</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 125.



by Isidore of Seville, often contain means of predicting the future through the interpretation of various astrological and physical signs.<sup>335</sup>

### 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.<sup>336</sup> 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.<sup>337</sup>

### ii. Computus

From Bede's *De temporum ratione* in the eighth century to Byrhtferth's *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.<sup>338</sup>

### 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

---

<sup>335</sup> Isidore of Seville defines a prognostic thus: 'Prognostica praevisio 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, *Etymologies* IV.x.2. Barney, S., W. Lewis, J. Beach and O. Berghof, ed., *The Etymologies of Isidore of Seville* (Cambridge, 2006), p. 114.

<sup>336</sup> Bremmer, 'Leiden, Vossianus Lat. Q. 69'.

<sup>337</sup> K. Dekker, 'Anglo-Saxon Encyclopaedic Notes: Tradition and Function', in *Foundations of Learning: The Transfer of Encyclopaedic Knowledge in the Early Middle Ages*, ed. R. H. J. Bremmer and K. Dekker, Mediaevalie Groningana New Series 9 (Paris, 2007), 279–315, esp. p. 283.

<sup>338</sup> 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.<sup>339</sup>

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.<sup>340</sup> While individual prognostics concerning the correct times of year to administer phlebotomy do occur in the *Leechbooks*, 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.<sup>341</sup>

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,<sup>342</sup> the numerological relationship between the veins of the body and the days of the year,<sup>343</sup> 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.’<sup>344</sup> 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

---

<sup>339</sup> ‘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).

<sup>340</sup> Chardonnens, L. S., ‘Context, Language, Date and Origin of Anglo-Saxon Prognostics’, in *Foundations of Learning*: ed. Bremmer and Dekker, pp. 317–40 at p. 322.

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

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

<sup>343</sup> Dekker, ‘Anglo-Saxon Encyclopaedic Notes: Tradition and Function’, items 4–5, p. 283 and pp. 289–90.

<sup>344</sup> 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,<sup>345</sup> 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.<sup>346</sup> 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.<sup>347</sup> 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

---

<sup>345</sup> 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.

<sup>346</sup> 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.

<sup>347</sup> Banham, 'A Millennium in Medicine', pp. 241–2.

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 *Allegemeinverständlichkeit*, or general understanding, in being technical terms not generally understood by the non-specialist speech community.<sup>348</sup>

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; *-wærc* 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.'<sup>349</sup> 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.

---

<sup>348</sup> Langslow, *Medical Latin*, pp. 13–14; Heller, 'Der Wortschatz unter dem Aspekt des Fachwortes', pp. 218–38.

<sup>349</sup> Bonser, 'Anglo-Saxon Medical Nomenclature,' p. 14.

## *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*,<sup>350</sup> 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.<sup>351</sup>

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*.<sup>352</sup> 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*.<sup>353</sup> 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.<sup>354</sup>

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.<sup>355</sup> It is presumably synonymous with the collocation *heafdes hriefðo* ‘scab of the head.’<sup>356</sup> 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

---

<sup>350</sup> 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).

<sup>351</sup> Campbell, *Old English Grammar*, p. 227.

<sup>352</sup> 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.

<sup>353</sup> ‘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 *PAL* II.121 ‘si nec ipsa invenitur, **capitalis** tangenda est,’ ‘if that is not found, the *capitalis* ought to be cut.’ Puschmann, ed., *Nachträge zu Alexander Trallianus*, p. 92

<sup>354</sup> It occurs at *Leechbook* I.53.2 and I.61.1.

<sup>355</sup> It occurs at *Leechbook* II.30.6 where it translates ‘acoras in capite’ from *Euporistes* I.9.

<sup>356</sup> 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 tiligeaen.’<sup>357</sup> In the table of contents for I.38, there is more specificity in stating ‘gif ban bryce on heafode sie.’<sup>358</sup> 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.<sup>359</sup>

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.’<sup>360</sup> 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 tobrocen sy.’<sup>361</sup>

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.<sup>362</sup>

---

<sup>357</sup> *Leechbook* I.H.1 ‘how one should treat a broken head.’

<sup>358</sup> I.H.38 ‘if a bone is broken in the head.’

<sup>359</sup> 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.

<sup>360</sup> Howald and Sigersit, ed., *Herbarius*, p. 4.

<sup>361</sup> De Vriend, ed., *Herbarium*, p. 30.

<sup>362</sup> 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. *brægen* (brain, L. *cerebrum*)

The term *brægen*, ‘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.<sup>363</sup> OE *brægen* 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 *brægenes adl* in II.27.4 clearly translates *cerebri alienatio* in Oribasius, *Synopsis* V.47, giving us a total of three instances of *brægen* 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 *brægen* could mean ‘top of the head’ is not backed up by the *Dictionary of Old English*,<sup>364</sup> which traces the only usage of *brægen* for anything other than the brain of a human or animal to be from the Paris Psalter (P), where *brægen* translates *vertex* in Psalm VII.16. The *DOE* also notes the consistent glossing of *cerebrum* with *brægen* in both medical and non-medical contexts.<sup>365</sup>

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*<sup>366</sup> and pseudo-Apuleius’ *Herbarius*,<sup>367</sup> but *facies* once from the *Liber medicinae ex herbis femininis*<sup>368</sup> while in the *Medicina de quadrupedibus* OE *andwlata* consistently translates L. *facies* in the  $\alpha$ -recension of Sextus Placitus *Liber medicinae ex animalibus*,<sup>369</sup> but *frons* once in *De moro*.<sup>370</sup> Bald’s *Leechbook* consistently presents the form *andwlitan*, while the *Old English Herbal* has a marked preference for the form *andwlatan*, with nine instances to a single instance of *andwlitan* at 184.3, while the *Medicina de quadrupedibus* exhibits

---

<sup>363</sup> McIlwain, ‘Brain and Mind’, p. 107.

<sup>364</sup> ‘Brægen’ in *DOE: A to H online* ed., Cameron, et al.

<sup>365</sup> 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.

<sup>366</sup> *OEHL* 1.3, (*DHVL* 2).

<sup>367</sup> *OEHL* 54.2 (*Herb* 53.3), *OEHL* 75.4 (*Herb* 74.6), *OEHL* 91.5 (*Herb* 90.9), *OEHL* 100.2 (*Herb* 99.2), *OEHL* 101.2 (*Herb* 99.2), *OEHL* 100.8 (*Herb* 99.8), *OEHL* 119.1 (*Herb* 118.1), *OEHL* 132.1 (*Herb* 131.1).

<sup>368</sup> De Vriend, ed., *Herbarium*, p. 233.

<sup>369</sup> *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*.

<sup>370</sup> De Vriend, ed., *Herbarium*, p. 239.



both forms. The *Peri didaxeon* contains the form *andwlita*. Unfortunately, no parallels have been found for the seven instances of the word in Bald's *Leechbook*.<sup>371</sup>

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'<sup>372</sup> translating 'Color in facie rubeus et subtumens' from *LT* 39.2.<sup>373</sup> 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.'<sup>374</sup> 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'<sup>375</sup> translating the *PPB* 1.23 'donec iniecta res naribus.'<sup>376</sup>

### *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 *þrotu* 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 *sweorcope* (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

---

<sup>371</sup> 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*.

<sup>372</sup> 'And his face is red and swollen.'

<sup>373</sup> 'There is a red colour in his face, and slight swelling.' Fischer, ed., *Liber tertius*, p. 312.

<sup>374</sup> 'And when he cannot [look] any longer, turn his face away.' Included in the appendices as Bald's *Leechbook* II.59.13.

<sup>375</sup> 'Put the juice in the nose.'

<sup>376</sup> 'While you apply that to the nostrils', Önnersfors, ed., *Physica Plinii Bambergensis*, pp. 23–4. See also *PPFP* I.1.23 'donec iniecta res nares', Winkler, ed., *Physica Plinii Florentino-Pragensis Liber I*, p. 59.

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 ‘Oþer is on þam geagle... Oþer is þonne on þære þrotan’<sup>377</sup> translates ‘Una est, quae in faucibus nascitur. Alia est, quae in gula nascitur.’<sup>378</sup> This gives us much more specific information on the highly ambiguous *geagl* which is defined by the *DOE* as ‘jaw, jowl, cheek,’<sup>379</sup> but can be seen to translate Latin *fauces*, meaning ‘pharynx’ in this instance.<sup>380</sup> 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’<sup>381</sup> for the *Liber tertius* reading ‘tumor etiam in ipsa gula uel collo nascitur.’<sup>382</sup> If we assume that the translator had a version of the *Liber tertius* closer to that used by *Gariopontus* 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’<sup>383</sup> seems to inform the Old English ‘Gif þonne sie on gehwæpere healfe þa ceacan asweollen 7 sio þrotu’<sup>384</sup> 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

<sup>377</sup> ‘One is in the pharynx... the other is in the throat.’

<sup>378</sup> ‘One is that which develops in the pharynx. The other is that which develops in the throat.’ Fischer, ed., *Liber tertius*, p. 334.

<sup>379</sup> ‘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).

<sup>380</sup> 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.

<sup>381</sup> ‘Swelling develops in the tongue itself or in the neck,’ Talbot, ‘Notes on Anglo-Saxon Medicine’, p. 167.

<sup>382</sup> ‘Swelling develops, moreover, in the throat or neck,’ Fischer, ed., *Liber tertius*, p. 134.

<sup>383</sup> ‘If one part of the pharynx becomes swollen’ *Tereoperica* or *Practica Petrocelli* 34, London, British Library, Sloane 2835, 24r, After Cameron, ‘Bald’s *Leechbook*,’ p. 180.

<sup>384</sup> ‘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 *sweorcope*, 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 ‘wip sculdor-wærc’ in I.20, we have several instances of identifiable translations involving the term in *Leechbook* II. The parallels are as follows

II.17.3 astihð oþ þæt **wipoban** 7 oþ ðone  
swiþran **sculdor** þæt sar.<sup>385</sup>

LT 37.1 Dolor... ascendet usque ad **iugulum** et  
**humerum** dextrum.<sup>386</sup>

II.46.2 hwilum becymð on þa **weopobon** 7 eft  
ymb lytel ge þa **gesculdru** ge eft þone  
neweseoþan þæt sar gret.<sup>387</sup>

LT 34.2 Peruenit etiam dolor ad **iugulum**,  
percutiens et post scapulas et **humeros**, et ilia  
etiam dolore tenentur.<sup>388</sup>

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 *weopoban* (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

<sup>385</sup> ‘The pain rises up to the collarbone as far as the right shoulder.’

<sup>386</sup> ‘The pain... ascends up to the neck (collarbone) and the right shoulder,’ Fischer, ed., *Liber tertius*, p. 311.

<sup>387</sup> ‘Sometimes it comes upon the collarbones and after a little while also upon the shoulder and then the pain greets the *ilia*’.

<sup>388</sup> ‘The pain arrives at the neck, also striking 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.<sup>389</sup>

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**’<sup>390</sup> translates ‘et scarifas **ea loca** detrahens sanguinem’<sup>391</sup> in the *Liber tertius*.

### *Heart and Breast*

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

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

II.1.7 and þæt deah wiþ <b>breostwærc</b> 7 wiþ <b>heortcoþe</b> 7 wið fellewærce 7 wiþ þon þe mon sie on þam magan omigre wætan gefylled. <sup>392</sup>	PAL 2.37.17 non solum <b>cardialgias</b> sanat sed inchoantem epilepsiam et ypocondriacas passiones uel quibus stomachus flegmate repletus frigidus est. <sup>393</sup>
---	--

In the following example, *breost* seems to translate *praecordia*, however:

II.37.3 and eal ða swætan þing <b>breostum</b> 7 innopum ne dugon. <sup>394</sup>	PAL II.108 Nam dulcia omnia naturaliter <b>praecordiis</b> et visceribus sunt pessima. <sup>395</sup>
--	--

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

---

<sup>389</sup> The use of L. *humerus* to denote either the upper arm or its underlying bone is noted in Langslow, *Medical Latin*, pp. 151–2. The use of *humerus* to denote the shoulder joint is not noted, but a similar form of semantic extension is noted with regards to L. *cubitus*, which can refer either to the radius of the forearm or the elbow, at p. 140.

<sup>390</sup> ‘Then draw with a glass from the shoulder.’

<sup>391</sup> ‘And scarify that place, withdrawing blood’ Fischer, ed., *Liber tertius*, pp. 310–11.

<sup>392</sup> ‘and that helps against chest pain and heartburn and *epilepsia* and in case one is filled with a phlegmatic humour in the stomach.’

<sup>393</sup> ‘it not only treats *cardialgia* but established epilepsy and abdominal diseases, and those whose stomach is filled with cold phlegm.’ Langslow, *The Latin Alexander*, pp. 166.

<sup>394</sup> ‘And all those sweet things are no good for the breast and bowels.’

<sup>395</sup> ‘For all sweet things are bad for the breast and bowels.’ Puschmann, ed., *Nachträge zu Alexander Trallianus*, p. 78.

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 biþ neah þære **heortan** 7 þære gelodr. 7 geadortenge þæm bræge<ne>.<sup>396</sup>

PAL II.14 Est <sc. stomachus> enim sensibilior 7 bene in conpatiendo per vena vicinas epati 7 **cordi**, consentiens contingitur etiam cerebro.<sup>397</sup>

II.1.4 hwilum wyrmas of þam niþerran dælum gesecað þa uferran dælas to þam magan. 7 eac **heortcoþe** wyrceað.<sup>398</sup>

PAL 2.36.3 Scire autem oportet quia et lumbrici superiora sepius petentes ex inferioribus partibus ad stomachum necesse est ut faciant **cardiacam** passionem.<sup>399</sup>

II.1.6 Þis deah eac on fruman þam þe þa **heortcoðe** 7 þæt gesceorf ðrowiað.<sup>400</sup>

PAL 2.37.3 Hiis ergo ab initio hunc oportet uti qui **cardialgeam** patiuntur<sup>401</sup>

II.1.7 and þæt deah wiþ breostwære 7 wiþ **heortcoþe** 7 wið fellewære 7 wiþ þon þe mon sie on þam magan omigre wætan gefylled.<sup>402</sup>

PAL 2.37.17 non solum **cardialgias** sanat sed inchoantem epilepsiam et ypocondriacas passiones uel quibus stomachus flegmate repletus frigidus est.<sup>403</sup>

II.17.1 and þurh feower ædra swiþpost onsent to þære **heortan** 7 eac geond ealne þone lichoman oþ þa ytmestan limo.<sup>404</sup>

VEA 19 deinde acceptum maioribus venulis quatuor ... usque ad finem membrorum emigrat redditque pulsum.<sup>405</sup>

<sup>396</sup> 'The stomach is near the heart and the spine, and is sympathetic with the brain.'

<sup>397</sup> '(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.

<sup>398</sup> 'Sometimes worms from the lower parts seek the upper parts to the stomach, and also make *heortcoðe*.'

<sup>399</sup> '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.

<sup>400</sup> 'This also helps those who suffer heartburn and that cutting in the beginning.'

<sup>401</sup> 'Therefore those who suffer *cardialgia* ought to make use of these things.' Langslow, *The Latin Alexander*, p. 164.

<sup>402</sup> 'And that helps against chest pain and heartburn and *epilepsia* and in case one is filled with a phlegmatic humour in the stomach.'

<sup>403</sup> '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.

<sup>404</sup> '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'

<sup>405</sup> '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 *heortcōðe* 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**.<sup>406</sup>

LT 37.1 In dextra parte sub **costas** molles<sup>407</sup>

II.46.2 Hwilum cnysse þæt sar on þa **rib**.<sup>408</sup>

LT 34.2 Quibus hic dolor in **costis** mollibus  
nascitur.<sup>409</sup>

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, \*þa 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];’<sup>410</sup> 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*, *smælbearm*, *rop*, *neweseope* and *bæcþearm*, 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 *heortcōpe* (see above), that *wamb* consistently renders L. *venter*, that *innop* renders *viscera* or *intestinus*, OE *neweseope* renders L. *ilium* and OE

<sup>406</sup> ‘(That swelling) is in the liver on the right side under the soft ribs.’

<sup>407</sup> ‘On the right side under the soft ribs.’ Fischer, ed., *Liber tertius*, p. 311.

<sup>408</sup> ‘Sometimes the pain strikes the ribs.’

<sup>409</sup> ‘In whom the pain arises in the soft ribs’ Fischer, ed., *Liber tertius*, p. 309.

<sup>410</sup> 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.<sup>411</sup> 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,<sup>412</sup> 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,<sup>413</sup> one saint’s life<sup>414</sup> and one homily.<sup>415</sup>

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*,<sup>416</sup> once in the *Cura pastoralis* chapter 43<sup>417</sup> and once in the *Regula benedicti* at chapter 8.<sup>418</sup> 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,<sup>419</sup> whilst in two separate interlinear glosses to the *Lorica* of Gildas, L. *stomachus* is glossed with OE *maga*.<sup>420</sup>

---

<sup>411</sup> Bosworth J. and T. N. Toller, ed., *An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary Based on the Manuscript Collections of the Late Joseph Bosworth* (London, 1898).

<sup>412</sup> Naturally *mæg* becomes *maga* in genitive plural. See Campbell, *Old English Grammar*, p. 62.

<sup>413</sup> The charm for a safe journey from Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 41, edited by Dobbie as ‘Metrical Charm 11’, *Minor Poems*, pp. 126–8.

<sup>414</sup> The Life of St. Sebastian in Skeat, W. W., ed., *Ælfric’s Lives of Saints*, EETS 76, 82, 94, 114 (London, 1881).

<sup>415</sup> The term occurs twice in the seventh Vercelli Homily, Scragg, D., ed., *The Vercelli Homilies and Related Texts*, EETS OS 300 (Oxford, 1992).

<sup>416</sup> 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).

<sup>417</sup> Sweet, H., ed., *King Alfred’s West-Saxon Version of Gregory’s Pastoral Care*, EETS OS 45, 50 (London, 1871), p. 319.

<sup>418</sup> Schröder, ed., *Die angelsächsischen Prosabearbeitungen der Benediktinerregel*, BDASP 2 (Kassel, 1885–8), p. 32.

<sup>419</sup> Rhodes, E. W., ed., *Defensoris Liber scintillarum*, EETS OS 93 (London, 1889); For the edition used by the *DOEC* see Getty, S. S., ‘An Edition with Commentary of the Latin/Anglo-Saxon Liber scintillarum’ (Unpubl. PhD dissertation, Univ. of Pennsylvania, 1969) The term occurs three times in chapter 10 and in chapters 28, 32 and 50.

<sup>420</sup> 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 Aedeluald 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.<sup>421</sup> In two glossaries, the term is used in a phrase glossing the lemma *fleumon*, which is presumably an orthographic variant of *phlegmone* (Gr. *φλεγμαονή*)<sup>422</sup> given the synonymy with L. *inflammans*. The glosses in full are interesting, given their medical nature:

*Fleumon* **magan** untrymnes dictum apoplegi quod interpretatur inflammans.<sup>423</sup>

*Fleumon* .i<d est>. infirmitas stomachi <ue>l dicitur inflammans **magan** untrumnes.<sup>424</sup>

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,<sup>425</sup> while the other three instances could perhaps be highlighted to some benefit.

OE*H* 2.3 and clænsað þone **magan** 7 þa  
smælþearmas swyþe wundrum well.<sup>426</sup>

*Herb.* 1.3 *Herbae plantaginis sucum potui*  
datum et interiora sanat et toracem hominis  
purgat mirifice.<sup>427</sup>

<sup>421</sup> These include Zupitza, J., ed., *Ælfrics Grammatik und Glossar*, Sammlung englischer Denkmäler 1 (Berlin, 1880), p. 298; Gloss 35 in Meritt, H. D., *Old English Glosses: A Collection*, MLA General Series 16 (New York, 1945), Antwerp Gloss 1155 in Kindschi, L., ‘The Latin-Old English Glossaries in Plantin–Moretus MS 32 and British Museum MS Additional 32246’ (Unpubl. PhD dissertation, Stanford Univ., 1955); Gloss 3129 in Wright, T., and R. P. Wücker, ed., *Anglo-Saxon and Old English Vocabularies* (London, 1884), Gloss no.Q573 in J. H. Hessels, ed., *An Eighth-Century Latin-Anglo-Saxon Glossary* (Cambridge, 1890); Gloss 284 in the minor Cleopatra Glosses in Quinn, J. J. ‘The Minor Latin-Old English Glosses in MS. Cotton Cleopatra A.III’ (Unpubl. PhD Dissertation, Stanford Univ., 1956) and Gloss 294 in Bodleian Library MS Bodley 730 in ‘Merrilees and Dictionary of Old English Transcript’.

<sup>422</sup> On this term, see Chapter 6 below.

<sup>423</sup> Stryker, W. G., ‘The Latin-Old English Glossary in MS. Cotton Gleopatra A. III’ (Unpubl. PhD Dissertation, Stanford Univ., 1951).

<sup>424</sup> Gloss F457 in Oliphant, R. T., ed., *The Harley Latin-Old English Glossary*, Janua Linguarum, Series Practica 20 (1966).

<sup>425</sup> In OE*H* 163.2 and 166.2.

<sup>426</sup> ‘And that cleanses the stomach and the small intestines very wonderfully well.’

<sup>427</sup> ‘The juice of the herb *plantago* also heals the innards and wonderfully purges the man’s thorax.’ Howald and Sigerist, ed., *Herbarius*, p. 22.



59.1 Wið þone dropan 7 wið þone **magan**.<sup>428</sup>

58.1 Ad flegmata intercidenda.<sup>429</sup>

60.2 *and* eac hyt þone **magan** ealne  
afeormað.<sup>430</sup>

59.2 et thoracem totum purgat.<sup>431</sup>

Here we see that L. *interiora et toracem* has been translated as *þone magan 7 þa smælþearmas*, indicating more than just the stomach in *OE* 2.3, whilst at 60.2 *OE maga* seems to translate *thorax* for want of a better term. In *OE* 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  
scafunga innan. swiþost on þam monnum þe  
habbað swiþe gefelne 7 sarcenne **magan** swa  
þæt hie sume somnunga swelta þone magon  
aberaþ þa strangan scafunga þæra æterna  
wætena. hwilum wyrmas of þam niþerran  
dælum gesecað þa uferran dælas to þam  
**magan**.<sup>432</sup>

*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.<sup>433</sup>

<sup>428</sup> ‘For the *dropa* and for the stomach’

<sup>429</sup> ‘For phlegmatic humours which are fit for severance.’ Howald and Sigerist, ed., *Herbarius* p. 111. It is difficult to render the sense of the gerundive here without a great deal of awkwardness.

<sup>430</sup> ‘And it also confirms the whole stomach,’

<sup>431</sup> ‘And it purges the whole thorax.’ Howald and Sigerist, ed., *Herbarius*, p. 112.

<sup>432</sup> ‘When the humours which cause harm become gathered in the stomach, and reign there with cuttings within, most frequently in those men who have very sensitive and easily pained stomachs, so that some of them suddenly perish, they may not bear the strong cuttings of the poisonous humours. Sometimes worms from the lower parts seek the upper parts to the stomach, and also make heartburn, and tightness and fainting so that some men sometimes perish and die from the biting of the worms.’

<sup>433</sup> ‘It happens to those in whom the worst and most venomous humours are gathered in that place with gripping of the stomach and especially dominates those who have an exceedingly sensitive stomach. Sometimes, therefore, some of them, not bearing the gripping of the most poisonous humours, die suddenly. One should understand, moreover, because worms frequently seeking the higher parts from the lower parts to the stomach, it is unavoidable that (the worms) create the disease *cardiacus*, and induce fainting with narrowness so that

II.1.7 and wip þon þe mon sie on þam <b>magan</b> omigre wætan gefyllled. <sup>434</sup>	PAL 2.37.11... uel quibus stomachus flegmate repletus frigidus est. <sup>435</sup>
II.7.t wið adeadodum <b>magan</b> . <sup>436</sup>	LT 22.1 Cura paralysis stomachi. <sup>437</sup>
II.7.4 Þis synd tacn adeadodes <b>magan</b> . <sup>438</sup>	LT 21.1 Paralysis stomachi ita cognoscitur. <sup>439</sup>
II.8.t Wip sare 7 unluste þæs <b>magan</b> . <sup>440</sup>	PPB 68.6 Item ad dolorem et fastidium stomachi. <sup>441</sup>

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’<sup>442</sup> translates *Liber tertius* 36.1 ‘scleria hoc est duritia cum sensu et dolore.’<sup>443</sup> 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 *þære 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 ‘Wip sarum 7 aþundenum 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 wið milte adle. ge wip magan’ would seem to translate the *Physica Plinii Bambergensis* 83.43 ‘Non solum autem spleniticis saluberimum est, sed etiam stomachicis.’<sup>444</sup> Here *wip 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.’

---

some immediately die from the gripping of the worms. Because of that, it is not at all appropriate to assume that sudden syncopy of the stomach arises from the worst venomous humours.’ Langslow, *The Latin Alexander* pp. 162–3.

<sup>434</sup> ‘And in case the man is filled with a phlegmatic humour in the stomach.’

<sup>435</sup> ‘and for those in whom the stomach is filled with cold phlegm.’ Langslow, *The Latin Alexander*, pp. 165–6.

<sup>436</sup> ‘For the deadened stomach.’

<sup>437</sup> ‘Care of paralysis of the stomach.’ Fischer, ed., *Liber tertius*, p. 304.

<sup>438</sup> ‘These are the signs of the deadened stomach.’

<sup>439</sup> ‘Paralysis of the stomach is recognised thus.’ Fischer, ed., *Liber tertius*, p. 304.

<sup>440</sup> ‘For pain and lack of appetite of the stomach.’

<sup>441</sup> ‘Again for pain and lack of appetite of the stomach.’ Önnersfors, ed. *Physica Plinii Bambergensis*, p. 90.

<sup>442</sup> ‘Hardness of the stomach with feeling and with pain.’

<sup>443</sup> ‘Scleria (σκληρία), that is hardness with feeling and pain.’ Fischer, ed., *Liber tertius*, p. 311.

<sup>444</sup> Önnersfors, ed. *Physica Plinii Bambergensis*, p. 114; Cf. *PPFP* II.18.29, Wachtmeister, ed., *Physica Plinii Florentino-Pragensis Liber II*, p. 110.

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 ‘Wip heardum swile þæs magan’ would seem to translate L *empneumatosi*<sup>445</sup> 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. ‘Wip unlust 7 wlættan 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:

l. 94. Ne sceal man swiðor etan þonne se maga gemyltan mæge.<sup>446</sup>

l. 97 Helped þæt se mete hreðe 7 wel mylteð þe se maga ðygeð.<sup>447</sup>

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.<sup>448</sup> Sentences such as *Leechbook II.2.1* ‘gedo ðonne on hnesce wulle smire þone magan mid’<sup>449</sup> 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.<sup>450</sup>

Table 4.1 Summary of Instances of OE *maga* in Medical Prose

	Heading Duplicate	Latin Term	Meaning	Collocation	Latin Source
<i>Old English Herbal</i>					
2.3	no	interior	stomach	clænsað	<i>Herb.</i> 1.3
13.1	yes	stomachus	stomach	sar	<i>Herb.</i> 12.1
46.2	yes	stomachus	stomach	sar	<i>Herb.</i> 45.2
46.2	no	stomachus	stomach	sar	<i>Herb.</i> 45.2

<sup>445</sup> The term is not listed in Langslow, *Medical Latin*. The *Liber tertius* contains the incorporated gloss ‘id est inflatio’ in chapter 19.

<sup>446</sup> ‘Nor should one eat more than the stomach can digest.’ Vercelli Homily 7, line 94; Scragg, ed. *Vercelli Homilies*, pp. 134–7.

<sup>447</sup> ‘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.

<sup>448</sup> See Langslow, *Medical Latin*, p. 151, n. 28.

<sup>449</sup> ‘Place [the medicine] on soft wool, smear the stomach with [it].’ Cf. *LT* 9.2 ‘fouas easdemque lanas expressas super stomachum ponis et fascias,’ Fischer, ed., *Liber tertius*, pp. 300–301.

<sup>450</sup> Other examples include *Leechbook II.2.3*, *II.2.9*, *II.12.3* and *II.15.2*.

59.1	yes	flegmata intercidenda	stomach		<i>Herb.</i> 58.1
60.2	no	thorax	stomach	afeormað	<i>Herb.</i> 59.2
60.3	yes	stomachus	stomach	sar	<i>Herb.</i> 59.3
84.1	no	stomachus	stomach	afeormað	<i>Herb.</i> 83.1
91.3	yes	stomachus	stomach	sar	<i>Herb.</i> 90.3
94.2	yes	stomachus	stomach	sar	<i>Herb.</i> 93.3
94.11	yes	stomachus	stomach	topundennysse	<i>Herb.</i> 93.15
106.1	yes	stomachus	stomach	sar	<i>Herb.</i> 105.1
106.1	yes	stomachus	stomach		<i>Herb.</i> 105.1
111.1	yes	stomachus	stomach	sar	<i>Herb.</i> 110.1
144.3	yes	stomachus	stomach	hæt	<i>LMHF</i>
153.1	no	stomachus	stomach	sar	<i>LMHF</i>
155.1	no	stomachus	stomach	sar	<i>LMHF</i>
163.2	yes	n/a	stomach	sar	<i>LMHF</i>
166.2	yes	n/a	stomach	heardnysse	<i>LMHF</i>
166.2	no	stomachus	stomach	heardnys	<i>LMHF</i>
170.0	no	stomachus	stomach		<i>LMHF</i>
184.0	no	stomachus	stomach	sar	<i>LMHF</i>
184.0	no	stomachus	stomach		<i>LMHF</i>
184.2	yes	stomachus	stomach		<i>LMHF</i>
Bald's <i>Leechbook</i>					
I.18.1	yes	n/a	stomach	acolod	
I.18.1		stomachus	stomach		<i>Syn.</i> VI.42
I.18.5	no	n/a	stomach		
I.19.1	no	n/a	stomach		
II.1.1	no	n/a	stomach	adlig	
II.1.2	no	stomachus	stomach	adl	<i>PAL</i> II.14
II.1.3	no	<i>*implied subject</i>	stomach		<i>PAL</i> II.14
II.1.3	no	stomachus	stomach	intiga	
II.1.4	no	stomachus	stomach		<i>PAL</i> 2.36.2
II.1.4	no	stomachus	stomach		<i>PAL</i> 2.36.2
II.1.4	no	stomachus	stomach		<i>PAL</i> 2.36.3
II.1.5	no	stomachus	stomach		<i>PAL</i> 2.37.2

II.1.7	no	stomachus	stomach		<i>PAL 2.37.11</i>
II.2.1	yes	*de stomachicis	stomach	sar and apened	<i>LT 9.2</i>
II.2.1	no	stomachus	surface		<i>LT 9.2</i>
II.2.3	yes	*stomachus	surface	sar	<i>LT 11.1 (Algema, id est dolor &lt;stomachi&gt;)</i>
II.2.3	no	stomachus	stomach		<i>LT 12.1</i>
II.2.4	no		stomach		
II.2.5	no	stomachus	stomach	apunden	<i>PAL II.43</i>
II.2.7	no	stomachus	stomach	sar	<i>PPB 70.30, PPFP II.5.7</i>
II.2.9	no	stomachus	stomach		<i>PPB 72.2, PPFP II.7.2</i>
II.2.9	no	super	surface		<i>PPB 72.2, PPFP II.7.2</i>
II.3.t	yes	phlegmone	stomach	geswel 7 sar	<i>LT 13.1</i>
II.4.t	yes	*scleroma	stomach	heard swil	<i>LT 15.1</i>
II.5.t	yes	empneumosis	stomach	apunden	<i>LT 17.1</i>
II.6.t	yes	*anorexia	stomach	unlust 7 wlættan	
II.6.2	no	n/a	stomach		
II.7.t	yes	paralysis stomachi	stomach	adeadod	<i>LT 21.1</i>
II.7.3	no	n/a	stomach	apunden	<i>PPB 75.5, PPFP II.4.6</i>
II.7.3	no	stomachus	stomach	geswenced	<i>PPB 75.5, PPFP II.4.6</i>
II.7.4	no	stomachus	stomach	adeadod	<i>LT 21.1</i>
II.7.4	no	stomachus	stomach		<i>LT 21.1</i>
II.8.t	yes	stomachus	stomach	sar	<i>PPB 70.1, PPFP II.5.3</i>
II.8.4	no	n/a	stomach	sar	
II.9.t	yes	stomachus	stomach	inwund	<i>LT 23.1</i>
II.9.1	no	n/a	stomach	sar	<i>LT 23.2</i>

II.10.t	yes	stomachus	stomach	to hættanne	<i>PPB 71.2, PPFP</i> II.6.2
II.10.1	no	n/a	stomach		<i>PPB 71.2, PPFP</i> II.6.2
II.11.t	yes	n/a	stomach	aþunden	n/a
II.11.2	no	n/a	stomach	aþunden	PPB 71.1, FPIL.6.1
II.11.2	no	stomachus	stomach	ceald	PPB 71.1, FPIL.6.1
II.12.3	no	n/a	surface		
II.13.t	yes	n/a	stomach	springe	
II.14.t	yes	n/a	stomach	trumness	
II.14.2	no	stomachus	stomach	bryn	<i>PPB 77.1, PPFP</i> II.12.1
II.15.t	yes	n/a	stomach	springe	
II.15.t	yes	stoamchus	stomach		<i>PAL</i> II.48
II.15.2	no	n/a	stomach	aþenung	
II.15.2	no	n/a	surface		
II.16.t	yes	n/a	stomach	hat omiht, ungemetlicfast	
II.16.1	no	n/a	stomach		
II.16.3	yes	stomachus	stomach	oferceald	<i>PAL</i> II.15
II.16.3	no	stoamchus	stomach		<i>PAL</i> II.15
II.16.4	yes	stomachus	stomach		<i>Pass.</i> II.31
II.16.6	no	stomachus	stomach	ceald adl	<i>PAL</i> II.15
II.16.6	no	stoamchus	stomach		<i>PAL</i> II.15
II.16.8	no	n/a	stomach		
II.17.2	no	*epatis / iecoris	liver	<i>mistake</i>	
II.25.4	no	n/a	stomach		
II.32.9	yes	n/a	stomach	adl	
II.39.1	yes	alia membra	stomach		<i>PAL</i> II.115 (Philagrios)
II.41.4	no	stomachicus	stomach		<i>PPB</i> 83.83, <i>PPFP</i> II.18.29
II.44.1	yes	n/a	stomach		
II.51.1	no	n/a	stomach		
II.56.11	no	n/a	stomach		<i>LT</i> 71.4

III.1	n/a		stomach	bridda	
III.15	yes	n/a	stomach	wærce	
III.69	yes	n/a	stomach	asurod	
III.69	yes	n/a	stomach	wærce	
III.70	yes	n/a	stomach	wærce	
<i>Foetus</i>	n/a	stomachus	stomach		Voss. Lat Q. 69 <sup>451</sup>
<i>Peri didaxeon</i>					
52	n/a	stomachus	stomach		<i>Ter.</i> 43
59	n/a	os stomachi	stomach		<i>Ter.</i> 47
63	n/a	n/a	stomach		* <i>Ter.</i> 45
64	n/a	stomachus	stomach		<i>Ter.</i> 49
64	n/a	stomachus	stomach		<i>Ter.</i> 49

ii. OE *wamb* and L. *uenter*

OE *wamb* or *womb* occurs very frequently, 277 times in all, in Old English.<sup>452</sup> 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)<sup>453</sup> 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)<sup>454</sup> 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

<sup>451</sup> Bremmer, ‘Leiden, Vossianus Lat. Q. 69’.

<sup>452</sup> With one false positive, the placename *Womburnan* in Charter, S 813 bringing the total reported by *DOEC* to 278.

<sup>453</sup> Wildhagen, K., ed., *Der Cambridger Psalter*, BDASP 7 (Hamburg, 1910).

<sup>454</sup> Harsley, F., ed., *Eadwine's Canterbury Psalter*, EETS OS 26 (London, 1889).

Library Additional, 37517)<sup>455</sup> at Psalm LXX.6, CXX.3 and CXXXI.11, five times in the Arundel Psalter (Psalter J, London, British Library, Arundel 60)<sup>456</sup> at Psalms XVI.14, XXI.10, XXX.10, XLIII.25 and LXX.6, twice in the Tiberius Psalter (Psalter H, London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius A. IV)<sup>457</sup> at Psalms XVI.14 and LXX.6, ten times in the Vespasian Psalter (Psalter A, London, British Library, Cotton Vespasian A. I)<sup>458</sup> at Psalms XVI.14, XXI.8, XXI.12, XXX.10, XLIII.26, LVII.3, LXX.5, LXX.6, CXXVI.4 and CXXXI.12. The Vespasian Psalter also utilises the compound *wambehriſ* for L. *uenter* at Psalm XXI.10. The term occurs three times in the Stowe Psalter (Psalter E, London, British Library, Stowe 2)<sup>459</sup> at Psalms XVI.14, LVII.4 and LXX.6, twice in the Lambeth Psalter (Psalter I, London, Lambeth Palace 427)<sup>460</sup> at Psalms XVI.14 and XLIII.25, and four times in the Salisbury Psalter (Psalter K, Salisbury Cathedral 150)<sup>461</sup> at Psalms XVI.14, XXI.11, XXX.10 and LXX.6.

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

Table 4.2 Summary of Instances of OE *wamb* in Glossed Psalter Manuscripts<sup>462</sup>

Psalm	A <sup>463</sup>	Meaning	Psalter	Totals
XVI.14	16.14	womb	E, J, H, A, G, D, I, B, K	9
XXI.10	21.8	womb	J, A, G, B	4
XXI.11	21.8	womb	A, B, K	3
XXI.15	21.12	belly, bowel	A, B	2
XXX.10	30.10	belly, bowel	J, A, B, K	4
XLIII.25	43.26	belly, surface	E, J, A, I, B	5
LVII.4	57.3	womb	E, A, D, B	4

<sup>455</sup> Lindelöf, U., 'Die altenglischen Glossen im Bosworth-Psalter', *Mémoires de la société neophilologique de Helsingfors* 5 (1909), 137–230.

<sup>456</sup> Oess, G., ed., *Der altenglische Arundel-Psalter: eine Interlinearversion in der Handschrift Arundel 60 des Britischen Museums*, Altistische Forschungen 30 (Heidelberg, 1910).

<sup>457</sup> Campbell, A. P., ed., *The Tiberius Psalter*, Publications médiévales de l'Université d'Ottawa 2 (Ottawa, 1974).

<sup>458</sup> Kuhn, S. M., ed., *The Vespasian Psalter* (Michigan, 1965).

<sup>459</sup> Kimmens, A. C., ed., *The Stowe Psalter*, Toronto Old English Series 3 (Toronto, 1979).

<sup>460</sup> Lindelöf, U., ed., *Der Lambeth-Psalter*, Acta societatis scientiarum Fennicae 35.i and 43.iii (Helsinki, 1909).

<sup>461</sup> Sisam, C. and K. Sisam, eds., *The Salisbury Psalter*, EETS 242 (London, 1959).

<sup>462</sup> 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.

<sup>463</sup> Kuhn's edition of the A psalter differs greatly from the Vulgate and other psalter editions in the numbering and division of psalm verses.



LXX.6	70.5	womb	E, L, J, H, A, G, D, F, B, K	10
CXXVI.3	126.4	Womb	L, A, B	3
CXXXI.11	131.12	Womb	A, L	2
Total:				46

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 *Habbacuc* III.16 is included in the monastic hours for Lauds on a Thursday.<sup>464</sup>

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.<sup>465</sup> The Durham Hymnal also contains three instances of this gloss,<sup>466</sup> and single instances are to be found in Isidore's *Sententiae*,<sup>467</sup> the glossed prayers in Arundel 155,<sup>468</sup> the Book of Cerne version of the *Lorica* of Gildas<sup>469</sup> and PseudoTheodore.<sup>470</sup>

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*,<sup>471</sup> the Antwerp glossator uses OE *wamb* twice, *seo inre wamb* glossing *aluus* and *seo utre wamb* glossing *uenter*.<sup>472</sup> 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

<sup>464</sup> The manuscripts in question are A, the Vespasian Psalter, C, Cambridge Psalter, J, the Arundel Psalter and K, the Salisbury Psalter as above, as well as the Royal Psalter (D, London, British Library Royal 2. B.v); Roeder, F., ed., *Der altenglische Regius-Psalter*, Studien zur englischen Philologie 18 (Halle, 1904), pp. 275–302 and the Vitellius Psalter (G, London, British Library, Cotton Vitellius E.xviii); Rosier, J. L. ed., *The Vitellius Psalter*, Cornell Studies in English 42 (Ithaca, NY, 1962), pp. 365–96.

<sup>465</sup> Rhodes, ed., *Liber scintillarum*; Thirteen of these instances occur in Chapter 10. The remainder occur in chapters 9, 21, 28, 47 and 54.

<sup>466</sup> Milfull, I. B., ed., *The Hymns of the Anglo-Saxon Church: A Study and Edition of the Durham Hymnal*, CSASE 17 (Cambridge, 1996) Hymns 44.3, 65.1 and 86.1.

<sup>467</sup> *Sententiae* II.19.3 in R. Cornelius, ed., *Die altenglische Interlinearversion zu "De vitiis et peccatis" in der Hs. British Library, Royal 7. C. IV* (Frankfurt am Main, 1995), pp. 164–81.

<sup>468</sup> Prayer 17 in Holthausen, F., 'Altenglische Interlinearversionen lateinischer Gebete und Beichten', *Anglia* 65 (1941), 230–54.

<sup>469</sup> Kuypers, ed., *The Book of Cerne*, pp. 85–8.

<sup>470</sup> Schlutter, O. B. 'Anglo-Saxonica', *Anglia* 32 (1909), 503–15 at p. 513.

<sup>471</sup> Zupitza, ed., *Ælfrics Grammatik*, pp. 43, 298 cf. *unicornis*, p. 308.

<sup>472</sup> Glosses 1091 and 1057 in Kindschi, 'The Latin-Old English Glossaries in Plantin–Moretus MS 32 and British Museum MS Additional 32246', pp. 111–89.

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*. The term also occurs once in the interlinear gloss of the *Lorica* transmitted with 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 **wambe** simle'<sup>473</sup> seems to translate Oribasius *Synopses* V.53 'Juvat autem tales passiones et infans cornus bene enim cum eum dormiet, ita secus junctus tangit **subventralem** semper.'<sup>474</sup>

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

II.1.7 þonne hnescað þa <b>wambe</b> 7 trymeþ <sup>475</sup>	<i>PAL</i> II.37.10 Malaxorat autem et confortat <b>ventrem</b> <sup>476</sup>
II.1.10 gif of þære <b>wambe</b> anre þa yfelan wætan cumen <sup>477</sup>	<i>PAL</i> II.38 Si enim in solo <b>ventre</b> habundauerint humores <sup>478</sup>
II.7.4 he þone sammeltan þurh ða <b>wambe</b> ut sent <sup>479</sup>	<i>LT</i> 21.1 incoctas easque per <b>uentres</b> emittunt <sup>480</sup>
II.31.2 and biþ þæt sar on ða swiðran sidan. healfe on þa scare. 7 þa <b>wambe</b> swiþe geneawod <sup>481</sup>	<i>LT</i> 69.1 Dolor in parte dextera super pectinem; uentrem constrictum habent <sup>482</sup>

<sup>473</sup> '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).

<sup>474</sup> 'Moreover it also helps such diseases that a very fat child will sleep with him so that it always touches alongside the belly.' Molinier, ed., *Synopsis* in Bussemaker and Daremberg, VI, 92.

<sup>475</sup> 'Then it softens and confirms the bowel.'

<sup>476</sup> 'Moreover it softens and confirms the bowel.' Langslow, *The Latin Alexander*, pp. 165–6

<sup>477</sup> 'If the harmful humours come from the bowel alone.'

<sup>478</sup> 'If the fluids abound in the bowel alone', Fradin, ed., *Practica Alexandri*, 38v.

<sup>479</sup> 'Then (the stomach) sends the half-digested food out through the bowel.'

<sup>480</sup> 'They expel that undigested through the bowel.' Fischer, ed., *Liber tertius*, p. 304.

<sup>481</sup> 'And the pain is on the left side, half on the flank and the gut is very narrowed.'

<sup>482</sup> 'The pain (is) on the right side over the breast, and they have a constricted gut.' Fischer, ed., *Liber tertius*, p. 328.

II.36.3 Hu se milte bið emlang 7 gædertenge  
þære **wambe** ...7 sio filmen ... wreonde þa  
**wambe** 7 þa innofaran 7 þa wyrmo<sup>483</sup>

VEA 20 Splen autem ponitur in sinistra parte  
precordiorum, natura oblongus. coniunctus est  
**ventri**. ... que < membrana> **ventrem** vel  
intestinae cooperit vel calefacit.<sup>484</sup>

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

	Heading Duplicate	Latin Term	Meaning	Collocation	Source Text
<i>Old English Herbal</i>					
1.11	yes	uenter	intestine	Sar	DHVL 11
1.21	no	n/a	surface	lege abutan	DHVL 21
2.2	yes	uenter	intestine	Sar	Herb. 1.2
2.2	no	uenter	intestine	apundeno	Herb. 1.2
2.2	no	n/a	surface	lege on	Herb. 1.2
2.4	no	disintericos	bowel	forweaxen	Herb. 1.4
2.4	no	uenter	bowel	dwineþ	Herb. 1.4
2.7	no	uenter	bowel	þwænan	Herb. 1.7

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

<sup>484</sup> ‘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.

3.2	yes	uenter	intestine	Sar	<i>Herb. 2.2</i>
40.1	no	disintericos	bowel	forweaxen	<i>Herb. 39.1</i>
53.1	no	disintericos	bowel	forweaxen	<i>Herb 52.1</i>
69.1	no	disintericos	bowel	forweaxen	<i>Herb. 68.1</i>
<i>Medicina de quadrupedibus</i>					
2.1	n/a	uenter	surface	wrið on	<i>De moro</i>
3.2	n/a	uenter	intestine	Sar	<i>MEA 1</i>
5.11	n/a	uentriculus	animal gut	Haran	<i>MEA 3</i>
5.17	n/a	uenter	intestine	wræce	<i>MEA 3</i>
7.9	n/a	uenter	bowel	flewsan	<i>MEA 5</i>
7.11	n/a	uenter	bowel	getogen	<i>MEA 5</i>
7.13	n/a	uenter	surface	utan gewrið	<i>MEA 5</i>
12.4	n/a	uenter	bowel	to astyrigenne	<i>MEA 9</i>
12.4	n/a	uenter	bowel	onlyseþ	<i>MEA 9</i>
<i>Bald's Leechbook</i>					
I.2.3	no		intestine	uferan	
I.18.3	no		intestine	idlan	
II.1.7	no	uenter	intestine		<i>PAL II.37.10</i>
II.1.10	no		intestine	cop	
II.1.10	no	uenter	intestine		<i>PAL II.38</i>
II.1.11	no	uenter	intestine		<i>PAL II.38</i>
II.7.4	no	uenter	bowel		<i>LT 21.1</i>
II.16.8	no		intestine		
II.19.3	no	uenter	bowel		<i>LT 39.1</i>

II.21.1	no	uenter	bowel		<i>LT 48.1</i>
II.22.5	no	uenter	bowel		<i>LT 45.1</i>
II.22.6	no	uenter	bowel		<i>LT 46.1</i>
II.25.t	yes	n/a	intestine	cop	
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	uenter	intestine	cop	<i>LT 28.1</i>
II.27.t	yes	uenter	intestine		<i>Syn. V.47</i>
II.27.1	no	uenter	intestine		<i>Syn. V.47</i>
II.27.1	no	uenter	intestine		<i>Syn. V.47</i>
II.27.2	no	uenter	intestine		<i>Syn. V.47</i>
II.27.2	no	n/a	intestine		<i>Syn. V.47</i>
II.27.4	no	uenter	intestine		<i>Syn. V.47</i>
II.27.4	no	n/a	intestine		<i>Syn. V.47</i>
II.27.6	no	uenter	surface		<i>Syn. V.53</i>
II.27.7	no	subuentralem	surface		<i>Syn. V.53</i>
II.27.8	no	n/a	intestine		<i>Syn. V.53</i>
II.27.8	no	n/a	intestine		<i>Syn. V.53</i>
II.27.8	no	uenter	intestine		<i>Syn. V.53</i>
II.27.12	no	n/a	intestine		<i>Syn. V.52</i>
II.27.12	no	n/a	bowel		<i>Syn. V.52</i>
II.28.1	yes	uenter	intestine		<i>Syn. V. 38</i>

II.28.4	no	n/a	intestine		
II.29.1	no	uenter	intestine		<i>Syn. V. 30</i>
II.30.1	yes	uenter	intestine		<i>Eup. I.9</i>
II.30.8	yes	uenter	intestine	cop	<i>PPB 85, PPFP II.20</i>
II.30.11	yes	uenter	intestine		<i>PPB 85.6, PPFP II.20.7</i>
II.30.11	no	uenter	intestine	cop	<i>PPB 85.6, PPFP II.20.7</i>
II.30.12	no	uenter pullorum	animal gut	bridda	<i>PPB 85.6, PPFP II.20.7</i>
II.30.14	no	n/a	intestine	cop	
II.30.16	no	n/a	intestine	cop	
II.30.18	no	n/a	intestine		
II.31.t	no		intestine	cop	
II.31.1	no		intestine		
II.31.2	no		intestine		
II.32.3	no	n/a	intestine	cop	
II.32.5	no		intestine	cop	
II.32.6	no		intestine	cop	
II.32.7	no		intestine	cop	
II.32.7	no		surface		
II.32.8	no		intestine	cop	
II.32.8	no		intestine		
II.32.9	no		intestine		
II.32.10	no		bowel	cop	

II.32.10	no		surface		
II.33.1	yes		surface		
II.33.12	yes		intestine		
II.34.1	yes		intestine		
II.34.4	yes		bowel	forweaxen	
II.34.8	yes	*uenter	intestine		<i>Herb.</i>
II.34.9	no		intestine	wyrmas	
II.34.9	no		intestine	wyrmas	
II.35.t	yes		intestine		
II.35.2	no		intestine		
II.36.1	no	uenter	bowel		<i>LT</i> 49.2
II.36.3	no	uenter	intestine		<i>VEA</i> 20
II.36.3	no	uenter	intestine		<i>VEA</i> 20
II.39.1	yes	uenter	intestine		PAL II.115
II.44.1	yes		intestine		
II.47.6	no		rectum (enema)		
II.48.1	no		intestine		
II.56.10	no	uenter	intestine		<i>PAL</i> II.20
II.56.11	no	n/a	intestine		<i>LT</i> 71.4
III.H.18	n/a		intestine	wærce	
III.70.	yes		intestine	wærce	
III.70.	no		intestine	heardness	
<i>Lacnunga</i> 129	no			giccendre	

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 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 biþ to clænsianne’<sup>485</sup> 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 sammeltan 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.’<sup>486</sup> 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<sup>487</sup>

Psalm	Latin Lemma	Meaning	Manuscript
XII.3	guttur	throat <sup>488</sup>	F

<sup>485</sup> ‘The *wamb* ought to be cleansed with a horn or pipe.’

<sup>486</sup> ‘Innop’ in Bosworth and Toller, *An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary*.

<sup>487</sup> See list of manuscript sigla on p. vi above. For further information see Gretsche, M., *Intellectual Foundations* pp., 17–41 and Kitson, P., ‘Topography, Dialect and the Relation of Old English Psalter Glosses’, *ES* 84 (2003), 9–32.

<sup>488</sup> The opening of this verse reads ‘Omnes 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 sepulchre.) L. *guttur* is here glossed with OE *innod*.



XVI.14	uenter	belly	F
XXI.10	uenter	womb	E, J, H, A, G, D, F, I, K
XXI.11	uenter	womb	C, E, J, H, G, D, F, I, B, K
XXI.15	uenter	belly	E, J, H, G, D, F, I, K
XXX.10	uenter	belly (meta)	E, H, G, D, F, I
XLIII.25	uenter	surface	E, G, D, F, K
L.12	uiscera	belly (meta)	C, E, L, J, H, A, G, D, I, B
LVII.4	uterus	womb	C, E, J, H, A, G, D, F, I, B, K
LXX.6	uterus	womb	C, E, L, J, H, A, G, D, F, I, B
CVIII.18	interior	belly	H, G, D, I
CIX.3	uterus	womb	C, E, J, H, A, G, D, F, I, B, K
CXXVI.3	uenter	womb	E, L, J, G, D, F, I
CXXXI.11	uenter	*womb	E, J, G, D, F, I, K
CXXXVII.13	uterus	womb	C, E, J, A, G, D, F, I, B, K

As we can see, the Latin term most commonly glossed with OE *innod* is L. *uenter*. The polysemy of OE *innod* 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: ‘Iuravit dominus dauid ueritatem et non frustrabitur eum de fructu uentris tui ponam super sedem tuam.’<sup>489</sup> The term has a metonymic sense of the whole of one’s being in Psalm XXX.10<sup>490</sup> whilst the same OE term, *innod* translates L. *uiscera* in a similarly metaphorical usage at L.12.<sup>491</sup>

Similar usages of OE *innod* 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

<sup>489</sup> ‘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.’

<sup>490</sup> ‘Miserere mei domine quoniam tribulor conturbatus est in ira 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).

<sup>491</sup> ‘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 *innoð* include L. *intus* at Mark VII.23 and *uiscera* at Luke I.78. Outside of the Bible, OE *innoð* glosses an even broader range of Latin terms, including *uterus*, *aluus* and *uiscus*<sup>492</sup> in Ælfric's *Grammar and Glossary*.<sup>493</sup>

OE *innoð* 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,<sup>494</sup> L. *interaneum* four times,<sup>495</sup> L. *intestinus* eight times,<sup>496</sup> L. *uenter* twenty-six times<sup>497</sup> and L. *uiscera* twice.<sup>498</sup> 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.<sup>499</sup> In four instances, the term is used in the phrase 'wið wyrmas on innoðe' (for worms in the intestines) which consistently translates the Latin term *lumbricus* meaning 'intestinal worm'.<sup>500</sup>

Including the tables of contents, OE *innoð* 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:

II.36.3 ...7 wreonde þa <b>wambe</b> 7 þa <b>innofaran</b> 7 þa wyrmo <sup>501</sup>	VEA 20 ... que <b>ventrem</b> vel <b>intestinae</b> cooperit vel calefacit. <sup>502</sup>
II.36.3 <sio milt>... on oðre is ðam <b>innoðe</b> getang. <sup>503</sup>	VEA 20 ab altera <b>visceribus</b> adherit. <sup>504</sup>

<sup>492</sup> Singular form of *uiscera*.

<sup>493</sup> Zupitza, ed., *Ælfrics Grammatik*, pp. 28, 30, 58 and 298.

<sup>494</sup> *OE* 52.1 and 80.3.

<sup>495</sup> *OE* 11.1, 27.2, 81.4 and 184.4

<sup>496</sup> *OE* 11.1, 37.4, 94.1, 94.11, 104.2, 148.1, 185.1 and *MdQ* 3.18

<sup>497</sup> *OE* 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.

<sup>498</sup> *OE* 150.1 and 185.1.

<sup>499</sup> *OE* 1.12, 18.2, 18.3, 28.1 (twice), 30.4 and 113.1.

<sup>500</sup> *OE* 137.2, 139.4, 147.4 and 156.1.

<sup>501</sup> 'And it covers and warms the bowel and the intestines.'

<sup>502</sup> 'And covers and warms the bowel or intestines.' Rose, ed., *Theodori Prisciani*, pp. 475–6.

<sup>503</sup> '(The spleen) is connected to the viscera on the other (side)'

<sup>504</sup> '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<sup>505</sup>

*PAL* II.108 = Philagrios. Nam dulcia omnia  
naturaliter praecordiis et **visceribus** sunt  
pessima<sup>506</sup>

II.56.9 op þæt se **innop** wyrð ge onburnen ge  
þurh þæt gewundod<sup>507</sup>

*LT* 71.1 ut exusti **intestini** uulnera facerunt.<sup>508</sup>

Here we see that *intestinus* is glossed by *innofara* once and *innop* once, while *viscera* is glossed by *innod* twice.

Table 4.5 Summary of instances of OE *innod* in medical prose

	Heading duplicate	Latin term	Meaning	Source Location <sup>509</sup>
Old English <i>Herbal</i>				
1.11	no	uenter	bowels	<i>DHVL</i> 11
1.12	no	aluus	bowels / rectum	<i>DHVL</i> 12
1.21	yes	ueretrum	penis	<i>DHVL</i> 21
2.3	yes	interior	bowels	<i>Herb.</i> 1.3
11.1	yes	interaneum	intestines	<i>Herb.</i> 10.1
11.1	no	intestinus	intestines	<i>Herb.</i> 10.1
18.2	yes	aluus	bowels / rectum	<i>Herb.</i> 17.2
18.2	no	n/a	bowels / rectum	<i>Herb.</i> 17.2
18.3	no	aluus	bowels	<i>Herb.</i> 17.3
22.1	no	n/a	bowels	<i>Herb.</i> 21.1
27.2	yes	strofus (στροφος). hoc est interaneum	bowels	<i>Herb.</i> 26.1
28.1	yes	aluus	bowels	<i>Herb.</i> 27.1
28.1	no	aluus	bowels	<i>Herb.</i> 27.1
30.4	yes	aluus	bowels	<i>Herb.</i> 29.4

<sup>505</sup> ‘And all sweet things do no good to the breast and intestines.’

<sup>506</sup> ‘For all sweet things are naturally worst for the abdomen and intestines.’ Puschmann, ed., *Nachträge zu Alexander Trallianus*, p. 78.

<sup>507</sup> ‘Until the intestines either become inflamed or wounded through that.’

<sup>508</sup> ‘So that there will be wounds of the burned intestine.’ Fischer, ed., *Liber tertius*, p. 331.

<sup>509</sup> 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*.

30.4	no	n/a	bowels	<i>Herb.</i> 29.4
32.2	yes	uenter	bowels	<i>Herb.</i> 31.2
37.4	yes	intestinus	bowels	<i>Herb.</i> 36.4
38.2	yes	ad colicos	bowels	<i>Herb.</i> 37.1
52.1	yes	colum	bowels / rectum	<i>Herb.</i> 51.1
53.2	yes	uenter	bowels	<i>Herb.</i> 52.2
53.2	yes	uenter	bowels	<i>Herb.</i> 52.2
62.1	yes	uenter	bowels	<i>Herb.</i> 61.1
63.1	yes	uterus	bowels	<i>Herb.</i> 62.1
69.2	no	uenter	bowels	<i>Herb.</i> 68.2
80.3	yes	colum	bowels / rectum	<i>Herb.</i> 79.2
81.4	no	interaneum	bowels	<i>Herb.</i> 80.4
84.1	yes	uenter	bowels	<i>Herb.</i> 83.1
90.10	yes	n/a	bowels	<i>Herb.</i> 89.10
94.1	yes	intestinus	bowels	<i>Herb.</i> 93.1
94.4	yes	uenter	bowels	<i>Herb.</i> 93.4
94.6	yes	uterus	womb	<i>Herb.</i> 93.6
94.11	yes	intestinus	bowels	<i>Herb.</i> 94.6
97.3	no	uenter	surface	<i>Herb.</i> 96.3
104.2	no	intestinus	bowels	<i>Herb.</i> 103.2
110.1	yes	interaneum	bowels	<i>Herb.</i> 109.1
113.1	yes	uenter	bowels	<i>Herb.</i> 112.1
113.1	no	aluus	bowels	<i>Herb.</i> 112.1
136.2	yes	*disintericus	bowels	<i>LMHF</i>
137.2	no	lumbricos	bowels	<i>LMHF</i>
139.4	yes	uenter	bowels	<i>LMHF</i>
139.4	yes	lumbricos	bowels	<i>LMHF</i>
146.2	yes	uenter	bowels	<i>LMHF</i>
147.4	yes	lumbricos	bowels	<i>LMHF</i>
148.1	yes	intestinus	bowels	<i>LMHF</i>
150.1	yes	uiscera	bowels	<i>LMHF</i>
151.2	no	n/a	bowels	<i>LMHF</i>
154.1	yes	uenter	bowels	<i>LMHF</i>
154.2	no	aliquae intrinsecus	bowels	<i>LMHF</i>
155.1	no	uenter	surface	<i>LMHF</i>
155.3	yes	testes	testes	<i>LMHF</i>
156.1	yes	lumbricos	bowels	<i>LMHF</i>
158.1	yes	n/a	bowels	<i>LMHF</i>
164.1	yes	uenter	bowels	<i>LMHF</i>

170.0	no	uenter	bowels	<i>LMHF</i>
173.1	yes	uenter	bowels	<i>LMHF</i>
173.2	yes	uiscera	bowels	<i>LMHF</i>
184.2	no	uenter	surface	<i>LMHF</i>
184.4	yes	interaneum	bowels	<i>LMHF</i>
185.1	yes	intestinus	bowels	<i>LMHF</i>
185.1	no	uenter	bowels	<i>LMHF</i>
<i>Medicina de quadrupedibus</i>				
3.18	n/a	intestinus	bowels	<i>MEA α 1. 17</i>
7.9	n/a	uenter	bowels	<i>MEA α 5.10</i>
7.11	n/a	uenter	bowels	<i>MEA α 5.12</i>
7.11	n/a	uenter	bowels	<i>MEA α 5.12</i>
7.13	n/a	torminosos	bowels	<i>MEA α 5.14</i>
7.24	n/a	uenter	surface / bowels	<i>MEA α 5.26</i>
9.5	n/a	uenter	bowels	<i>MEA α 7.5</i>
10.7	n/a	uterus	womb	<i>MEA α 8.15<sup>510</sup></i>
10.18	n/a	uenter	surface	<i>MEA α 8.28</i>
<i>Bald's Leechbook</i>				
I.38.t	no	n/a	bowels, internal organs	Unknown
I.47.3	no	n/a	bowels	Unknown
I.48.2	yes	n/a	bowels	Unknown
I.48.3	yes	intestinus	bowels	<i>Herb 93.2</i>
II.H.1	n/a	n/a	bowels, internal organs	n/a
II.H.53	n/a	n/a	bowels	n/a
II.H.60	n/a	n/a	womb	n/a
II.H.64	n/a	n/a	bowels	n/a
II.23.2	n/a	n/a	bowels	<i>PAL II.61</i>
II.23.3	n/a	uiscera	bowels	<i>PAL II.61</i>
II.25.4	n/a	n/a	bowels	Unknown
II.33.2	yes	n/a	bowels	Unknown
II.33.3	n/a	n/a	bowels	unknown
II.33.4	n/a	n/a	bowels	unknown
II.33.5	n/a	n/a	bowels	unknown
II.36.3	n/a	uiscera	intestines	<i>VEA 20</i>

<sup>510</sup> 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.

II.37.3	n/a	uiscera	bowels	<i>PAL</i> II.108 (Phil)
II.37.3	n/a	n/a	bowels	<i>PAL</i> II.108 (Phil)
II.44.1	yes	n/a	bowels	unknown
II.46.2	n/a	n/a	bowels	<i>LT</i> 34.2
II.46.3	n/a	n/a	intestines	<i>LT</i> 34.2
II.54.2	yes	n/a	bowels	unknown
II.56.7	yes	n/a	bowels	<i>LT</i> 71.2-3
II.56.9	n/a	intestinus	bowels	<i>LT</i> 71.1
II.56.10	n/a	intestinus	bowels	<i>PAL</i> II.80
II.56.10	n/a	intestinus	bowels	<i>PAL</i> II.80
II.59.21	n/a	n/a	bowels	unknown
II.64.4	yes	n/a	bowels	unknown
III.23	yes	n/a	bowels	unknown
<i>Lacnunga</i>				
ch 132	n/a	n/a		unknown
ch 151	n/a	n/a		unknown
<i>Formation of the Foetus</i> <sup>511</sup>				
	n/a		womb	V. Lat Q 69, cf. <i>Gyn.</i> 20
	n/a		womb	V. Lat Q 69, cf. <i>Gyn.</i> 20
	n/a		womb	V. Lat Q 69, cf. <i>Gyn.</i> 20
<i>Peri didaxeon</i> <sup>512</sup>				
ch 1	n/a	iecur	liver	<i>Ter.</i> 151
ch 1	n/a	n/a	liver	<i>Ter.</i> 151
ch 52	n/a	n/a	bowels	cf <i>Ter.</i> 44
ch 61	n/a	iecur	liver	<i>Ter.</i> 43
ch 63	n/a	uenter	bowels	<i>Ter.</i> 45
ch 63	n/a	n/a	surface	not located
ch 63	n/a	n/a	bowels	not located
ch 65	n/a	uenter	bowels	<i>Ter.</i> 49
ch 65	n/a	uenter	bowels	<i>Ter.</i> 49
ch 67	n/a	uenter	bowels	<i>Ter.</i> 49

<sup>511</sup> 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’.

<sup>512</sup> 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 *neweseopa* 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*.<sup>513</sup>

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 *neweseopa* to translate L. *ilium*, but unfortunately continues to be misled by Bosworth and Toller’s dictionary, stating that ‘*neweseopa* normally means “pit of the belly” (“stomach”) rather than, as in the *Leechbook*, “flank.”’<sup>514</sup> The only citation used by Bosworth and Toller<sup>515</sup> 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.<sup>516</sup> 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 neweseopan. 7 milte scare. beoð æblæce 7 eal se lichoma ascimod.’<sup>517</sup> 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 leuaque in lateribus, ubi costi non sunt.*’<sup>518</sup> Here are the parallel text examples of the terms:

<sup>513</sup> The neuter plural of L. *ilium*, *ilia* is occasionally treated as feminine singular *ilia*, *iliae*. See Vindicianus, *Epitome altera* 25 at note 518 below.

<sup>514</sup> Cameron, *Anglo-Saxon Medicine*, p. 96.

<sup>515</sup> ‘Neweseopa’ in Bosworth and Toller, ed., *An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary*.

<sup>516</sup> For more on semantic extension in medical Latin see Langslow, *Medical Latin*, pp. 149–56, esp. section 3.6.1b at p. 151.

<sup>517</sup> ‘Concerning their colour, and the navel and the groin and the anus and the colon (*neweseopan*) and the right flank (*milte scare*) are blackened and all the body ashen’

<sup>518</sup> ‘The ilia are on the right and left sides, where there are no ribs,’ Rose, ed., *Theodori Prisciani*, p. 478.

II.17.1 Sio <lifer> biþ on þa swiþran sidan aþened oþ þone <b>neweseoþan</b> <sup>519</sup>	VEA 19 Epar nostrum ponitur in dextro latere extensum usque ad langaones hoc est <b>ilium</b> . <sup>520</sup>
II.31.2 gecymð æt þam bæcþearme 7 æt þam <b>neweseoþan</b> . <sup>521</sup>	LT 69.1 et perueniens usque ad anum ab <b>iliis</b> . <sup>522</sup>
II.36.3 Sio <milt> is aþened oþ þone winestræn <b>neweseoþan</b> <sup>523</sup>	VEA 20 <Splen> extensum est usque ad <b>ilium</b> sinistrum. <sup>524</sup>
II.46.2 ge eft þone <b>neweseoþan</b> þæt sar gret <sup>525</sup>	LT 34.2 et <b>ilia</b> etiam dolore tenentur. <sup>526</sup>

OE *bæcþearm* translates Latin *anus* twice. once in II.31.2 (above) and once in the description of the symptoms of dysentery:

II.56.8 þæt se man sar gefelð... 7 þurst 7 unlust 7 þurh <b>bæcþearm</b> lytel blod dropað. <sup>527</sup>	LT 71.3 sitim et fastidium habent et per <b>anum</b> minutas guttas et sanguineas mittunt. <sup>528</sup>
--	---

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.<sup>529</sup>

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.

<sup>519</sup> ‘The (liver) is extended as far as the **neweseoþa** on the right side.’

<sup>520</sup> ‘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.

<sup>521</sup> ‘It extends to the anus and the **neweseoþa**.’

<sup>522</sup> ‘And it reaches as far as the anus from the **ilium**.’ Fischer, ed., *Liber tertius*, p. 328.

<sup>523</sup> ‘The spleen is extended as far as the left **neweseoþa**.’

<sup>524</sup> ‘It is extended as far as the left **ilium**.’ Rose, ed., *Theodori Prisciani*, p. 475.

<sup>525</sup> ‘And the pain touches the **neweseoþa** again.’

<sup>526</sup> ‘And their **ilia** are touched by pain.’ Fischer, ed., *Liber tertius*, p. 309.

<sup>527</sup> ‘That the man feels pain... and thirst and lack of appetite and a little blood drips through the anus.’

<sup>528</sup> ‘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.

<sup>529</sup> ‘*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.<sup>530</sup>

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

I.22.1 Wiþ **lenden** ece genim betonican  
swilce twegen penegas gewegen.<sup>531</sup>

DHVL 46 *Ad lumborum et coxarum  
dolorem*

Vettonicae dragmas II...<sup>532</sup>

### *Meaning Kidneys*

II.17.1 Sio <lifer> hæfð fif læppan helt þa  
**lendenbrædan**<sup>533</sup>

VEA 19 <Epar> pinnas habet quinque  
continens **renis**.<sup>534</sup>

II.31.3 Wenað unwise læcas þæt þæt sie  
**lenden adl... lenden seoce** men migað  
blode and sande.<sup>535</sup>

LT 69.3 Unde si medicus haec signa  
nescierit. errorem patietur. ut credat eos  
**nefreticos** esse.... Nam **nefreticus** aut  
sanguinem meiant. aut harenas mittit.<sup>536</sup>

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

<sup>530</sup> Langslow, *Medical Latin*, p. 151

<sup>531</sup> ‘For pain of the lower back take as much betony as two pennies weighed.’

<sup>532</sup> ‘For pain of the lower back and tailbone. Two *drachmas* of betony.’ Howald and Sigerist, ed., *Herbarius*, p. 20.

<sup>533</sup> ‘The (liver) has five lobes, it holds the kidneys.’

<sup>534</sup> ‘(The liver) has five lobes containing the kidneys.’ Rose, ed., *Theodori Prisciani*, p. 474.

<sup>535</sup> ‘Foolish medics think that that is kidney disease... nefretic men urinate blood.’

<sup>536</sup> ‘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 biþ þæt sar... eft fram þam nafolan op þone milte. 7 on þa winestran <b>rægereosan</b> <sup>537</sup>	<i>LT</i> 69.1 Dolor ab umbilico ascendit usque ad splenem et descendit usque ad <b>inguinem</b> sinistrum <sup>538</sup>
--	---

This parallel would imply that in this case at least, OE *rægereorsa* translates L. *ingen*, 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 wiþ wifa gecyndum forsetenum 7 eallum wifa tydernessum’<sup>539</sup> 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 **innoþe** oððe gif hio cennan ne mæg’<sup>540</sup> 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*.

*OE H*.63.1 Wið þæt wif hæbbe on hyre **innoðe** deadboren tuddur.<sup>541</sup>

*OE H*.94.6 Gif deadboren cild sy on wifes **innoðe**.<sup>542</sup>

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

<sup>538</sup> ‘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.

<sup>539</sup> ‘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.

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

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

<sup>542</sup> ‘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** deadboren tuddur genim þysse wyrte  
 wos þe we *dictamnum* nemdun.<sup>543</sup>

OEH 94.6 Gyf deadboren cyld sy on wifes  
**innoðe** genim þysse ylcan wyrte  
 <dweorgedweosle> þry cyþas. 7 þa syn  
 niwe swa hy swyþost stincen. cnuca on  
 ealdon wine. stile drincan.<sup>545</sup>

*Formation of the Foetus*

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

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 byrþres lic on hire **innoþe** scypigende  
 bið.<sup>548</sup>

*Herb. 62.1 Herba Diptamnum*

Si qua mulier in **utero** pecus mortuum  
 habuerit. Herbae diptamni sucum...<sup>544</sup>

*Herb. 93.7 Herba Puleium*

Si infans mulieri in **utero** mortuus fuerit.  
 Herbae pulei codas tres recentes. quae olent  
 suauiter. tritum. in uino ueteri optimo  
 quartario dabis bibere.<sup>546</sup>

Voss Lat. Q. 69<sup>547</sup>

-

Cerebrum. prius conpingitur in homine. Fit  
 ilium erga cerebrum. trifidum. in .ui.  
 ebdomade.

Tunc ueniunt dolores matri quod mouetur.  
 corpus. Idem. pastus in **utero**.<sup>549</sup>

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

<sup>543</sup> ‘If any woman has a stillborn offspring in her *innoð*, take the juice of this plant that we call *dictanum*.’ De Vriend, ed., *Herbarium*, p. 106.

<sup>544</sup> ‘If any woman has a dead thing in her *uterus*. (Give) the juice of the herb *diptamnum*.’ Howald and Sigerist, ed., *Herbarius* p. 116.

<sup>545</sup> ‘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 drink.’ De Vriend, ed., *Herbarium*, p. 138.

<sup>546</sup> ‘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.

<sup>547</sup> Bremmer, ‘Leiden, Vossianus Lat. Q. 69’, p. 22.

<sup>548</sup> ‘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.

<sup>549</sup> ‘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. *uterus* in a Latin exemplar.<sup>550</sup> It is highly probable that OE *innoð* is semantically extended to mean ‘womb’ in these instances due to the polyvalence of L. *uterus* in medical Latin, which can mean both ‘belly’ and more specifically ‘womb’.<sup>551</sup>

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

On þam teoþa<n> monþe þæt wif hit negedigð	In x. feltacus hoc est, <b>stomachus</b> qui, conpellit
hyre feore gif þæt bearn accenned ne biþ. for	hominem nasci. <sup>553</sup>
þam þe hit in þam <b>magan</b> wyrð hire to feorh	
adle oftost on tiwes niht. <sup>552</sup>	

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

<sup>550</sup> 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.

<sup>551</sup> Langslow, *Medical Latin*, p. 140.

<sup>552</sup> ‘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. Liuzza, p. 201.

<sup>553</sup> ‘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 *neweseopa* and *ragereorsa* do not seem to appear at all outside of the Bald's *Leechbook*, whilst the term *bæcþearm* 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.<sup>554</sup>

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 hnescaþ 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.

---

<sup>554</sup> '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 Altenglische 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 geþwærlæcað, and cnihtiugoð and sumor beoð gelice, and hærfast and geþungen yld geferlæcað, and winter and yld ateorlað. Lengtentima ys wæt and wearm; þæt lyft ys wæt and wearm; cildyld byð wæt and wearm, and hyra blod byð wæt and wearm. *Æstas* ys sumor; he byð wearm and drigge. *Colera rubea* (þæt synt read incoða) beoð on sumera; hig beoð wearne 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 sweart 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 hraca oððe geposu) deriað þam ealdan and þam unhalan.<sup>555</sup>

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

---

<sup>555</sup> Baker, P., and M. Lapidge, ed., *Byrhtferth's Enchiridion*, EETS SS 15 (Oxford, 1995), pp. 10–12.

wet. Water is cold and wet; so the old man is cold and snuffly.<sup>556</sup> *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.’<sup>557</sup> 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 *wæt* 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).

---

<sup>556</sup> 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.

<sup>557</sup> 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**.*<sup>558</sup>

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 Toller<sup>559</sup> 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 supplement<sup>560</sup> or addenda.<sup>561</sup> 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*

	weak m. or f.	weak m. or f.	strong n	strong n
	singular	plural	singular	plural
nominative	wæta, -e	wætan	wæt	*wæt
accusative	wætan	wætan	wæt	*wæt
genitive	wætan	wætena	wætes	*wæta
dative	wætan	wætum	wæte	wætum
instrumental	wætan	*wætum	*wæte	*wætum

<sup>558</sup> '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*.

<sup>559</sup> Bosworth and Toller, ed., *An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary*.

<sup>560</sup> Toller, T. N., ed., *An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary Based on the Manuscript Collections of the Late Joseph Bosworth: Supplement* (Oxford 1921).

<sup>561</sup> Campbell, A., ed., *Enlarged Addenda and Corrigenda to the Supplement by T. Northcote Toller* (Oxford, 1972).



### *Senses Listed in Bosworth and Toller*

For the neuter *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 L. *irriguum* as a separate sense.<sup>562</sup>

For the weakly declined *wæta* (m) and *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.’<sup>563</sup>

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 *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*

#### *OEH: Headings*

- 1 125.1 Wip ealle gegaderunga þæs yfelan **wætan**.<sup>564</sup>  
‘For all gatherings of the harmful fluid.’
- 2 175.2 Gif wif of ðam gecyndelican limon þone flewsan þæs **wætan** ðolige.<sup>565</sup>  
‘If a woman suffers a flow of the fluid from the reproductive organs.’
- 3 181.1 Wip þone yfelan **wætan** þæs lichoman.<sup>566</sup>  
‘For the harmful fluid of the body.’

#### *OEH*

- |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|
| 4 | 1.20 geðicge ðonne þæs <b>wætan</b> þreo full fulle. <sup>567</sup> | <i>DHVL</i> 39 et aquae calidae quiatos duo bibat. <sup>568</sup> |
|   | ‘then drink three cups full of that liquid.’                        | ‘and drink two <i>cyathos</i> of hot water.’                      |

<sup>562</sup> ‘*Wæt*’ in Bosworth and Toller, ed., *An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary*; and Toller, ed., *Supplement*.

<sup>563</sup> ‘*Wæta*’ in Bosworth and Toller, ed., *An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary*.

<sup>564</sup> De Vriend, ed. *Herbarium*, p. 21.

<sup>565</sup> *Ibid.* p. 28.

<sup>566</sup> *Ibid.* p. 29.

<sup>567</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 34.

<sup>568</sup> Howald and Sigerist, ed., *Herbarius*, p. 9.

5	4.9 lege to þære wunde swa oþþæt ða corn þurh ðone <b>wætan</b> gehnehsode syn. <sup>569</sup>  'apply to the wound thus until the grains are softened by the moisture.'	<i>Herb.</i> 3.9 tritici quoque grana integra indito uulneribus, donec <b>humore</b> mollita expleat. <sup>570</sup>  'whole grains of wheat placed likewise on the wounds until they swell, softened by moisture.'
6	37.6 Wið niwe wunda þe þone <b>wætan</b> gewyrceaþ. <sup>571</sup>  'For new wounds that produce fluid'	36.6 Ad vulnera vetera quae <b>humorem</b> praestant. <sup>572</sup>  'For old wounds which produce fluid.'
7	86.1 na he on caldum wætere cume ne he cealdne <b>wætan</b> ne þicge. <sup>573</sup>  'He should not come into cold water, nor drink any cold fluid.'	85.6 in frigida non descendat neque <b>frigida</b> bibat. <sup>574</sup>  'He should not go down into cold (water) nor drink any cold (water).'
8	93.3 (Wiþ wæterseocnysse) Eac hyt bynnan healfon geare ealne þone <b>wætan</b> ut atyhp. <sup>575</sup>  '(For dropsy) It will also drive out all the fluid within half a year.'	92.3 Per anum enim <b>humor</b> omnis detrahitur. <sup>576</sup>  'Indeed, throughout the year every humour is reduced.'
9	125.1 Wið ealle gegaderunga þæs yfelan <b>wætan</b> of þam lichoman. <sup>577</sup>  'With all gatherings of the harmful fluid of the body.'	124.1 <i>Ad apostema</i> . <sup>578</sup>  'For <i>apostema</i> .'
10	126.2 ne he colne <b>wætan</b> þicge. <sup>579</sup>	125.2 <b>frigida</b> non bibat. <sup>580</sup>

<sup>569</sup> De Vriend, ed. *Herbarium*, p. 46.

<sup>570</sup> Howald and Sigerist, ed., *Herbarius*, p. 30.

<sup>571</sup> De Vriend, ed. *Herbarium*, p. 84.

<sup>572</sup> Howald and Sigerist, ed., *Herbarius*, p. 82.

<sup>573</sup> De Vriend, ed., *Herbarium*, p. 124.

<sup>574</sup> Howald and Sigerist, ed., *Herbarius*, p. 152.

<sup>575</sup> De Vriend, ed., *Herbarium*, p. 136.

<sup>576</sup> Howald and Sigerist, ed., *Herbarius*, p. 167.

<sup>577</sup> De Vriend, ed., *Herbarium*, p. 164.

<sup>578</sup> Howald and Sigerist, ed., *Herbarius*, p. 210.

<sup>579</sup> De Vriend, ed., *Herbarium*, p. 164.

<sup>580</sup> Howald and Sigerist, ed., *Herbarius*, p. 212.

	‘For pain of the bladder... nor consume any cold liquid.’	‘For pain of the bladder... nor drink cold water.’
11	175.2 Gif wif of ðam gecyndelican limon þone flewsan þæs <b>wætan</b> þoligen, genim þas ylcan wyrt gesodene, gelege	LMHF Haec etiam matricibus mulierum sanguinem profundentibus praestat; si autem <b>humoris</b> profluvium mulieres ex naturalibus patiuntur, haec herba decocta omnem <b>humorem</b> supersedentium mulierum solo vapore constringit. <sup>582</sup>
12	under þam wifon sittendum ealne þone <b>wætan</b> of hyre æþme heo gewrið. <sup>581</sup>	
	‘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.’
13	181.1 Wið þone yfelan <b>wætan</b> þæs lichaman 7 þonne he hine spiwan onginneþ he sceal gelomlice liðne	Eius grana xv cum aqua mulsa trita et pota corpus <b>humoribus</b> per vomitum purgat... in ipso autem vomitu assidue <b>aqua mulsa</b>
14	<b>wætan</b> beores þicgean. <sup>583</sup>	sorberi debet. <sup>584</sup>
	‘For the harmful fluids of the body... and when he begins to vomit, he should often drink a light drink of <i>beor</i> .’	‘Fifteen grains of it ground with <i>aqua mulsa</i> purges the body of humours through vomit... He should take the <i>aqua mulsa</i> frequently in that vomiting.’

*Medicina de quadrupedibus*

15	3.1. Wiþ nædran slite, heortes horn hafað mægen ælcne <b>wætan</b> to adrigenne. <sup>585</sup>	<i>MEA</i> α 1.1 <i>Ad omnes homores</i> . <sup>586</sup> cornus cervinus habet vim omnes <b>humores</b> siccandi. <sup>587</sup>
	‘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.’

<sup>581</sup> De Vriend, ed., *Herbarium*, p. 220.

<sup>582</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 221.

<sup>583</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 226.

<sup>584</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 227.

<sup>585</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 240.

<sup>586</sup> **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.

<sup>587</sup> Howald and Sigerist, ed., *Herbarius*, p. 235.

16	7.10 genim þæt wæter þe innan gæt byþ 7 heo hwilum ut geoteð mēge þone <b>wætan</b> wið hunige 7 sealte. <sup>588</sup>	<i>MEA</i> α 5.11 Aqua, quae in caprae lacte <sup>589</sup> est paulatim effunditur, misceatur cum melle et sale. <sup>590</sup>
	‘Take that fluid which is within a goat and she sometimes pours out, mix the liquid with honey and salt.’	‘The water which is gradually poured off goat’s milk, let it be mixed with honey and salt.’
17	7.11. Wið innoðes heardnysse: swa hwæt swa he ete mēge wið þone <b>wætan</b> . <sup>591</sup>	5.12 <i>Ad ventris duritiam</i> . Idem ut supra bibitur et ventrem strictum solvit. <sup>592</sup>
	‘For hardness of the bowels: mingle whatever he eats with that liquid.’	‘For hardness of the bowels, the same as above, is to be drunk and softens the constricted bowel.’
18	7.12. Wið þone <b>wætan</b> . <sup>593</sup>	5.13 <i>Ad humores</i> . <sup>594</sup>
	‘For the humour.’	For humours.
19	8.2. smyre mid þam <b>wætan</b> þe drype of healfsodenre rammes lungenne.	6.2 <b>liquor</b> arietis qui de pulmonibus concoquis stilla.
	‘smear with the liquid that drips from a half-boiled ram’s lung.’	‘drip the liquid which you boil from the lungs of a ram.’
20	9.11 ahefe upp 7 abid oppæt se <b>wæta</b> of aflogen sy.	7.11 si suspenderis et passa fuerit donec <b>aquaticus humor</b> affluat.
	lift up and wait until the water has flowed out of it.	if you hang it up and it undergoes this until the watery fluid drains.

#### 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

<sup>588</sup> De Vriend, ed., *Herbarium*, p. 256.

<sup>589</sup> *caprae lacte*: α reads *capra*. Sigerist and Howald emend on the Basis of the β reading.

<sup>590</sup> Howald and Sigerist, ed., *Herbarius*, p. 252.

<sup>591</sup> De Vriend, ed., *Herbarium*, p. 256.

<sup>592</sup> Howald and Sigerist, ed., *Herbarius*, p. 252.

<sup>593</sup> De Vriend, ed., *Herbarium*, p. 256.

<sup>594</sup> Howald and Sigerist, ed., *Herbarius*, p. 252.

- 22 I.H.31 wiþ ælcra yfelre swellendre **wætan**
- 23 I.H.77 gif þu wille þæt yfel swyle & æterno **wæte** ut berste.

Bald's *Leechbook* I

- |    |  |   |
|----|--|---|
| 24 | I.1.18. sio adl cymð of yfelre <b>wætan</b> ufan flowendre.  | PAL I.45 Et fit hoc cum superfluitas ibi aliqua inceserit: aut certe resolutus <b>humor</b> in ventositatem exagitat loca. <sup>595</sup>   |
| 25 | I.1.24 atihð þæt þa yfelan <b>wætan</b> ut opþe þurh muð oððe þurh nosu.   | PPB I.1 materia detrahare per nares uel per os. <sup>596</sup>  |
| 26 | I.1.25 Eft þus þu scealt þa yfelan ofsetenan <b>wætan</b> utadon þurh spatl 7 hræcean meng pipor wiþ hwit cwudu sele to ceowanne.        | MDM V.7 Masticem cum pipere qui diu commanducauerit calefacto cerebro <b>umorem pituitae</b> naribus effundit. <sup>597</sup>   |
| 27 | I.2.3. <i>and</i> mettas. 7 þa swiþost þa ðe on ðære uferan wambe gewuniað 7 ne magon meltan. ac þær yfele <b>wætan</b> wyrceað 7 þicce. | Oribasius, <i>Synopsis</i> V.37<br>In suspitionem sit vin<e>s multus et dulces et cibos qui in superiora ventris multum manet et indigestis et <b>humida</b> generant opera et pingua. <sup>598</sup> |
| 28 | I.4.5 þonne atihð hio mid ealle þa yfelan <b>wætan</b> ut 7 þone gund.   | cf. Marcellus 15.51 <sup>599</sup>  |
| 29 | I.4.12 þa yfelan <b>wætan</b> & þat sar  | n/a   |
| 30 | I.18.1. Se cymð ... of to micelre fylle. oððe of to micle lærnesse. oððe of yfelum <b>wætan</b> slitendum 7 sceorfendum þone magan.      | Syn. VI.42 Singultus fit aut ex plenitudine aut de evacuatione, vel inanitate, aut certe ex acros <b>humores</b> mordicationem in stomacho facta.   |

<sup>595</sup> Fradin, ed., *Practica Alexandri*, 7r.

<sup>596</sup> Önnersfors, ed., *Physica Plinii Bambergensis*, p. 21; cf. Winkler, ed., *Physica Plinii Florentino-Pragensis*, I, 51.

<sup>597</sup> Niedermann and Leichtenhan, ed., *Marcelli de medicamentis*, p. 92.

<sup>598</sup> Molinier, ed., *Oeuvres d'Oribase*, VI, 65–6. Cameron attempts to synthesise two distinct recensions of the *Synopsis* here, printing the parallel as 'et cibos qui in superiora ventris multum manet et indigestis et humida generant opera et pinguis erudga, porrus.' Cameron, *Anglo-Saxon Medicine*, pp. 84–8.

<sup>599</sup> Niedermann, and Leichtenhan ed., *Marcelli de medicamentis*, p. 254; See Cameron, 'Bald's *Leechbook*,' p. 179.

- |    |  |   |
|----|--|---|
| 31 | I.18.2 Gif þonne se seoca man þurh<br>spiwedrenc aspiwð þone yfelan bitendan<br><b>wætan</b> on weg þonne forstent se geohsa | sed mox vomuerit <b>humores</b> , requiescit<br>singultus.                                      |
| 32 | I.18.2 se geohsa se þe of þæs yfelan<br><b>wætan</b> micelnysse cymð   | hii ergo qui ex plenitudinem aut<br>mordicationem <b>humorum</b><br>singultiunt. <sup>600</sup> |
| 33 | I.18.5 Gif of hatum <b>wætan</b> yfelum on þone magon gesamnodum se geohsa cume.   |   |
| 34 | I.31.10 Wiþ yflum <b>wætan</b> 7 swile   |   |
| 35 | I.31.10 Þæt worms 7 þone yfelan <b>wætan</b> aweg dep 7 adriþ.   |   |
| 36 | I.31.12 Wiþ ælcum yflum <b>wætan</b> .   |   |
| 37 | I.36.1 Drince þonne æfter þone drenc 7 nanne oþerne <b>wætan</b> .   |   |
| 38 | I.42.1 Of geal adle... þonne geweaxeð on innan ungemet <b>wætan</b> .  |   |
| 39 | I.47.9 drinc nigon morgenas nanne oþerne <b>wætan</b> .  |   |
| 40 | I.56.1 <i>and</i> meddrosna do to <b>wætan</b> .   |   |
| 41 | I.63.1 do eala to <b>wætan</b> .   |   |
| 42 | I.63.3 Drince þisne drenc... 7 nane oþre <b>wætan</b> þæt picce & stille sie.  |   |
| 43 | I.72.6 þonne þa yfelan <b>wætan</b> beoþ gegaderode.   |   |
| 44 | I.73.1 do on þæt lim 7 nane <b>wætan</b> .   |   |
| 45 | I.73.1 gif þu <b>wætan</b> dest to oþþe smera sealf.   |   |
| 46 | I.75.1 heald þritig nihta wiþ <b>wætan</b> .   |   |
| 47 | I.80.2 swilcre <b>wætan</b> swa he drincan scyle.  |   |

Bald's *Leechbook* II: Chapter Headings

- 48 II.H.25 hu mon þa yfelan **wætan** þære wambe lācnian scyle  
49 II.H.25 for þære yfelan omihtan **wætan**  
50 II.H.28 þæt uferre hrif sie gefylled wið yfelre **wætan**  
51 II.H.29 *and* cirre on fule 7 yfle **wætan** oppe scittan.

<sup>600</sup> Molinier, ed., *Synopsis* in *Oeuvres d'Oribase*, ed. Bussemaker and Daremberg, VI, 123.

- 52 II.H.38 hu mon sceal þa **wætan** & wonsceafta utan lacnian.
- 53 II.H.38 *and* be þam **wætum** yflum þæs miltes
- 54 II.H.38 *and* wið slipunge **wætan** þæs miltes.
- 55 II.H.42 Læcedomas gif omihtre blod 7 yfele **wætan** on þam milte syn þindende

Bald's *Leechbook* II

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <p>56 II.1.3 se maga biþ neah þære heortan 7<br/>þære gelodr. 7 geadortenge þæm<br/>bræge&lt;ne&gt;. of þam cumað þa adla<br/>swiþost of þæs magan intingan 7 on<br/>yflum seawum <b>wætan</b> atterberendum.</p> | <p><i>PAL</i> II.14 Est enim sensiblor 7 bene in<br/>compatiendo per vena vicinas epati 7<br/>cordi consentiens contingitur etiam<br/>cerebro. In hiis ergo principalibus tantas<br/>7 tales passiones 7 causa stomachus<br/>facit.<sup>601</sup></p> |
| <p>57 II.1.4 Þonne ða <b>wætan</b> þa yfelan weorþaþ<br/>gegaderode on þone magan. 7 þær rixiað<br/>mid scearfunga innan.</p>   | <p><i>PAL</i> II.36.2 Contingit autem his quibus<br/>pessimi et uenonosi cum mordicatione<br/>stomachi ibidem colliguntur<br/><b>humores...</b></p>   |
| <p>58 ne magon aberan þa strangan scearfunga<br/>þæra æterna <b>wætena</b>.</p>   | <p>non ferentes insustentabilem<br/>mordicationem uenenosis<br/><b>humoribus.</b><sup>602</sup></p>   |
| <p>59 II.1.5 be þære gelicunge þæs magan þe þa<br/>yfelan <b>wætan</b> sceorfendan 7 scearpan<br/>hæfð</p>  | <p><i>PAL</i> II.37.2 si is qui patitur sit<br/>temperantia satis calida, et in eius<br/>stomacho contineantur <b>humores</b><br/>mordicantes et acres nimis</p>  |
| <p>60 II.1.6 þa ðe mægen wiþ habban þam<br/>yfelan <b>wætan</b></p>   | <p><i>PAL</i> II.37.4 sed repugnando uincere<br/>possunt malos qui continentur <b>humores</b></p>   |
| <p>61 II.1.7 and wiþ þon þe mon sie on þam<br/>magan omigre <b>wætan</b> gefylled</p>   | <p><i>PAL</i> II.37.11 uel quibus stomachus<br/><b>flegmate</b> repletus frigidus est</p>   |
| <p>62 II.1.7 and wið manegum adlum þæt deah.<br/>ða þe cumað of oferfyllo and of<br/>missenlicum yflum <b>wætum</b>.</p>  | <p>sed et alia plurima de quibus nunc non<br/>est tempus ad commemorandum.<sup>603</sup></p>  |

<sup>601</sup> Fradin, ed., *Practica Alexandri*, 34v.

<sup>602</sup> Langslow, *The Latin Alexander*, pp. 162–3.

<sup>603</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 165.

63	II.1.9 Gif hie þonne cumað of oþrum biterum 7 yfelum <b>wætum</b> þa þe wyrceað oman ...	<i>PAL</i> II.38 Si <i>autem</i> ex <b>humorum</b> acredine fit cacochimia est.
64	II.1.9 þonne beoþ þa elcran to stillanne oþþæt þe hie unstrangran weorþan swiþost gif þa <b>wætan</b> beoð þicce 7 slipeggran.	Flegmatici <i>autem</i> extenuandi sunt 7 maxime si pingues 7 viscosi sunt. <sup>604</sup>
65	II.1.10 Be wambe coþe oþþe gif of þære wambe anre þa yfelan <b>wætan</b> cumen.	<i>PAL</i> II.38 Si <i>enim</i> in solo ventre habundauerint <b>humores</b>
66	gif þonne sio yfele <b>wæte</b> of þære wambe oferyrneþ ealne þone lichoman	Si <i>autem</i> ex toto corpore decurrunt in ventres <b>humores</b>
67	hwilum him mon sceal of ædran blod lætan gif þæs bloddes to fela þince 7 þære yflan <b>wætan</b> .	Interdum etiam flobothomandi sunt si sanguinis videtur esse habundantia 7 nihil sit quo impediat <sup>605</sup>
68	II.16.3 <i>and</i> gif him ofstondeþ on innan æniguu ceald <b>wæte</b> .	<i>PAL</i> II.15 sed <b>humor</b> aliquis frigidior subsistens <sup>606</sup>
69	II.16.4 þa slipinga <b>wætan</b> on þam magan 7 þa acolodan 7 þæt ofstandene þicce slipige horh þu scealt mid þam ærgenemnedan læcedomum wyrman 7 þynnian.	<i>Pass</i> II.31 Et si nimium <b>phlegma</b> inducis in stomacho idest in ore ventris congestum, huius medicaminis <sup>607</sup>
70	II.16.6 <i>and</i> gifernes arist of þæs hores <b>wætan</b> þe of þam magan cymð 7 he beoþ spiwende 7 swa swa hund eft sona secað þa mettas.	<i>PAL</i> II.15 Alia habent etiam nam 7 <b>flegma</b> vomunt/ 7 cibos quemadmodum canis 7 iterum ad vomitus reuertuntur <sup>608</sup>

<sup>604</sup> Fradin, ed., *Practica Alexandri*, 38v.

<sup>605</sup> Fradin, ed., *Practica Alexandri*, 38v

<sup>606</sup> *Ibid.*, 34v.

<sup>607</sup> Talbot, 'Notes on Anglo-Saxon Medicine,' pp. 160–1.

<sup>608</sup> Fradin, ed., *Practica Alexandri*, 34v.



71	II.21.5 þincþ him sona on fruman þæt sio <b>wæte</b> swiþor niþor gewite þonne hio upstige. <sup>609</sup>	<i>PAL</i> II.59 Mox enim in initio in inferioribus partibus magis videtur esse <b>tumor</b> quam in superioribus <sup>610</sup>
72	II.23.3 Ælc broþ is to forganne forþon þe hit biþ þindende 7 yfele <b>wætan</b> wyrçþ.	n/a
73	II.23.3 Ægru sint to forganne forþonþe hira <b>wæte</b> bið fæt 7 maran hæto wyrçð.	<i>PAL</i> II.61 Oua autem sunt prohibenda propter quod <b>liquor</b> eorum pinguis est 7 inflammationem faciunt maiorem. <sup>611</sup>
74	II.23.6 <i>and</i> adrigþ mid þy læcedome þa <b>wætan</b> 7 wirð se swile swa heard swa stan.	<i>PAL</i> II.65 Dessicat enim <b>humores</b> vel excocti sicut lapis efficiuntur. <sup>612</sup>
75	II.24.13 7 nænige oþre <b>wætan</b> .	
76	II.24.13 ...7 nane oþre <b>wætan</b> .	
77	II.24.13 ... 7 nanne oþerne <b>wætan</b> .	
78	II.25.t hu mon þa yfelan <b>wætan</b> þære wambe lacnian scyle.	
79	II.25.4 Gif þæt sie omihte <b>wæte</b> innan onburnenu.	
80	II.25.4 <i>and</i> wyrð gegaderodu omig <b>wæte</b> on þære wambe.	
81	II.27.8 Gif sio yfle <b>wæte</b> to micel sie. þonne dugon him ceald wæter 7 scarpe mettas butan hætu.	cf Oribasius, <i>Synopsis</i> . V.53 <sup>613</sup>
82	II.27.8 Hwilum beoþ þa <b>wætan</b> on þære wambe filmenum.	<i>Syn.</i> V.53 sed si autem circumtenetur humor in tonicis ventris.
83	II.27.8 <i>and</i> mid swelcum utyrnendum drencum ateon ut þa horhehtan <b>wæta</b> .	<i>Syn.</i> V.53 per ea quae mediocriter purgat; <sup>614</sup>

<sup>609</sup> 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.

<sup>610</sup> Fradin, ed., *Practica Alexandri*, 43r.

<sup>611</sup> *Ibid.*, 43r.

<sup>612</sup> *Ibid.*, 43v.

<sup>613</sup> 'Nam ea que **supercurrent** 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.

<sup>614</sup> Molinier, ed., *Synopsis* in Bussemaker and Daremberg, ed., *Oeuvres d'Oribase*, VI, 92–3.

84	II.28.t Wip þon þe mannes þæt uferre hrif sie gefylled mid yfelre <b>wætan</b> horhehtre.	<i>Syn.</i> V.38 Galenus. Ad eos qui <b>flegmam</b> in ventrem superiorem repletum habent. <sup>615</sup>
85	II.28.4 Gif sio wamb biþ windes full þonne cymð þæt of wlacre <b>wætan</b>	n/a
86	sio cealde <b>wæte</b> wyrçþ saran.	n/a
87	II.29.t Wip þon þe men mete untela melte 7 gecirre on yfele <b>wætan</b> 7 scittan.	<i>Syn.</i> V.30 De his quibus in ventre conrumpitur cibus. <sup>616</sup>
88	II.29.2 Seo <b>wæte</b> wyrçþ, gif hie mon ne deþ aweg, uneaplacna adla	n/a
89	II.30.5 swiðost on forweardne lencten ær þon sio yfele <b>wæte</b> se þe on wintra gesomnad bið hie togeote geond opera lima.	<i>Eup</i> I.16 Hoc autem faciat in primum uer antequam ebulescat et effundatur collectus ex hieme <b>humor</b> superhabundans et currat per aliqua membrorum loca et periculosas generat passiones
90	II.30.6 þonne becymð of þam yflum <b>wætum</b> oððe sio healfdeade adl oþþe fyllewærc oððe sio hwhite riefþo þe mon on suþerne <i>lepra</i> hæet oþðe tetra oþþe heafod hriefðo oþþe oman	et alii pati uidentur exantematas (ἐξάνθηματος) similia aut aspera, qualia sunt lepre aut impetigines, alii acoras (ἄχωρ) in capite, aerisipilas et aerpitas.
91	II.30.7 Forþon sceal mon ær clæsnian þa yflan <b>wætan</b> aweg ær þon þa yfelan cuman 7 geweaxen on wintra 7 þa limo geondyrnen.	purgare oportet antequam ebullescant collecti <b>humores</b> de hieme et resoluentur et currant per membra. <sup>617</sup>
92	II.35.2 Gif his mon getilað æt þære yfelan <b>wætan</b>	
93	II.36.6 Of cele ungemetlicum, of hæto & of drignesne, of micelre yfelre <b>wætan</b> forþon wixþ se milte ofer gesceap	<i>PAL</i> II.104 (Philagrius) nam <splen> infrigidatur et calefit et siccatur et <b>humectatur</b> et post haec sicut alia

<sup>615</sup> *Ibid.*, VI, 73.

<sup>616</sup> *Ibid.*, VI, 68.

<sup>617</sup> *Ibid.*, VI, 413; See also Cameron, *Anglo-Saxon Medicine*, pp. 77–82, 118–9.

		membra distemperatus efficitur et aegritudines in eo generatur.
94	II.36.6 <i>and</i> swipost of cele 7 of ungemetlicre <b>wætan</b> .	<i>PAL</i> II.105 (Philagrius) Frequenter enim distemperatur splen et maxime de frigida et <b>humida distemperantia</b> . <sup>618</sup>
95	II.36.10 þurh þas þing þa <b>yfelan wætan</b> 7 windigo þing beoþ acenned on þam milte	<i>PAL</i> II.106 (Philagrius) <i>pro</i> hec augmentantur <b>reumata</b> 7 ventositates generantur. <sup>619</sup>
96	II.38.t Hu man sceal þa <b>wætan</b> 7 þa wonsceaftan utan lacnian.	<i>PAL</i> II.111 (Philagrius) Curatio humidae distemperantia.
97	II.38.2 Wiþ þam <b>wætan</b> yfle þæs miltes.	n/a
98	II.38.5 Ne bið þæt an þæt þæt drige þa <b>wætan</b>	<i>PAL</i> II.111 Non solum enim ad <b>distemperantiam</b> splenis existimandus est facere,
99	II.38.5 ...ac þa aheardodan swilas þa ðe cumað of þiccum <b>wætum</b> slipegrum bet & þwænð.	...sed et tumores induratos qui fiunt de <b>humoribus</b> spissis et viscosis iuvare solet;
100	II.38.6 Wiþ slipegrum <b>wætum</b> þæs miltes	...potest enim digerere <b>humidam</b> splenis <b>distemperantiam</b> . <sup>620</sup>
101	II.40.1 þa laciað þone milte 7 aweg adoð þæt þicce & lifrige blod. 7 þa yfelan <b>wætan</b> .	n/a
102	II.42.1 Gif omihte blod 7 yfel <b>wæte</b> on þam milte sie þindende	n/a
103	II.46.6 Swa þu meaht ongitan þæt þære sidan sar cymð of yfelre <b>wætan</b>	<i>LT</i> 34.4 sic lateris intelligis dolorem ex <b>reumatismo</b> contigisse. <sup>621</sup>
104	<b>II.53.1</b> to <b>wætan</b> healf halig wæter	
105	II.56.7 sum mid þiccum <b>wætum</b> geond goten.	

<sup>618</sup> Puschmann, ed., *Nachträge zu Alexander Trallianus*, p. 74.

<sup>619</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 76.

<sup>620</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 80).

<sup>621</sup> Fischer, ed., *Liber tertius*, p. 310.

- 106 II.66.4 gif he þæs stanes gesceafenes hwilcne dæl on **wætan** onfehð  
 107 II.66.5 gif he þone stan on **wætan** þigeþ  
 108 II.66.8 þe þone stan on **wætan** byrigþ.

*Leechbook III*

- 109 III.H.29 and wip þam þe man sie mid **wætan** forbærned<sup>622</sup>  
 and in case one is scalded with liquid  
 110 III.2. do þæt se **wæta** mæge furpum ofer yrnan þa wyrta.<sup>623</sup>  
 make it so that the liquid may also run over the herbs  
 111 III.29. Gif mon sie mid **wætan** forbærned nime elmrinde 7 lilian moran.<sup>624</sup>  
 ‘If one is scalded with liquid take elm bark and lily root.’  
 112 III.29 Wylle þonne on cetele oþ þæt se **wæta** sie twæde on bewylled.<sup>625</sup>  
 ‘Then boil in a kettle until the liquid is reduced by half.’

London, British Library Addit. 43703<sup>626</sup>

- 113 Nim þonne vi and xxx lybcorna, gnid smæle, do **wætēs** 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*<sup>627</sup>

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

- |     |  |  |
|-----|--|--|
| 114 | II.59.1 þæs þa sina toslupað 7 beoð<br>mid slipigre 7 þiccere <b>wætan</b> yfelre 7<br>yfelre þiccere 7 micelre. | <i>Syn.</i> VIII.14 <i>De paralyisin</i> Contingit ergo<br>haec passio ex <b>humoribus</b> gluttinosis et<br>pinguissimis constipantis nervus. |
|-----|--|--|

<sup>622</sup> Cockayne, ed., *Leechdoms*, II, 302.

<sup>623</sup> *Ibid.*, II, 304.

<sup>624</sup> *Ibid.*, II, 324.

<sup>625</sup> *Ibid.*, II, 324.

<sup>626</sup> Torkar, ‘Zu den AE. Medizinaltexten’, pp. 330–38.

<sup>627</sup> Leechbook Fragment, London, British Library Harley 55, 1r–3r, (ed. Cockayne, II, 280–88) Contained in the appendices as *BLB* II.59.

- 115 II.59.1 þa **wætan** man scæl mid Manifestum est ergo quia evacuari  
 blodlæsum 7 drencum 7 læcedomum oportet tales **humores**.<sup>628</sup>  
 on weg adon.
- 116 II.59.7 lytlað þa yfelan **wætan** on þam seocum men
- 117 II.59.16. ac hwilc æthwega yfel **wæte** LT 79.2 sed cuiuscumque **humoris**  
 bið gegoten on þæt lim deriuatio, qui partem corporis tenet.<sup>629</sup>
- 118 II.59.18. oð þæt þridan dæl þære **wætan** oððe feorðan  
*Lacnunga*<sup>630</sup>
- 119 43 (42) and ða wyrte geornlice wið þone **wætan** gemengce, drince þonne.<sup>631</sup>  
 ‘And thoroughly mix the plants with the liquid, then drink.’
- 120 64 (66) þas gebedu þriwa man sceal singan, ælc þriwa on þysne drænc; 7 þas  
 mannes oruð eallinga on þone **wætan** þa 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.’
- 121 64 (66) Gif se mon sy innan forswollen, þæt he ne mæge þone **wætan** picgean.<sup>632</sup>  
 ‘If the man be swollen inside so that he may not consume the liquid,’
- 122 68 (71) and nænigne oþerne **wætan** ne ðige.<sup>633</sup>  
 and do not consume any other liquid.
- 123 84 (91) and ne cume þær æt nan **wæta**, butan of þan wyrtan sylfan.<sup>634</sup>  
 and let no liquid at it except of the plants themselves.
- 124 115 (122) Nim þone **wætan** 7 werm, 7 lafa þin heafod mid.<sup>635</sup>  
 take the liquid and warm it, and wash your head with it.

<sup>628</sup> Oribasius, *Synopsis* viii.14 (ed. Molinier, VI, 222–3).

<sup>629</sup> Fischer, ed., *Liber tertius*, p. 337.

<sup>630</sup> 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.

<sup>631</sup> Pettit, ed., *Lacnunga* I, 24.

<sup>632</sup> *Ibid.*, I, 36.

<sup>633</sup> *Ibid.*, I, 66.

<sup>634</sup> *Ibid.*, I, 72.

<sup>635</sup> *Ibid.*, I, 84.

125 127 (Metrical Charm 4, A43.4) ‘Wið færstice’

Nim þonne þæt seax, ado on **wætan**.<sup>636</sup>

‘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  
ungemætfæstre hæto, hwilum of  
ungemætfæstum cyle, hwilum of  
ungemætlicre **wætan**, hwilum of  
ungemætlicre drignesne.<sup>637</sup>

‘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.<sup>638</sup>

‘Coughing also, like dyspnoea, is a mere  
symptom, and it, too, has causes of  
differences of quality. For it takes its  
beginning sometimes from a hot imbalance,  
sometimes, too, from a cold or a wet or  
even a dry imbalance.’

London, British Library, Cotton Faustina A. X, 115v<sup>639</sup>

127 *And þas wyrta sy swyþe smæl corflode. 7 gedon innan þam croccan on uppan þam  
sy gedon grut*<sup>640</sup> *opþe wæta 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’ Recipes<sup>641</sup>

128 10. Eft wið þæt ilce nim sauina 7 betonica 7 wermod 7 merc 7 seoð on win oððe on  
oðer **wæt** swyðe.

<sup>636</sup> *Ibid.*, I, 94.

<sup>637</sup> *Ibid.*, I, 120.

<sup>638</sup> Langslow, *The Latin Alexander*, pp 184–6.

<sup>639</sup> Cockayne, ed., *Leechdoms*, III, 292.

<sup>640</sup> Cockayne suggests this reading in his translation, his edition shows the characters ‘GT’ with some kind of abbreviation mark above them.

<sup>641</sup> Cockayne, ed., *Leechdoms*, I, 374–8.

‘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 <b>wætun</b> syndon on þan manniscen lichama.  | Petrocellus, <i>Tereoperica</i> . 151 <i>Epistola Ypocratis et Galieni</i> contemplantium quatuor esse <b>humores</b> in humano corpore. <sup>642</sup> |
|     | ‘And they said that there were four humours in the human body.’  | ‘Four humours may be observed to exist in the human body.’  |
| 130 | 1. þat ys þa <b>wæte</b> on þan heafode and þæt blod on þara breosta...  | <i>Ter</i> . 151 <b>Flegma</b> naturalem locum cerebrum ostendit; sanguis vero in arterias et venas sedet...  |
|     | ‘That is phlegm in the head, and blood in the breast.’   | ‘Phlegm exhibits its natural place, the brain; blood truly resides in the arteries and veins.’  |
| 131 | 1. Þæt ys fram xviii <i>kalendas. ianuaris.</i> usque in viii <i>kalendas. aprilis.</i> , þæt on ðan heafde se <b>wæte</b> byð wexende; <sup>643</sup>                           | <i>Kalendas Aprilis</i> crescit in capite <b>flegma</b> et augmentatur  |
|     | ‘That is, from the 15 <sup>th</sup> of December to the 25 <sup>th</sup> of March, that the phlegm is increased in the head.’   | ‘The month of April: the phlegm thrives in the head and is increased.’  |
| 132 | 3. Ad scabiosos. Nim wingeardes sæt and gnid on <b>wæte</b> and lege uppan þar sar. <sup>644</sup>   |   |
|     | ‘Take grape seed, grind in fluid and lay upon the sore.’   |   |
| 133 | 5. Eftsona nim mintan and cnuca hy smale and lege uppan þa wunda, and ealle þa <b>wæten</b> , ðe þarut gað of þan sare, eall heo hit adrigh, and gehælð þæt sare. <sup>645</sup> | <i>Ter</i> 15 Item menta trita et imposita vulnera capitis et <b>humores</b> natos discutit.  |

<sup>642</sup> All sources for the *Peri didaxeon* are from De Renzi, Dares and Henschel, eds., *Collectio Salernitana* IV, 185–286 after Löweneck, ed., *Peri didaxeon*.

<sup>643</sup> Löweneck, ed., *Peri didaxeon*, pp. 3–5.

<sup>644</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 5.

<sup>645</sup> *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.’
134	8. Wið tobrocenum heafod oððer gewundedum, þe of þan <b>wætan</b> byð acenned of þan heafode. <sup>646</sup>  ‘For a broken or wounded head from which fluid is engendered in the head.’	<i>Ter</i> 11 Fracturam capitis vocamus vulnera que ex <b>humore</b> nascuntur in capite.  ‘We speak of the fracture of the head, the wound from which fluid is generated in the head.’
135	18. and þam mannan swyðest, se on <þ>ara seocnesse cealdne <b>wætan</b> drincap.  ‘And most severely for that man who drinks a cold fluid in that sickness.’	<i>Ter</i> 17 maxime illis qui in egritudine frigidam <b>potionem</b> accipere presumpserint.  ‘most severely for him who will have assumed to take a cold drink in the sickness.’
136	18 forþan þe hi beoð acennede of þan swertan <b>wætan</b> , and hy reade atywp. <sup>647</sup>  ‘Therefore they are generated from the dark humour.’	<i>Ter</i> 17 que ex <b>melancolico humore</b> nativitatem habent, neque rubee sunt  ‘which have origin from the melancholic humour.’
137	19 þæt ys ærest, þæt ðæt sar becymþ on ða eagen mid mycelre hætan; hwilum hit cymð on mid <b>wæten</b> <sup>648</sup>  ‘That is first, that that pain comes upon the eyes with great heat, sometimes it comes on with fluid’	18 Oculorum passio contingit aliquando cum ingenti fervore doloris, aliquando cum tumore, aliquando cum largo reumatismi cursu  ‘Disease of the eyes sometimes occurs through the unnatural fervor of pain, sometimes with swelling, sometimes with a plentiful rheumatic discharge.’
138	33. Oft of þan heuede se wyrsta <b>wate</b> cymþ to þan toþan.	<i>Ter</i> 30 Efficiuntur dentium dolores sub aquoso et frigido <b>flegmate</b> .

<sup>646</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 7.

<sup>647</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 13.

<sup>648</sup> *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.’
139	33. ealswa þa ufe <b>wæte</b> of þan heafod fylþ uppan þa teþ and hy þane þurhþreawþ and deþ, þæt hy rotigeþ and toþinddaþ. <sup>649</sup>	<i>Ter 30 Reumatizantibus gingivis ipsi dentes cavernantur ... et putridi facti aut lividi aut nigri.</i>
	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
140	52 And soþ hys, þæt ælc <b>wæte</b> cymd ærest ut of þan magan,	<i>Ter 43 Sed sciant hoc nescientes, quod omnis humor stomachum pulsatur et vulnerat pectus</i>
	‘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’
141	and þur þane <b>wæten</b> þa breost beoþ geheafugede and þa heorte ge sydu byð gefullede mid yfele blode	<i>Quia vene et viscera morbo putrido sunt plena.</i>
	‘And through the humour the chest is made heavy and the heart or sides are filled with harmful blood.’	‘Because the veins and bowels are filled with putrid disease.’
142	... And gif he þanne þa spatl swyþe utspæte, þanne hys þat þe hyfela <b>wæte</b> , þe on þan heafode rixaþ. <sup>650</sup>	n/a
	‘And if he then vomits up the spittle well, then it is the harmful humour, that reigns in the head’	
143	59. Sume men hyt eagles hof þas heafedes <b>wæten</b> , and sume men hyt eagles, þanne hi fæstende beoþ. <sup>651</sup>	<i>Ter 47 Aliquibus enim ex flegmate capitis...Aliquando ieiunis...</i>

<sup>649</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 21.

<sup>650</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 33–5.

<sup>651</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 39.

‘It afflicts some men from the humour of the head, and it ails some men when they are fasting.’

144 61. Wyte þu gewyslice, þæt se  
speaudrenc deaþ hym mycel god and  
fultum ge on þa breostan ... ge on ealle  
þa yfele **wæta**, þe wyþinna þe mægen  
beoþ and abeotan þa heortan

‘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.’

145 þe spæudrenc ys god... þat seo  
fastnysse þæs yfeles **wætan** on þan  
heafede and þæt oferflawende yfel on  
146 þan breostan byð astired æfter þan mete  
and se yfela **wæta** on þan gellan byð eac  
astired þanne þur þane dreng he byd  
147 afeormud and ne geþafaþ, þæt þær ænig  
yfel **wæta** beo gesamnad innan þan  
mægen.<sup>652</sup>

‘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.’

‘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 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 contingunt inundationes exagitatas. id est flegma et coleram atque **humorem** felliticum evacuat, et non permitit congregari in stomacho **humores** nequissimos.

‘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.’

<sup>652</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 41.

## *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 *þa 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.

Text	wm	wf	wp	sn	irr
<i>OEH</i>	14	0	0	0	0
<i>MDQ</i>	6	0	0	0	0
<i>BLB I</i>	9	8	10	0	0
<i>BLB II</i>	6	30	29	0	0
<i>Leechbook III</i>	0	2	2	0	0
Cotton Otho B xi	0	0	0	1	0
<i>Leechbook Fragment</i>	0	3	2	0	0
<i>Lacnunga</i>	6	1	1	0	0
Cot. Faust. A.x	1	0	0	0	0
Cot. Vit. C. III Flyleaf	0	0	0	1	0
<i>Peri didaxeon</i>	6	0	5	0	8

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 ungemætlicre 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** þicge’ 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 *wæt-* 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 formula ‘wiþ wætan’ (item 18).

The following table summarises the sense, source lexeme and declensional class of the medical instances of *wæt*, *wæta* and *wæte*.

Table 5.3: Summary of Instances of OE *wæt-* in Medical Literature

#	text	sense	translates	modifier	form
1	<i>OEH</i> H.125.1	humour	-	yfel	wm
2	<i>OEH</i> H.175.2	humour	-	-	wm
3	<i>OEH</i> H.181.1	humour	-	yfel	wm
4	<i>OEH</i> 1.20	drink	aqua calida	-	wm
5	<i>OEH</i> 4.9	humour	humor	-	wm
6	<i>OEH</i> 37.6	humour	humor	-	wm
7	<i>OEH</i> 86.1	drink	frigida	ceald	wm
8	<i>OEH</i> 93.3	humour	humor		wm
9	<i>OEH</i> 125	humour	<i>paraphrase</i>	yfel	wm
10	<i>OEH</i> 126.2	drink	frigida	ceald	wm
11	<i>OEH</i> 175.2	humour	humor	-	wm
12	<i>OEH</i> 175.2	humour	humor	-	wm
13	<i>OEH</i> 181.1	humour	humor	yfel	wm
14	<i>OEH</i> 181.1	drink	-	lið	wm
15	<i>MdQ</i> 3.1	humour	humor	-	wm
16	<i>MdQ</i> 7.10	fluid	-	-	wm
17	<i>MdQ</i> 7.11	drink	-	-	wm
18	<i>MdQ</i> 7.12	disease	humor	-	wm
19	<i>MdQ</i> 8.2	fluid	liquor	-	wm
20	<i>MdQ</i> 9.11	humour	aquaticus humor	-	wm
21	<i>BLB</i> I H.17	humour	-	yfel slittend	wf
22	<i>BLB</i> I H.31	humour	-	yfel swellend	wf
23	<i>BLB</i> I H.77	humour	-	æterno	wf

24	<i>BLB</i> I.1.18	humour	humor	yfel	wf
25	<i>BLB</i> I.1.24	humour	pituitas	yfel	wp
26	<i>BLB</i> I.1.25	humour	umor pituitae	ofseten	wp
27	<i>BLB</i> I.2.3	humour	humida	yfel	wf
28	<i>BLB</i> I.4.5	humour	<i>paraphrase</i>	yfel	wf
29	<i>BLB</i> I.4.12	humour	-	yfel	wp
30	<i>BLB</i> I.18.1	humour	acros humores	yfel slitend	wm
31	<i>BLB</i> I.18.2	humour	humor	yfel bitend	wm
32	<i>BLB</i> I.18.2	humour	humor	yfel	wm
33	<i>BLB</i> I.18.5	humour	<i>paraphrase</i>	yfel hat	wm
34	<i>BLB</i> I.31.10	humour	-	yfel	wp
35	<i>BLB</i> I.31.10	humour	-	yfel	wm
36	<i>BLB</i> I.31.12	humour	-	yfel	wp
37	<i>BLB</i> I.36.1	drink	-	-	wm
38	<i>BLB</i> I.42.1	humour	-	ungemet	wm
39	<i>BLB</i> I.47.9	drink	-	-	wm
40	<i>BLB</i> I.56.1	fluid	-	-	wp
41	<i>BLB</i> I.63.1	drink	-	-	wp
42	<i>BLB</i> I.63.3	drink	-	-	wf
43	<i>BLB</i> I.72.6	humour	-	yfel	wp
44	<i>BLB</i> I.73.1	fluid	-	-	wm
45	<i>BLB</i> I.73.1	fluid	-	-	wp
46	<i>BLB</i> I.75.1	fluid	-	-	wp
47	<i>BLB</i> I.80.2	drink	-	-	wf
48	<i>BLB</i> II H.25	humour	-	yfel	wp
49	<i>BLB</i> II H.25	humour	-	yfel omiht	wf
50	<i>BLB</i> II H.28	humour	-	yfel	wf

51	BLB II H.29	humour	-	yfel	wf
52	BLB II H.38	humour	-	-	wp
53	BLB II H.38	humour	-	yfel	wp
54	BLB II H.38	humour	-	slipung	wf
55	BLB II H.42	humour	-	yfel	wf
56	BLB II.1.3	humour	<i>paraphrase</i>	ætterberend	wp
57	BLB II.1.4	humour	humor	-	wp
58	BLB II.1.4	humour	humor uenenus	ætern	wp
59	BLB II.1.5	humour	humor	yfel	wp
60	BLB II.1.6	humour	humor	yfel	wm
61	BLB II.1.7	humour	flegmata	omig	wf
62	BLB II.1.7	humour	<i>paraphrase</i>	yfel	wp
63	BLB II.1.9	humour	humor	yfel biter	wp
64	BLB II.1.9	humour	<i>paraphrase</i>	þic 7 slipig	wp
65	BLB II.1.10	humour	humor	yfel	wp
66	BLB II.1.10	humour	humor	yfel	wf
67	BLB II.1.10	humour	<i>paraphrase</i>	yfel	wf
68	BLB II.16.3	humour	humor frigidior	ceald	wf
69	BLB II.16.4	humour	-	slipung	wf
70	BLB II.16.6	humour	flegma	horh	wm
71	BLB II.21.5	humour	tumor	-	wf
72	BLB II.23.3	humour	ydrie	yfel	wf
73	BLB II.23.3	humour	liquor	-	wf
74	BLB II.23.6	humour	humor	-	wf
75	BLB II.24.13	drink	-	-	wf
76	BLB II.24.13	drink	-	-	wf
77	BLB II.24.13	drink	-	-	wm



78	BLB II.25.t	humour	-	yfel	wp
79	BLB II.25.4	humour	-	omiht	wf
80	BLB II.25.4	humour	-	omig	wf
81	BLB II.27.8	humour	distemperantia	yfel	wf
82	BLB II.27.8	humour	humor	-	wp
83	BLB II.27.8	humour	<i>paraphrase</i>	horheht	wp
84	BLB II.28.t	humour	flegma	yfel horheht	wf
85	BLB II.28.4	humour	-	wlac	wf
86	BLB II.28.4	humour	-	ceald	wf
87	BLB II.29.t	humour	<i>paraphrase</i>	yfel	wf
88	BLB II.29.2	humour	-	-	wf
89	BLB II.30.5	humour	humor	yfel	wf
90	BLB II.30.6	humour	<i>paraphrase</i>	yfel	wp
91	BLB II.30.7	humour	humor	yfel	wp
92	BLB II.35.2	humour	-	yfel	wf
93	BLB II.36.6	humour	humectatur	yfel	wf
94	BLB II.36.6	humour	humida distemperantia	ungemetlic	wf
95	BLB II.36.10	humour	rheuma	yfel	wp
96	BLB II.38.t	humour	humida distemperantia	-	wp
97	BLB II.38.2	humour	<i>paraphrase</i>	yfel	wm
98	BLB II.38.5	humour	distemperantia	-	wp
99	BLB II.38.5	humour	humor	þicc slipig	wp
100	BLB II.38.6	humour	humida distemperantia	slipig	wp
101	BLB II.40.1	humour	-	yfel	wp
102	BLB II.42.1	humour	-	yfel	wf

103	<i>BLB</i> II.46.6	humour	rheumatismus	yfel	wf
104	<i>BLB</i> II.53.1	drink	-	-	wp
105	<i>BLB</i> II.56.7	humour	-	þicc	wp
106	<i>BLB</i> II.66.4	drink	-	-	wp
107	<i>BLB</i> II.66.5	drink	-	-	wp
108	<i>BLB</i> II.66.8	drink	-	-	wp
109	<i>Leechbook</i> III.H.29	fluid	-	-	wp
110	<i>Leechbook</i> III.2	fluid	-	-	wm
111	<i>Leechbook</i> III.19	fluid	-	-	wp
112	<i>Leechbook</i> III.29	fluid	-	-	wm
113	Cotton Otho B. XI	fluid	-	-	sn
114	<i>Leechbook</i> <i>Fragment</i> , <i>BLB</i> II.59.1	humour	humor	þicc, yfel, slipig	wf
115	<i>BLB</i> II.59.1	humour	humor	-	wp
116	<i>BLB</i> II.59.7	humour	-	yfel	wp
117	<i>BLB</i> II.59.16	humour	humor	yfel	wf
118	<i>BLB</i> II.59.18	fluid	-	-	wf
119	<i>Lacnunga</i> 43	fluid	-	-	wm
120	<i>Lacnunga</i> 64	fluid	-	-	wm
121	<i>Lacnunga</i> 64	fluid	-	-	wm
122	<i>Lacnunga</i> 68	fluid	-	-	wm
123	<i>Lacnunga</i> 84	fluid	-	-	wm
124	<i>Lacnunga</i> 115	fluid	-	-	wm
125	<i>Lacnunga</i> 127	fluid	-	-	w
126	<i>Lacnunga</i> 173	moisture	humida	ungemætlic	wf

127	Cotton. Faustina A. X	fluid	-	-	wm
128	Flyleaf 10	fluid	-	-	sn
129	<i>Peri didaxeon</i> 1	humour	humor	fewer	w (irr)
130	<i>Peri didaxeon</i> 1	humour phlegm	flegma	-	wf
131	<i>Peri didaxeon</i> 1	humour phlegm	flegma	-	m (irr)
132	<i>PeriD</i> 3	fluid	-	-	sn
133	<i>PeriD</i> 5	humour	humor	-	w (irr)
134	<i>PeriD</i> 8	humour	humor	-	wm
135	<i>PeriD</i> 18	fluid	potio	-	wp
136	<i>PeriD</i> 18	humour	melancolicus humor	swert	wp
137	<i>PeriD</i> 19	humour	rheumatismus	-	wp (irr)
138	<i>PeriD</i> 33	humour phlegm	flegma frigida	wyrst	m (irr)
139	<i>PeriD</i> 33	humour phlegm	rheumatismus	ufe	wf (irr)
140	<i>PeriD</i> 52	humour	humor	-	wf (irr)
141	<i>PeriD</i> 52	humour	humor	-	wm (irr)
142	<i>PeriD</i> 52	humour phlegm	-	yfel	wm (irr)
143	<i>PeriD</i> 59	humour phlegm	flegma	-	w (irr)
144	<i>PeriD</i> 61	humour	humor	yfel	(irr)

145	<i>PeriD</i> 61	humour phlegm	flegma	yfel	wm
146	<i>PeriD</i> 61	humour	humor	yfel	wm
147	<i>PeriD</i> 61	humour	humor	yfel	wm

### *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*

	<i>OEH</i> + <i>MDQ</i>	<i>BLB</i> I	<i>BLB</i> II	<i>Lacn</i>	<i>PD</i>	Totals
calida / frigida	3		1			4
distemperantia			5	1		6
flegma			3		4	7
liquor	1		1			2
humor	9		18		8	35
pituitas		1	2			3

potio					1	1
recrimentia		1				1
rheuma			2		2	4

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

	<i>OEH</i>	<i>BLB I</i>	<i>BLB II</i>	<i>Lacn.</i>	<i>PeriD</i>
æterno/ æterberend	-	1	1	-	-
bitend	-	1	-	-	-
biter	-	-	1	-	-
ceald	2	-	2	-	-
fæt	-	-	1	-	-
hat	-	1	-	-	-
horheht	-	-	3	-	-
lið	1	-	-	-	-
ofset	-	1	-	-	-
omig	-	-	4	-	-
slipig	-	-	5	-	-
slitend	-	1	-	-	-
þicc	-	-	3	-	-
ungemet	-	1	1	1	-
yfel	4	13	31	-	5

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 þæt 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*

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <p>1 I.4 (B1.1.5) þæt he ne mæg ætes oððe<br/><b>wætes</b> brucan,<sup>653</sup></p> <p>‘so that he may not have enjoyment of food<br/>or drink.’</p>   | <p><i>Passio Iohannis</i> Et neque esca cibari<br/>potest neque poculo satiari.<sup>654</sup></p> <p>‘and neither can he eat food nor be satisfied<br/>by drink.’</p>                                      |
| <p>2 I.11 (B1.1.12) [and] he ða fæste<br/>feowertig daga 7 feowertig nihta swa þæt<br/>he ne onbyrigde ætes ne <b>wætes</b> on<br/>eallum þam fyrste.<sup>655</sup></p> <p>‘And then he fasted for forty days and forty<br/>nights so that he did not consume food or<br/>drink in all of that time.’</p> | <p>Mt 4:2 Et cum ieunasset quadraginta<br/>diebus et quadraginta noctibus postea<br/>esuriit.<sup>656</sup></p> <p>‘And when he had fasted forty days and forty<br/>nights, afterwards he was hungry.’</p> |
| <p>3 I.25 (B1.1.27) He bið mare ætforan<br/>gode: ne abyrigð he wines ne nan þæra<br/><b>wætana</b> þe men ofdrunciað.<sup>657</sup></p> <p>‘May he be great before God, and let him<br/>taste no wine nor any fluids that may<br/>intoxicate one. ‘</p>  | <p>Luke I.15 erit enim magnus coram<br/>Domino et vinum et <b>sicera</b> non bibet.</p> <p>‘For he shall be great before the Lord and<br/>shall drink no wine nor strong drink.’</p>                       |
| <p>4 Eal his reaf wæs awefen of oluendes<br/>hærum: his bigleofa wæs stīplic: ne<br/>dranc he wines drenc ne nanes<br/>gemencgedes <b>wætan</b> ne gebrowenes.<sup>658</sup></p>  | <p>cf Luke I.15, Matthew III.4, Mark I.6.<sup>659</sup></p>  |

<sup>653</sup> Clemons, P., ed., *Ælfric’s Catholic Homilies: The First Series Text*, EETS SS 17 (Oxford, 1997), p. 210.

<sup>654</sup> Mombricitus, B., ed., *Sanctuarium seu vitae sanctorum*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1910) II.55–61 after M. Godden, ed., *Ælfric’s Catholic Homilies: Introduction, Commentary and Glossary*, EETS SS 18 (Oxford, 2000), pp. 33–4.

<sup>655</sup> Clemons, ed., *Catholic Homilies I*, pp. 266–74 at p. 266.

<sup>656</sup> after Godden, ed., *Commentary*, pp. 84–94 at p. 85.

<sup>657</sup> Clemons, ed., *Catholic Homilies I*, pp. 379–87 at p. 379

<sup>658</sup> Clemons, ed., *Catholic Homilies I*, pp. 379–87 at p. 380.

<sup>659</sup> 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.’

- 5 An is þæt gehwa hine sylfne getemprie  
mid gemete on æte 7 on **wæte**.<sup>660</sup>

‘One is anyone who tempers himself with  
moderation in food and drink.’

- 6 I.27 (B1.1.29) 7 he þær andbidiende ne  
onbyrigde ætes ne **wætes** binnon þreora  
daga fæce.<sup>662</sup>

‘And he waited there, he did not consume  
any food or drink within the space of three  
days.’

- 7 I.34 (B1.1.36) ðær is ahangen sum  
glæsen fæt mid sylfrenre raceteange: 7  
þæs wynsuman **wætan** onfehð;

‘There a glass vessel is with a silver chain  
hung and it collects the pleasant fluid;’

- 8 ... 7 þæs heofonlican **wætan** onbyrigað;

‘... and taste the heavenly fluid.’

- 9 Se **wæta** is swiðe wynsum on swæcce. 7  
swiðe halwende on hrepunge.

‘The fluid is very pleasant in flavour and  
very wholesome in touch.’

Ps-Augustine 196 Unum a potu atque  
epulis temperare.<sup>661</sup>

‘One is to refrain from food as well as  
drink.’

Acts IX.9 Et erat ibi tribus diebus non  
videns, et non manducavit, neque  
bibit.<sup>663</sup>

‘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.’

...coelestis degustare **liquoris**.

‘taste of the heavenly liquid.’

Nam et gustu suavis et tactu salubris

‘For it is both sweet in taste and wholesome  
in touch.’

<sup>660</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 385.

<sup>661</sup> Pseudo-Augustine, Sermon 196 in Migne, J.-P., ed., *Sermones*, PL 39 (Paris, 1815–75), pp. 2112–13 after Godden, ed., *Commentary*, pp. 200–9 at p. 207.

<sup>662</sup> Clemoes, ed., *Catholic Homilies I*, pp. 400–9.

<sup>663</sup> after Godden, ed., *Commentary*, pp. 221–9 at p. 223.



- 10    menige æfter langsumum fefere &                      denique nonnulli per longas febrium  
       mislicum metrumnyssum þurh ðyses                flammæ hac hausta **stilla**, celeri  
       **wætan** þigene hrædlice heora hæle              confestim refrigerio potiuntur salutis.<sup>665</sup>  
       brucað;<sup>664</sup>
- ‘Many quickly regained their health after              ‘having drunk this drop a great many people  
       lengthy fever and various sicknesses through       immediately obtain health from the long heat  
       the consumption of this liquid.’                      of fevers.’
- 11    II.3 (B1.2.4) ne dranc he naðor ne win.              cf Luke I.15  
       ne beor. ne ealu. ne nan ðæra **wætēna** ðe  
       menn of druncniað.<sup>666</sup>
- ‘He drank neither wine nor *sicera* nor ale,  
       nor any of the dinks that may make men  
       drunk.’
- 12    II.6 (B1.2.7) and hit mid ðam upspringe              Luke **VIII.6** et natum aruit, quia non  
       forbarn. for ðan ðe hit næfde nænne              habebat **humorem**.<sup>667</sup>  
       **wætan.**
- ‘and it was scorched in sprouting because it              ‘and dried out having sprouted because it had  
       had no moisture.’    no moisture.’
- 13    ða forscranc hit. for ðan ðe hit næfde              cf Lk VIII.6.  
       nænne **wætan.**
- ‘Then it shrank, for it had no moisture.’
- 14    þonne abreoðað hi for ðan þe se **wæta** ne              cf Bede, *Commentary on Luke* 3<sup>668</sup>  
       gefæstnode heora wyrtruman.
- ‘Then it withered because the moisture had  
       not fastened to the roots.’
- 15    hwæt is se **wæta** buton lufu and anrædnys.<sup>669</sup>

<sup>664</sup> Clemoes, ed., *Catholic Homilies I*, pp. 465–75 at p. 469.

<sup>665</sup> ‘Relatio de dedicatione’ in Migne, J.-P., ed., *Homiliary of Paul the Deacon*, PL 95 (Paris, 1815–75), 1524 CD after Godden, ed., *Commentary*, pp. 281–9 at p. 285.

<sup>666</sup> M. Godden, ed., *Ælfric’s Catholic Homilies: The Second Series Text*, EETS SS 5 (Oxford, 1979), pp. 19–28 at p. 19.

<sup>667</sup> Godden, ed., *Commentary*, pp. 388–94 at p. 389; cf. Matthew XIII.1–23, Mark IV.1–20.

<sup>668</sup> Parallel suggested in Godden, ed., *Commentary*, p. 391.

<sup>669</sup> Godden, ed., *Catholic Homilies II*, pp. 52–9.

‘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.<sup>670</sup>

‘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 ðicge mid oferflowendnysse. ætes oððe **wætes**. Alcuin, *De virtutibus et vitiis* intemperans cibi vel **potus** voluptas

‘or partakes of too much to his harm with superfluity in food and drink.’

‘immoderation in food or pleasure in drink.’

- 18 We sceolon oferwinnan ærest gifernysse mid gemetegunge. ætes. and **wætes**.<sup>671</sup> Prima superbia per humilitatem, gula per abstinentiam ...<sup>672</sup>

‘We shall first overcome avarice with temperance in food and drink.’

‘First pride through humility, gluttony through abstinence.’

- 19 II.14.1 (B1.2.16) and for ði gebudon. eced ðam drihtne. unwynsumne **wætan**. swa swa hi sylfe wæron.<sup>673</sup> Augustine, *Tract* 119.4, 18–20 Iudaei quippe ipsi erant acetum degenerantes a vino patriarcharum et prophetarum.<sup>674</sup>

‘and therefore gave vinegar to the Lord, unwholesome fluid, just as they themselves were.’

The Jews themselves of course were degenerating to vinegar from the wine of the patriarchs and prophets.

- 20 II.15 (B1.2.18) þæt wæter is brosnienðlic **wæta** and æfter gastlicere gerynu hæfð halwende mihte.<sup>675</sup> Ratramnus *De Corpore et Sanguine* 18<sup>676</sup> igitur in proprietate humor corruptibilis, in misterio vero virtus sanabilis.

‘That water is a corruptible fluid and according to the spiritual course it has healing power.’

‘therefore in its property moisture is corruptible, in mystery, however, a healing power.’

<sup>670</sup> *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.

<sup>671</sup> Godden, ed., *Catholic Homilies II*, pp. 110–26 at pp. 124–5.

<sup>672</sup> Migne, J.-P., ed., *Alcuini de uirtutibus et vitiis*, PL 101 (Paris, 1815–75), 636CD after Godden, ed., *Commentary*, pp. 448–66 at pp. 463, 465.

<sup>673</sup> Godden, ed., *Catholic Homilies II*, pp. 137–49, at p. 147.

<sup>674</sup> Godden, ed., *Commentary*, pp. 474–86 at p. 484.

<sup>675</sup> Godden, ed., *Catholic Homilies II*, pp. 150–60 at p. 153.

<sup>676</sup> Godden, ed., *Commentary*, pp. 487–500, at p. 492.

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <p>21 II.18 (B1.2.21) Ne dranc he wines drenc.<br/>ne nan ðæra <b>wætena</b> þe druncennysse<br/>styriað.<sup>677</sup></p> <p>‘He drank no sup of wine, nor any of the<br/>fluids that stir drunkenness.’</p>  | <p>Rufinus, <i>Historia ecclesiastica</i> ii.23.4–6<br/>Vinum et siceram non bibit neque<br/>animalem manducavit<sup>678</sup></p> <p>‘He drank neither wine nor <i>siceram</i>, nor ate<br/>any animal.’</p>   |
| <p>22 II.33 (B1.2.41) Ða heton ða apostoli hi<br/>aberan to heora inne. and hi ðrim dagum<br/>ne onbirigdon ætes. ne <b>wætēs. ac symle</b><br/><b>hrymdon.</b><sup>679</sup></p> <p>‘Then the apostles commanded them taken to<br/>their lodging and for three days they did not<br/>consume food or drink, but constantly cried<br/>out’.</p> | <p><i>Passio Simonis et Iude</i> Tunc apostoli Dei<br/>iusserunt eos... duci ad hospitia sua, et<br/>per triduum non manducare non bibere<br/>neque dormire illis possibile fuit.<sup>680</sup></p> <p>‘Then the apostles of God commanted them<br/>to be lead to their inn, and for three days it<br/>was not possible for them to eat or drink or<br/>sleep.’</p> |
| <p>23 II.39 (B1.2.48) Eles gecynd is. þæt he<br/>wile oferstigan ælcne <b>wætan.</b></p> <p>‘The nature of oil is that it wants to rise over<br/>every fluid.’</p>  | <p>Augustine, <i>Sermon</i> 93.5 Omnibus enim<br/><b>humoribus</b> oleum supereminet.</p> <p>‘For oil rises above all liquids’</p>  |
| <p>24 Ageot ele uppon wæter. oððe on oðrum<br/><b>wætan.</b> se ele flyt bufon; Ageot wæter<br/>uppon ðone ele. and se ele abrecð up and<br/>swimð bufon.</p> <p>‘Pour oil upon water, or on another fluid, the<br/>oil floats above. Pour water upon the oil, and<br/>the oil breaks up and floats to the top.’</p>                            | <p>Mitte <b>aquam</b>, et superinfunde oleum,<br/>oleum supereminet. Mitte eleum,<br/>superinfunde aquam, oleum supereminet.</p> <p>‘Take water, and pour oil over it, the oil rises<br/>above. Take oil, pour water over it, the oil<br/>rises above.’</p>   |
| <p>25 Æfre he oferswið þone oðerne <b>wætan.</b><br/>and seo soðe lufu næfre ne fylð.<sup>681</sup></p>   | <p>Si ordinem servaveris, vincit: si ordinem<br/>mutaveris, vincit. ‘Caritas nunquam<br/>cadit.’<sup>682</sup></p>  |

<sup>677</sup> Godden, ed., *Catholic Homilies II*, pp. 169–73, at p. 171.

<sup>678</sup> Godden, ed., *Commentary*, pp. 507–12, at p. 511.

<sup>679</sup> Godden, ed., *Catholic Homilies II*, pp. 280–7, at p. 284

<sup>680</sup> Mombricitus, *Sanctuarium seu vitae sanctorum*, II, 537 after Godden, ed., *Commentary*, p. 618.

<sup>681</sup> Godden, ed., *Catholic Homilies II*, pp. 327–34 at p. 328.

<sup>682</sup> Migne, ed., *Sermones*, p. 575 after Godden, ed., *Commentary*, pp. 654–61 at p. 657.

‘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 II.40 (B1.2.49) Þa leohtan gyltas sind ydele spræca. and þæt man underfo on æte and on **wæte** mare ðonne his lichaman neod sy.<sup>683</sup>

Caesarius, *Sermon* 179 Quotiens aliquis aut in cibo aut in **potu** plus accipit quam necesse est<sup>684</sup>

‘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 gemycclian þone **wætan**.<sup>685</sup>

‘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**.<sup>686</sup>

‘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**.<sup>687</sup>

‘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**.

‘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 ðicge on æte and on **wæte**.<sup>688</sup>

‘One is *temperantia* which is that one does not consume too much food or drink.’

<sup>683</sup> Godden, ed., *Catholic Homilies II*, pp. 335–45 at p. 343.

<sup>684</sup> Morin, G., ed., *Caesarii Arelatensis opera*, CCSL 103 (Turnhout, 1953), p. 3 after Godden, ed., *Commentary*, pp. 661–9 at p. 668.

<sup>685</sup> Skeat, ed., *Lives of Saints I*, 148–68 at p. 164.

<sup>686</sup> *Ibid.*, I, 194–208 at p. 202

<sup>687</sup> *Ibid.*, I, 306–18 at p. 312.

<sup>688</sup> *Ibid.*, I, 336–62 at p. 354, 358.

- 32 *St Martin* (B1.3.30) and his mæssepreoste sealde healfne dæl þæs **wætan** þe wæs on þære blede.<sup>689</sup>

‘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)

Augustine 6, 26-33

Ac him wæs þæs **wætan** forwyrnd, swa  
swa he forwyrnde ær þa crumen þam  
earmæn Lazare.<sup>690</sup>

In illa nocte diues ardebat, et stillam  
aquae de digito pauperis requirebat;  
dolebat,angebatur, fatebatur, nec ei  
subueniebatur, et conatus est  
benefacere.<sup>691</sup>

‘But this liquid was denied him, just as he  
before denied the wretched Lazarus crumbs.’

‘That night the rich man burned, and asked  
for a drop of water from the finger of the  
pauper; he grieved and was anguished and  
requested that he be rescued, but there was  
no help for him.’

- 34 *De duodecim abusivis* (B1.6.2.1) Se oferlyfa on æte 7 on **wæte** deð þone man unhalne.

‘Gluttony in food and drink does the man harm.’

- 35 to mycel forhæfdnyss on æte 7 on **wæte** 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 **wæte**.

‘One is called *gula* ... or to take too much of food and drink.’

- 37 An is *temperantia* ... 7 to mycel ne þicge on æte 7 on **wæte**.

‘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 **wæte** & on gewædum eac 7 on cumliðnyssse.<sup>692</sup>

‘In many ways one may give alms in food and drink and also in clothes and in hospitality.’

Ælfric’s Letters

<sup>689</sup> *Ibid.*, II, 218–314 at p. 260.

<sup>690</sup> S. Irvine, ed., *Old English Homilies from MS Bodley 343*, EETS OS 302 (Oxford, 1993), pp. 61–74.

<sup>691</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 70; cf. Luke XVI.22–31

<sup>692</sup> ‘De duodecim abusivis’ in Morris, R., ed., *Old English Homilies, First Series*, EETS OS 29, 34 (Oxford, 1868), pp. 296–304.

39 *Second Old English Letter to Wulfstan* (B1.8.3)

Seðe aniges þinges abirigð, ætes oððe **wætēs** ... ne ræde he pistol ne godspell to mæssan.<sup>693</sup>

‘If he tastes anything, food or drink ... he may not read the epistle or Gospel at mass.’

40 *Admonitio ad filium spiritualem* (B1.9.3)

ðonne bist þu gelic þam luftymum treowe þe grewð wið þone stream stedefæst on **wætan** and byrð æfre wæstmas.<sup>694</sup>

‘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)

41 10.11 Forbærn ðone oðerne ende þonne gæð se **wæta** ut æt ðam oðrum ende mid ðam smice.<sup>695</sup>

‘Burn one end, then the moisture goes out at the other end with the smoke.’

42 11.2 Seo lyft liccað 7 atihð þone **wætan** of ealre eorðan 7 of ðære sæ<sup>696</sup> 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.’

‘Clouds are formed having collected in the air drop by drop, which vapours of the waters from the earth and the sea.’

43 11.7 and of ðære sæ ealne ðone **wætan**, þe bið to renum awend Cf. *DNR* 33

‘and from the sea, all the moisture which is turned to rains’

44 11.8 ðære lyfte gecynd is þæt heo sicð ælcne **wætan** upp to hire. Cf. *DNR* 33

<sup>693</sup> Ælfric, *Second Old English Letter to Wulfstan*, ed. Fehr, B., *Die Hirtenbriefe Ælfrics in Altenglischer und Lateinischer Fassung*, BDASP 9 (Hamburg 1914) pp. 146–227, at pp. 180–3, 188–9.

<sup>694</sup> Norman, H. W., ed., ‘Admonitio ad filium spiritualem’ in *The Anglo-Saxon Version of the Hexameron of St. Basil and the Anglo-Saxon Remains of St. Basil's Admonitio ad filium spiritualem*, (London, 1848), pp. 32–56.

<sup>695</sup> Henel, H., ed., *Ælfric's De temporibus anni*, EETS OS 213 (London, 1942), pp. 72–77. Parallel Latin text from Henel's edition.

<sup>696</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 76–80.

	‘The nature of the air is that it sucks all fluids up to itself.’	
45	9.1 Ðis mæg sceawian se ðe wile, hu se <b>wæta</b> gæð upp,	
	‘You may observe this, if you will, how the fluid goes up.’	
46	9.2 And ðurh ðære lyfte bradnyse to ferscum <b>wætan</b> awend.	Cf. <i>DNR</i> 32 above
	‘And it is turned to fresh water by the broadness of the air.’	
47	13.1 Snaw cymð of ðam ðynnum <b>wætan</b> . <sup>697</sup>	<i>DNR</i> 34. Niues <b>aquarum uapore</b> , ... formantur,
	‘Snow comes from the thin moisture.’	‘Snows are formed by the vapour of waters.’
48	14 <i>De tonitru</i> . Þunor cymð of hætan &	<i>DNR</i> 29. Quidam dicunt, dum aer in se
49	of <b>wætan</b> , seo lyft tyhð þone <b>wætan</b> to	uaporaliter <b>aquam</b> de imis, et ignem
50	hire neoðan. 7 ða hætan ufan. 7 ðonne hi gegaderode beoð. seo hæte 7 se <b>wæta</b> ,	caumaliter de superioribus trahat, ipsis
	binnon þære lyfte, þonne winnað hi him betwynan mid egeslice swege. 7 þæt fyr aberst ut ðurh ligette. 7 derað wæstmum.	confligentibus horrissonos tonitruorum
51	gif he mare bið þonne se <b>wæta</b> ; swa	crepitus gigni: et si ignis uicerit obesse
52	hattra sumor swa mare ðunor. 7 liget on geare. gif se <b>wæta</b> bið mare ðonne þæt fyr, þonne fremað hit. <sup>698</sup>	fructibus: si <b>aqua</b> , prodesse.
	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	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.

<sup>697</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 81.

<sup>698</sup> *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 abyrige ne ætes ne **wætēs** buton hit for unhæle sy.<sup>699</sup>  
‘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 **wætēs** to onbyrigenne ær þære nigoðan tide 7 ær he mæssan hæbbe gehyred.<sup>700</sup>  
‘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) Cambridge, Pembroke College 25, Item  
Seo ys ungemetigende gewilnung ægðer 93: quæ est intemperans cybi et potus  
ge ætes ge **wætēs**.<sup>701</sup> uoluptas.  
‘Which is unmoderated desire either in food or drink.’ ‘Which is intemperance in food and pleasure in drink.’
- 56 *Inuenio crucis* (B3.3.6)<sup>702</sup>  
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)<sup>703</sup>  
Hwæt, he nænigre **wætan** onbitan nolde, þe druncennysse þurh come.  
‘Lo, he would imbibe none of the drink from which drunkenness arises.’

<sup>699</sup> Bethurum, D., ed., *The Homilies of Wulfstan* (Oxford, 1957), pp. 233–5.

<sup>700</sup> Scragg, ed., *Vercelli Homilies*, pp. 315–26, at pp. 319–20.

<sup>701</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 332–42 at p. 336. Parallel Latin text from Scragg’s edition.

<sup>702</sup> Morris, R., ed., ‘Discovery of the True Cross’ in *Legends of the Holy Rood*, EETS OS 46 (London, 1871), pp. 3–17, at p. 11

<sup>703</sup> Gonser, ed., *Das angelsächsische Prosa-Leben des heiligen Guthlac*, Anglistische Forschungen 27 (Heidelberg, 1909), pp. 100–73.



58	<i>Blickling Homilies: St Michael</i> (B3.3.25) '... swiþe wynsum ond hluttur <b>wæta</b> ut flowende ...  'a very sweet and clear fluid flowing out.'	<i>Relatio de dedicatione</i> dulcius et nimium lucida quattatim <b>aqua</b> dilabitur.  'a sweet and exceedingly shining water flows drop by drop.'
59	Ponne wæs ongear ðyssonum wæterscipe glæsen fæt on seolfrenre racenteage ahangen þæt ðæs wynsuman <b>wætan</b> þær onfeng.  'Then there was a glass vessel hung by a silver chain by that conduit so that it collected the wonderful fluid.'	Ob hoc et vitreum vas eiusdem receptui praeparatum argentea pended catena suspensum  'On account of this a glass vessel hangs by a silver chain prepared to catch it.'
60	Þæt hie æfter hlæddrum up to ðæm glæsenum fæte astigon 7 þære heofonlican <b>wætan</b> 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.'	morisque est populo communicato singulos ad vasculum ascendere per gradus donumque coelestis degustare <b>liquoris</b>  'It is said of the people that by custom they ascend one step at a time to the small receptacle to taste the offering of the divine fluid.'
61	Is þis eac to tacne þæt manige men on feforadle 7 on mislicum oþrum untrumnessum þurh þyses <b>wætan</b> onbyrignesse wurdan sona gehælde. <sup>704</sup>  '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.'	denique nonnulli per longas febrium flammas hac hausta <b>stilla</b> , celeri confestim refrigerio potiuntur salutis <sup>705</sup>  'Having drunk this drop, a great many people immediately obtain the relief of health after the long heat of fevers.'
62	<i>Vitae Patrum</i> (B3.3.35) and uncer mete wæs healfsoden flæsc and uncer <b>wæta</b> wæs olfenda miolc. <sup>706</sup>  'and our food was half-boiled flesh and our drink was camels' milk.'	

<sup>704</sup> Morris, R., ed., *The Blickling Homilies*, EETS OS 58, 63, 73 (London, 1874–80), pp. 197–211 at pp. 207–9.

<sup>705</sup> after Godden, ed., *Commentary*, p. 285; Migne, ed., *Homiliary of Paul the Deacon*, p. 1524 CD.

<sup>706</sup> Assman, ed., *Angelsächsische Homilien und Heiligenleben*, BDASP 3 (Kassel, 1964).

- 63 *Apocalypse of Thomas* (B3.4.12.1)  
 On þam nehstum tidum þisse worlde þær bið micel gefeoht 7 hungur 7 eorðrenas 7 micel **wæta** geond middaneard.<sup>707</sup>  
 ‘In the last hour of this world there shall be great war and hunger and earthquakes and a great flood through the earth.’
- 64 Vercelli Homily 21 (B3.5.13) Cambridge, Pembroke College 25, Item 40. Quid enim proficit ieiunare et abstinerere a carne **et uino** nisi cessemus a uitiiis et peccatis?  
 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 ætūm ge **wætūm**<sup>708</sup>  
 ‘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...’  
 ‘Anyone who manages to fast and abstain from meat and wine unless we desist in vices and sins.’
- 65 Luke VII.44 (B8.4.3.3) ne sealdest þu me **wætān** to minum fotum.<sup>709</sup> Luke VII.44 tuam **aquam** pedibus meis non dedisti  
 ‘thou gavest me no water for my feet.’
- 66 Luke VIII.6 And sum feoll ofer þæne stan 7 hit forscranc forþam þe hit **wætān** næfde. Luke VIII.6 et aliud cecidit supra petram et natum aruit quia non habebat **humorem**  
 ‘And other some fell upon a rock: and as soon as it was sprung up, it withered away, because it had no moisture.’
- 67 *Pastoral Care* (B9.1.3) *Gregori Magni Regula pastoralis* i.11  
 11. Ðonan cymeð sio mettrymnes ðæm healedum, ðe se **wæta** ðara innoða astigð to ðæm lime. Vitium quippe est ponderis, cum **humor** uiscerum ad uirilia labitur.<sup>710</sup>

<sup>707</sup> Förster, ‘A New Version of the Apocalypse of Thomas in Old English’ *Anglia* 73 (1955), 6–36, at pp. 17–27.

<sup>708</sup> Scragg, ed., *Vercelli Homilies*, pp. 351–65.

<sup>709</sup> Skeat, W. W., ed., *The Four Gospels in Anglo-Saxon, Northumbrian, and Old Mercian Versions* (Cambridge, 1871–87).

<sup>710</sup> Rommel, F., ed., *Règle Pastorale*, 2 vols., Sources Chrétiennes 381 (Paris, 1992), I, 172.

	‘When the infirmity comes to the dropsied, the humour of the bowels sinks to the limbs.’ <sup>711</sup>	‘It is, in fact, a fault of heaviness, when the fluid of the bowels sinks to the manly (members).’
68	41 Ðonne bið se deaðbæra <b>wæta</b> on ðæm menn ofslægen mid ðæm biteran drence. <sup>712</sup>	iii.17 dum uero gustus per dulcedinem fallitur, <b>humor</b> mortiferus per amaritudinem uacuatur. <sup>713</sup>
	‘Then the deadly fluid in that man is slain with the bitter drink.’	‘The deadly humour is voided through bitterness.’
69	Orosius v.7 (B9.2.6) Pæt hie heora feawa for þam <b>wætan</b> ahebban mehton, 7 for þæm gefliemde wurdon, for þon þe elpendes hyd wile drincan <b>wætan</b> , gelice 7 spynges deð <sup>714</sup>	Orosius, <i>Historiae aduersus paganos</i> v.7 cujus ea natura est, ut imbrem tanquam spongia ebibat, quia circumferri non poterant defendere nequiverunt. <sup>715</sup>
70	‘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.’
71	Old English <i>Consolation of Philosophy</i> (B9.3.2) <sup>716</sup> 15, ll. 8–11: Nalles scir win hi ne druncan, ne nanne <b>wætan</b> hi ne cupon wið hunige menga. <sup>717</sup>	Boethius, <i>De consolazione philosophiae</i> II.met 5 ll. 4–7 Facili quae sera solebat Ieiunia soluere glande. Non Bacchica munera norant liquido confundere melle. <sup>718</sup>
	‘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.’

<sup>711</sup> Sweet translates: ‘Hydrocele is caused by the humours of the body collecting within the member.’

<sup>712</sup> Sweet, ed., *Gregory’s Pastoral Care*, pp. 73, 303.

<sup>713</sup> Rommel, ed., *Règle Pastorale* I, 366.

<sup>714</sup> Batley, J., ed., *The Old English Orosius*, EETS SS 6 (Oxford, 1980), pp. 120–2.

<sup>715</sup> 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).

<sup>716</sup> *DOEC* text from Sedgefield, W. J., ed., *King Alfred’s Old English Version of Boethius’ De consolazione Philosophiae* (Oxford, 1899), checked against Godden, M., and S. Irvine, ed., *The Old English Boethius: an Edition of the Old English Versions of Boethius’s De Consolatione Philosophiae* 2 vols. (Oxford, 2009).

<sup>717</sup> Godden and Irvine, ed., *Old English Boethius*, I, 271.

<sup>718</sup> Bieler, L., ed., *Anicii Manlii Severini Boethii Philosophiae consolatio*, CCSL 94 (Turnhout, 1957), pp. 28–9.

72	33, ll. 167–70: swa þæt heora nan oðres mearce ne ofereode, & se cile geþwærode <sup>719</sup> wið ða hæto, & þæt wæt wið þam drygium. <sup>720</sup>	Boethius, <i>CP</i> III. met. 9, 10–12  Tu numeris elementa ligas, ut frigora flammiis, Arida conueniant <b>liquidis</b> , ne purior ignis Euolet aut mersas deducant 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.’	‘You bind the elements by number, so that the cold is appropriate to the flame, the dry to the wet, nor does the purer fire flee, or lest weights pull down the overwhelmed earth.’
73	39, l. 351 Hwylum flihð se wæta þæt dryge. <sup>721</sup>	Boethius, <i>CP</i> IV met. 6, 21  Vicibus cedant <b>humida</b> siccis.
	‘Sometimes the wet flees the dry.’	‘In turn the wet concedes to the dry.’
74	Gregory’s <i>Dialogues</i> 1.9 (B9.5.2) and þa þa he of þam wætan þæs wines hwæthugu sænde geond ealle þa fatu...	<i>Gregori Magni dialogi</i> I.ix.4  Cum uero ex <b>liquore</b> uini parum aliquid in uasis omnibus misisset... et uasa in quibus tenuissimum <b>liquorem</b> fuderat
75	þa þe he geat ær swyðe lytelne dæl þæs þynnestan wætan, <sup>722</sup>	ubertim uinum fundentia inuenit, <sup>723</sup>
	‘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.’	‘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.’
76	3.34 (B9.5.5) And seo þonne asworeted 7 bideð æt þam fæder þanes landes 7 wætes.	<i>Dialogi</i> III.xxxiv.4 Quae suspirans a patre terram <b>inriguam</b> petit. <sup>724</sup>

<sup>719</sup> geþwærode] Sedgefield: geprowode

<sup>720</sup> Godden and Irvine, ed., *Old English Boethius*, I, 115–16.

<sup>721</sup> *Ibid.*, I, 369.

<sup>722</sup> Hecht, ed., *Dialogues*, pp. 58–9.

<sup>723</sup> de Vogüé, A., ed., *Grégoire le Grand Dialogues*, 3 vols, Sources Chrétiennes 251, 260, 265. (Paris, 1978–80). II, 78.

<sup>724</sup> de Vogüé, ed., *Dialogues* II, 402.

	‘and then she is grieved and prays to the father for his land and water.’	‘Who, sighing, entreats irrigated ground from the father.’
77	... ac þonne gyt hi beþurfon þanes landes 7 <b>wæt</b> es.	...sed adhuc <b>inriguam</b> indigent. <sup>725</sup>
	‘yet they needed that land and moisture.’	‘but they still need well watered (land).’
78	And ic cwæð ær, þæt wæron twa cynn þære inbryrdnesse, 7 þæt se fæder hire	III.xxxiv.5 Sed quia, ut dixi, duo sunt
79	sealde þan 7 <b>wæt</b> bufan. and þan 7 <b>wæt</b> beneoðon. Witodlice seo sawl onfehð	conpunctionis genera, dedit ei pater suos <b>inriguum</b> superius et <b>inriguum</b> inferius.
80	þan 7 <b>wæt</b> bufan þonne heo hi sylfe geswænceð in tearum for ðam luste þæs heofonlican rices, 7 heo onfehð þanum 7	<b>Inriguum</b> quippe superius accipit anima, cum sese in lacrimis caelestis regni desiderio adfligit, <b>inriguum</b> uero
81	<b>wætum</b> beneoðan. <sup>726</sup>	inferius accipit... <sup>727</sup>
	‘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...’
82	3.37 Þa þa Langbeardisce mæn wrungon elebergan on þære treddan 7 heom wæs wana, þæt hi mihton ænigne eles <b>wætan</b> ut aþyn. <sup>728</sup>	III.xxxvii.2 Hic namque quodam tempore, cum in praelo Langobardi oliuam premerent, ut in oleum <b>liquari</b> debuisset,
	‘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’

<sup>725</sup> *Ibid.*, II, 402.

<sup>726</sup> Hecht, ed., *Dialogues*, pp. 244–6.

<sup>727</sup> de Vogué ed., *Dialogues*, II, 402–4.

<sup>728</sup> Hecht, ed., *Dialogues*, pp. 249–57.

83	4.28 Soðlice his handa 7 his fet wæron swellende 7 aþundene for þy <b>wætan</b> þære fotadle <sup>729</sup>	IV.xxviii.3 Nam manus eius ac pedes, podagrae <b>humore</b> tumescentes. <sup>730</sup>
	‘Truly his hands and his feet were swollen and inflamed for the humour of the gout.’	‘For his hands and feet, swollen with the humour of gout.’
84	Bede, <i>HE</i> i.27 (B9.6.3)  Forðon he bær þa <b>wætan</b> þære uncyste in þæm telgan, þone he geteah ær of þam wyrtruman. <sup>731</sup>	Bede, <i>Historia Ecclesiastica Gentis Anglorum</i> i.27 nam ut arbor quae portat in ramo <b>umorem</b> uitii, quem traxit ex radice. <sup>732</sup>
	‘For he bore the sap of vice in the branch, which he had drawn from the roots.’	‘For like a tree which bears in the branch the sap of evil which he drew from the root.’ <sup>733</sup>
85	<i>HE</i> iv.19 (B9.6.6) Þa heht me mon, cwæð he, þæt ic þone swile gesticade, þætte seo sceðþende <b>wæte</b> ut fleowe, seo þær in wæs. <sup>734</sup>	<i>HE</i> iv.19 ‘Iusseruntque me’ inquit ‘incidere tumorem illam, ut efflueret noxius <b>umor</b> qui interat.’ <sup>735</sup>
	‘Then someone called me, he ordered me to prick the swelling so that the harmful fluid would flow out, that was in there.’	“‘I was ordered,’” he said, “‘to cut this tumour so as to drain out the poisonout matter within it.’”
86	<i>Old English Rule</i> (B10.3.1.1) <sup>736</sup>  43 and be dæle æt and <b>wæt</b> gewanod sy, oðþæt he þæs gyltes gymeleaste gebete.	<i>Benedicti regula</i>  xlili.16 sed sequestratus a consortio omnium reficiat solus sublata ei portione sua <b>uinum</b> usque ad satisfactionem et emendationem.
	‘and by degrees food and drink are to be reduced, until he ask for the forgiveness of that guilt.’	‘But he should eat sequestered from all company, alone in the taking of the portion of wine to him until satisfaction and correction (occur)’

<sup>729</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 260–350.

<sup>730</sup> de Vogüé, ed., *Dialogues*, III, 96

<sup>731</sup> 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.

<sup>732</sup> Colgrave and Mynors, ed., *Historia ecclesiastica*, pp. 96–7.

<sup>733</sup> Translation from Colgrave and Mynors.

<sup>734</sup> Miller, ed., *Ecclesiastical History*, I, 320.

<sup>735</sup> Colgrave and Mynors, ed., *Historia Ecclesiastica*, pp. 394–5. Translation from Colgrave and Mynors.

<sup>736</sup> Schröer, ed. *Die angelsächsischen Benediktinerregel*, p. 69.

87	<p>43 Ne gedyrstlæce nan, ne ær gesettere tide ne æfter, nan ðing to ðigenne, ne on æte ne on <b>wæte</b>.</p> <p>‘None should presume, neither before nor after the set time, to consume any thing, either in food or in drink.’</p>	<p>xliii.18. Et ne quis praesumat ante statutam horam uel postea quicquam cibi aut <b>potus</b> praesumere.</p>
88	<p>49 ... and began hy geornlice syndrige gebeda and forhæfdnesse healdan, ægðer ge on æte, ge on <b>wæte</b>, ge on slæpe...</p> <p>‘And they earnestly observe many prayers and hold self restraint, either in food or in drink and in sleep.’</p>	<p>xlix.5 Ergo his diebus augeamus nobis aliquid solito pensu seruitutis nostrae, orationes peculiares, ciborum et <b>potus</b> abstinentiam.</p> <p>‘Therefore in these days let us increase something of our service, with customary prayers, abstinence in food and drink.’</p>
89	<p><i>Rule of Chrodegang of Metz</i> (B10.4.1)</p> <p>5 Be þam þæt on preosta geferræddene ealle gelice onfon ætes and <b>wætes</b>.<sup>737</sup></p> <p>‘For that in a community of priests all are to partake of food and drink equally.’</p>	<p><i>Enlarged Rule of Chrodegang of Metz</i></p> <p>5 De eo quod in congregatione canonica equaliter cibus et potus accipiat.</p> <p>‘That in a regular congregation of canons, food and drink are taken equally.’</p>
90	<p>38 And nelle we na forbeodan þæt se seoca on ælcne sæl æt and <b>wæt</b> picge.</p> <p>‘And neither do we forbid that the sick not consume food or drink in any cell.’</p>	<p>38 et hoc interdictum non est quod infirmo licet omni hora cibus et potum sumere.</p> <p>‘And this is not forbidden, that it is allowed to the sick to consume food and drink at any time.’</p>
91	<p>60. Nan fefor nis mannon mara, þonne se winlica <b>wæta</b>, of þam deafiað þa earan and wleaffað seo tunge.</p> <p>‘No fever is greater to men, than the vinous fluid, by which the ears are deafened and the tongue stammers.’</p>	<p>Nulla febris hominum, maior quam uiteus <b>humor</b>./ Surdescunt aures, balbutit denique lingua.<sup>738</sup></p> <p>‘No fever of men is greater than liquor./ The ears go deaf and then the tongue stutters.’</p>

<sup>737</sup> Langefeld, B., ed., *The Old English Version of the Enlarged Rule of Chrodegang*, Münchener Universitätsschriften Texte und Untersuchungen zur Englischen Philologie 26 (Frankfurt am Main, 2003), p. 181.

<sup>738</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 294–5.

92	Theodulf of Orleans, <i>Capitula</i> (B10.6.2) 34 Witodlice swa hwylce swa wenað þæt soð lufu sy on æte 7 on <b>wæte</b> . <sup>739</sup>  'Truly, just as those who think that true love is in food and drink.'	Nam quicumque in <b>potu</b> et cibo et dandis atque a cipiendis rebus esse caritatem putant <sup>740</sup>  'For whoever believes charity to be in food and drink and in the giving and receiving of things'
93	§40 Soplice wines 7 ælces <b>wætan</b> druncennes 7 galnes synt forbodene. <sup>741</sup>  'Truly drunkenness and revelry of wine and all drink are forbidden.'	Uini enim ebrietas et luxuria prohibet sunt.  'Drunkenness and luxury in wine are to be forbidden'
94	<i>Rules of Confraternity</i> (B10.7)  §18 and þam do eallum æt 7 <b>wæt</b> . <sup>742</sup>  'And give them all food and drink.'	
95	<i>Confessionale pseudo-Egberti</i> (B11.1.1)  28.b. Se ðe oþrum sylle þone <b>wætan</b> þe bið on deadmus oððe wesle adruncen. <sup>743</sup>  'He who gives someone else a drink, in which there is a dead mouse or a weasel drowned.'	
96	34.f. Gif lytel fearh afealle and cwicu sy of atogen sprengre man þæne <b>wætan</b> mid haligwætere and berece mid recelse gyf	<i>Poenitentiale Theodori</i> i.8. Surrex si ceciderit in <b>liquorem</b> tollatur inde, et aspargatur aqua sancta, et sumatur si
97	hit dead sy and ðone <b>wætan</b> man ne mæge syllan, geote man ut. <sup>744</sup>  '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	vivens sit; si vero mortua, omnis <b>liquor</b> projiciatur foras, nec homini detur, et mundetur vas. <sup>745</sup>  'If a shrew has fallen into drink, it is lifted from there and sprinkled with holy water, and (the drink) may be drunk if it is living; if

<sup>739</sup> Sauer, H., ed., *Theodulfi Capitula in England: Die antenglischen Übersetzungen, zusammen mit dem lateinischen Text*, Münchener Universitäts-schriften Institut für Englische Philologie 8 (Verlag, 1978), p. 371.

<sup>740</sup> Parallel Latin from Sauer's edition

<sup>741</sup> Sauer, ed., *Theodulfi Capitula*, p. 391.

<sup>742</sup> 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.

<sup>743</sup> Spindler, ed., *Das Altenglische Bussbuch*, p. 191. From the context of the chapter it would appear that *wæta* specifically refers to the sanctified eucharistic wine.

<sup>744</sup> Spindler, ed., *Das Altenglische Bussbuch*, p. 193.

<sup>745</sup> Haddan, A. W. and W. Stubbs, ed., *Councils and Ecclesiastical Documents Relating to Great Britain and Ireland* (Oxford, 1871), pp. 173–203, at p. 183.



- dead and one may not give the drink; it is to be poured out.’
- 98 34.h. Gyf on mycelne **wætan** hwylc mus oððe wesle afealle and ðær dead sy, sprengce man mid haligwætere and ðicge.<sup>746</sup>
- ‘If a mouse or weasel has fallen and is dead in a lot of fluid, one should sprinkle it with holy water and drink.’
9. Si multus sit **cibus ille liquidus** in quo mus vel mustela immersa moritur, purgetur et aspargatur aqua sancta et sumatur, si necessitas sit.<sup>747</sup>
- ‘If there is a lot of that liquid food in which a mouse or weasel dies having fallen in, it is to be purified and sprinkled with holy water and consumed if it is necessary.’
- 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.<sup>748</sup>
- ‘And he rebukes himself in the name of his lord very vigorously with self control in food and drink and all bodily desire.’
- 100 *Poenitentie Theodori and Capitula d’Acheriana* (B11.5)<sup>749</sup>
- 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 bæð.<sup>750</sup>
- Give shelter without, to those who need it, and fire and fuel and food and drink and bed and bath.

<sup>746</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 193.

<sup>747</sup> Haddan and Stubbs, ed., *Councils and Ecclesiastical Documents*, p 183.

<sup>748</sup> 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.

<sup>749</sup> Mone, F., ed., ‘Poenitentie Theodori and Capitula d’Acheriana’ in *Quellen und Forschungen zur Geschichte der deutschen Literatur und Sprache* (Aachen 1830), pp. 515–27.

<sup>750</sup> Jost, K., ed., *Die “Institutes of Polity, Civil and Ecclesiastical”*, Schweizer anglistische Arbeiten 47 (Bern, 1959), p. 241.

102	Old English <i>Martyrology</i> (B19.5) 52. ond þa wuniað on fænne þa þe gewurdon of þæs fænnes <b>wætan</b> . <sup>751</sup>  'and they dwell in the fen, those that were born of the moisture of the fen.'	<i>De ordine creaturarum liber</i> ix.10–11. aliae in palustribus locis, aliae ex paludum <b>humore</b> . <sup>752</sup>  'others in marshy places, others from a marshy fluid.'
103	56. Ond of þæm ostum ðæs treowes floweð ut swetes stences <b>wæta</b> , se hafað eles onlicnesse.  'And from the knots of that tree a liquid of sweet fragrance flows, which has the likeness of oil.'	Adamnan, <i>De locis sanctis</i> III.iii. 13. nam de nodis eorum trinalium lignorum <b>liquor</b> quidam odorifer quasi in similitudinem olei  'The knots in the three beams exude a fragrant liquid somewhat like oil.'
104	Gif mon ðæs <b>wætan</b> ænne lytelne dropan seleð untrumum mæn him byð sona sel <sup>753</sup>  'If one gives a little drop of that fluid to a sick man, he is immediately better.'	14. Cuius uidelicet <b>liquoris</b> si etiam paruula quaedam stillula super egrotantes inponatur. <sup>754</sup>  'If even a small drop of the liquid be applied to sick people ...'
105	Byrhtferth's <i>Enchiridion</i> (B20.20.1) 2.3 Hig wendon, ure ylðran, þæt hig hæfdon gast of þære sunnan and lichaman of þam monan and andgyt of <i>Mercurio</i> and of <i>Venere</i> lust and blod of <i>Marte</i> and gemetgunge of <i>Ioue</i> and <b>wætan</b> of <i>Saturno</i> . <sup>755</sup>  'They believed, our ancestors, that they had spirit from the sun, and body from the moon	Isidore, <i>Etymologiae</i> V. 30.8. dicentes habere a Sole spiritum, a Luna corpus, a Mercurio ingenium et linguam, a Venere voluptatem, a Marte sanguinem, a Ioue temperantiam, a Saturno <b>humorem</b> . <sup>756</sup>  'declaring that they have spirit from the sun, body from the moon, intelligence and speech

<sup>751</sup> Kotzor, G., ed., *Das altenglische Martyrologium*, Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften Philosophisch-Historische Klasse 88 (Munich, 1981), p. 41.

<sup>752</sup> Cross, J. E., 'De ordine creaturarum liber in Old English Prose', *Anglia* 90 (1972), 132–40 at p. 137. For an edition of the Latin, see Díaz y Díaz, M. C., ed., *Liber de ordine creaturarum: Un anónimo irlandés del siglo VII, Estudio y edición crítica*, Monografías de la Universidad de Santiago de Compostela 10 (Santiago de Compostela, 1972).

<sup>753</sup> Kotzor, ed., *Das altenglische Martyrologium*, p. 42.

<sup>754</sup> Meehan, D., ed., *Adamnan's De Locis Sanctis*, Scriptorum Latini Hiberniae 3 (Dublin, 1958), p. 110. Translation also from Meehan.

<sup>755</sup> Baker and Lapidge, ed., *Byrhtferth's Enchiridion*.

<sup>756</sup> Lindsay, W. M., ed., *Isidori Hispalensis Episcopi Etymologiarum sive Originum Libri XX*, (Oxford, 1911) Source identified in Baker and Lapidge.

	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	<p><i>Alexander’s Letter to Aristotle</i> (B22.1)</p> <p>10 Ða ferde we in Agustes monþe þurh þa weallendan sond, &amp; þurh þa wædlan stowe wætres &amp; ælcere <b>wætan</b>.<sup>757</sup></p> <p>‘Then in the month of August we went through the sandy foreign place, and through the place poor in water and every fluid.’</p>	<p><i>Epistola Alexandri ad Aristotolem</i></p> <p>mense Augusto per feruentes sole harenas et egentia <b>humoris</b> loca profectus sum.<sup>758</sup></p> <p>‘In the month of August we set out through the sandy place hot from the sun and lacking in moisture.’</p>
107	<p>13 Sume men ðonne of hiora scome þa <b>wætan</b> for þæm nyde þigdon.</p> <p>‘Then in their shame some men in their need drank piss.’</p>	<p>Udimus etiam plerosque pudore amisso suam ipsam <b>urinam</b> uexatos ultimis necessitatibus haurientis.<sup>759</sup></p> <p>‘Then we saw many having lost their shame who drank their own urine vexed by necessity.’</p>
108	<p>36 and cwæð þæt ic wende þæt hie for miclum <b>wætan</b> 7 regnum swa heage weoxon.</p> <p>‘and said that I thought that grew so high because of great moisture and rain.’</p>	<p>Cum eas mirarer diceremque frequentibus inbribus in tantum creuisse<sup>760</sup></p> <p>‘Then I marvelled at them and said thaty they grow so much through frequent rainfall.’</p>

In two instances in the prose material the word carries its specialised medical sense of bodily fluid or humour (item 68, *Patoral Care* and item 83, Gregory’s *Dialogues* iv).

<sup>757</sup> A. Orchard, ‘The Letter of Alexander to Aristotle’ in his *Pride and Prodigies: Studies in the Monsters of the Beowulf Manuscript*, (Toronto, 1995), pp. 204–23. Translation and parallel Latin text from Orchard’s edition.

<sup>758</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 207.

<sup>759</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 208.

<sup>760</sup> *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

#	text	sense	word	collocation	declension
1	Ælfric, <i>CHI</i> .4	drink	<i>paraphrase</i>	æt	sn
2	<i>CHI</i> .11	drink	<i>praphrase</i>	æt	sn
3	<i>CHI</i> .25	drink	sicera	relative	w (m/f)
4	<i>CHI</i> .25	drink	*sicera	gemencged	wm
5	<i>CHI</i> .25	drink	<i>paraphrase</i>	æt	sn
6	<i>CHI</i> .27	drink	<i>paraphrase</i>	æt	sn
7	<i>CHI</i> .34	fluid class	<i>paraphrase</i>	wynsum	wm
8	<i>CHI</i> .34	fluid class	liquor	heofonlic	wm
9	<i>CHI</i> .34	fluid class	<i>paraphrase</i>	*wynsum	wm
10	<i>CHI</i> .34	fluid class			wm
11	<i>CH</i> II.3	drink class	*sicera	relative	w (m/f)
12	<i>CH</i> II.6	moisture	humor		wm
13	<i>CH</i> II.6	moisture	<i>recap</i>		wm
14	<i>CH</i> II.6	moisture	humor		wm
15	<i>CH</i> II.6	moisture	<i>recap</i>		wm
16	<i>CH</i> II.10	fluid			wm
17	<i>CH</i> II.12	drink	potus	æt	sn
18	<i>CH</i> II.12.2	drink		æt	sn
19	<i>CH</i> II.14.1	drink class	aceto	unwynsum	wm
20	<i>CH</i> II.15	fluid class	humor	brozniendlic	wm
21	<i>CH</i> II.18	drink class	sicera	relative	w (m/f)
22	<i>CH</i> II.33	drink	<i>paraphrase</i>	æt	sn
23	<i>CH</i> II.39	fluid class	humor		wm
24	<i>CH</i> II.39	fluid class	aqua		wm
25	<i>CH</i> II.39	fluid class	aqua		wm
26	<i>CH</i> II.40	drink	<i>potus</i>	æt	sn
27	Ælfric, <i>Lives of Saints</i> III.6	drink class			wm
28	<i>LS</i> III.8	drink		æt	sn
29	<i>LS</i> III.14	fluid class		deoffolic	wm

30	<i>LS III.16</i>	drink		æt	sn
31	<i>LS III.16</i>	drink		æt	sn
32	<i>LS III.31</i>	drink class			wm
33	<i>Healing of a Blind Man</i>	drink class			wm
34	<i>De duodecem abusivis</i>	drink		æt	sn
35	<i>DDA</i>	drink		æt	sn
36	<i>DDA</i>	drink		æt	sn
37	<i>DDA</i>	drink		æt	sn
38	<i>DDA</i>	drink		æt	sn
39	2nd Letter to Wulfstan	drink		æt	sn
40	<i>Admonitio ad filium spiritualement</i>	water			w (m/f)
41	<i>Ælfric, De temporibus anni</i> x.11	elemental			wm
42	<i>DTA xi.2</i>	elemental	<i>aqua</i>		wm
43	<i>DTA xi.7</i>	elemental	<i>paraphrase</i>		wm
44	<i>DTA xi.8</i>	elemental	<i>paraphrase</i>		wm
45	<i>DTA xi.9</i>	elemental	<i>paraphrase</i>		wm
46	<i>DTA xiii</i>	elemental	<i>paraphrase</i>	fersc	wm
47	<i>DTA xiv</i>	elemental	<i>aqua</i>	ðynn	wm
48	<i>DTA xiv</i>	elemental	<i>paraphrase</i>		wm
49	<i>DTA xiv</i>	elemental	<i>paraphrase</i>		wm
50	<i>DTA xiv</i>	elemental	<i>paraphrase</i>		wm
51	<i>DTA xiv</i>	elemental	<i>paraphrase</i>		wm
52	<i>DTA xiv</i>	elemental	<i>paraphrase</i>		wm
53	Wulfstan <i>Homily</i> 14	drink		æt	sn
54	Vercelli 19	drink		æt	sn
55	Vercelli 20	drink		æt	sn
56	<i>Inuenio crucis</i>	drink		æt	sn
57	Anon V. Guthlaci	drink class		relative	wf
58	Blickling Homilies: St Michael	fluid class	liquor	hluttur	wm
59	<i>ibid</i>	fluid class	<i>paraphrase</i>	wynsum	wm
60	<i>ibid</i>	fluid class	<i>paraphrase</i>	heofonlic	wf
61	<i>ibid</i>	fluid class	<i>paraphrase</i>		wm
62	<i>Vitae patrum</i>	drink			wm
63	<i>Apocalypse of Thomas</i>	flood			wm

64	Vercelli 21	drink	uinum	æt	pl (sn)
65	Luke VII.44	water	aqua		w (m/f)
66	Luke VIII.6	moisture	humor		w (m/f)
67	<i>Cura pastoralis</i> 11	humour (medical)	humor	ðara innoða	wm
68	<i>Cura pastoralis</i> 41	humour (medical)	humor		wm
69	Orosius <i>Historiae</i> v.77	moisture	paraphrase		wm
70	<i>Historiae</i> v.77	moisture	inber		w (m/f)
71	<i>Consolation of Philosophy</i> 15	wet (abstract)	<i>paraphrase</i>		wm
72	<i>Consolation</i> 33.5	wet (abstract)	liquidus		sn
73	<i>Consolation</i> 39.13	wet (abstract)	humidus		wm
74	Gregory <i>Dialogi</i> 1.9	drink class	liquor	þæs wines	wm
75	<i>Dialogi</i> 1.9	drink class	liquor	þynnest	wm
76	<i>Dialogi</i> 3.34	irrigation	inriguum	land	sn
77	<i>Dialogi</i> 3.34	irrigation	inriguum	land	sn
78	<i>Dialogi</i> 3.34	irrigation	inriguum		sn
79	<i>Dialogi</i> 3.34	irrigation	inriguum		sn
80	<i>Dialogi</i> 3.34	irrigation	inriguum		sn
81	<i>Dialogi</i> 3.34	irrigation	inriguum		pl (sn)
82	<i>Dialogi</i> 3.37	fluid classeme	paraphrase		wm
83	<i>Dialog</i> 4.28	humour	humor	þære fotadle	w (m/f)
84	Bede, <i>HE</i> i.27	sap	humor		w (m/f)
85	<i>HE</i> iv.19	humour	humor	sceðþend	wf
86	<i>Regula</i> 43	drink	uinum	æt	sn
87	<i>Regula</i> 43	drink	potus	æt	sn
88	<i>Regula</i> 49	drink	potus	æt	sn
89	<i>Rule of Chrodegang</i> 5	drink	potus	æt	sn
90	<i>Chrodegang</i> 38	drink	potus	æt	sn
91	<i>Chrodegang</i> 60	drink class	humor	winlic	wm
92	<i>Capitula Theodori</i> 34	drink		æt	sn
93	<i>Capitula</i> 48	drink class		druncennes	wm
94	Confraternity 18	drink		æt	sn
95	Pseudo-Ecgbert 28	drink	<i>paraphrase</i>	relative	wm
96	Pseudo-Ecgbert 34	drink	liquor		wm
97	Pseudo-Ecgbert 34	drink class	liquor		wm
98	Pseudo-Ecgbert 34	drink class	liquidus		wm

99	<i>Confessors handbook</i>	drink		æt	sn
100	<i>Poenitentiale Theodori</i>	drink class			w (m/f)
101	<i>Institutes of Polity</i> 50	drink		æt	sn
102	<i>OE Martyrology</i> 52	moisture	humor	þæs fænnēs	wm
103	<i>Martyrology</i> 56	fluid	liquor		wm
104	<i>Martyrology</i> 56	fluid	liquor		wm
105	<i>Enchiridion</i> 2.3	humour (medical)	humor		w (m/f)
106	<i>Epistola Alexandri</i> 10	moisture	humor	wæter	wf
107	<i>Epistola Alexandri</i> 13	euphemism (urine)	urina		wf
108	<i>Epistola Alexandri</i> 36	moisture	paraphrase (inber)		wm

## 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 wæt*. Where the adjective is treated substantively 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 *wæt* 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. *inriuius*.

### *Semantics of the Weak Declension*

The weak declension of *wæta* or *wæte* is far more common than the strong neuter *wæt*, 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

Author	Text	Feminine	indeterminate	masculine
Ælfric	Catholic Homilies	0	3	15
Ælfric	Other Works	0	1	16
Anon	Life of Guthlac	1	0	0
Anon	Blickling Homilies (St Michael)	1	0	3
Anon	Vitae Patrum	0	0	1
Anon	Apocalypse of Thomas	0	0	1
	Gospel of Luke	0	2	0



*Gregory	Cura Pastoralis	0	0	2
*Orosius	Histories	0	1	1
Boethius	Consolation	0	0	2
*Gregory	Dialogues	0	1	3
*Bede	Ecclesiastical History	1	1	0
Chrodegang	Enlarged Rule	0	0	1
Theodorus	Capituli	0	0	1
Ps Egberti	Poenitientiale	0	0	4
Theodorus	Poenitientiale	0	1	0
Anon	Martyrology	0	0	3
Byrhtferth	Enchiridion	0	1	0
Ps.- Alexander	Epistola ad Aristotolam	2	0	1

The only authors, scribes, or translators who may have considered *wæte* to be properly feminine in the prose corpus under consideration are those of the Anonymous life of St Guthlack, the Blickling Homilies, 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 *wæta* or *wæte* 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: *hluttur*, *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 aþyn' 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 plausible 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*.<sup>761</sup> In Ælfric's *Catholic Homilies*, I.25, John's abstinence is mentioned twice, first with the phrase 'ne abyrið 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 gebrowenes' 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 ðæra **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 *wæter* 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.'

<sup>761</sup> 'Soðlice he byð mære beforan drihtne 7 he ne drincð win ne **beor**.' Luke I.15 in Skeat, ed., *The Four Gospels in Anglo-Saxon*, pp. 14–238.

Outside the gospels, *aqua* is translated as *wæta* rather than *wæter* 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 *wæta*, 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 temporm ratione* (items 41–52). Where Bede’s Latin uses *aqua* twice in describing environmental moisture involved in weather formation Ælfric’s Old English uses *wæta* ten times (items 42–52).<sup>762</sup> 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 *wæta*, in the context of being the source of the spontaneous generation of life forms (item 102), here translating the word *humor*. The usage of *wæta* to denote environmental moisture necessary for vegetative life also occurs in Alexander’s *Letter to Aristotle* (item 108) where ‘for miclum **wætan** 7 regnum’ translates ‘frequentibus inbribus,’ *wæta* 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, *wæta* can denote fluids internal to a living organism, including vegetables as well as animals. In the Old English *Ecclesiastical History* I.27.7 *wæta* 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.

*Wæta* 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).

<sup>762</sup> 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*.<sup>763</sup> 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 homoeoteuton 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',<sup>764</sup> whereas the Latin suffix *-or*, as in *humor* and *liquor* tend to be verbal or adjectival abstracts often with concrete

---

<sup>763</sup> *A Thesaurus of Old English*, ed. Roberts, J. and C. Kay with L. Grundy, 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition, <http://libra.englant.arts.gla.ac.uk/oethesaurus> (viewed 19 August, 2009).

<sup>764</sup> Langslow, *Medical Latin*, p. 375.

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).<sup>765</sup>

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. 34h, 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

---

<sup>765</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 293–9.

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.’<sup>766</sup> 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, erysipelalous inflammations,’ though as we shall see this is not always a fitting definition for the word.<sup>767</sup> 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 ‘erysipelalous 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 Wiþ **homan** 7 eagna sare 7 fotadle.<sup>768</sup>

‘Against *ignis sacer* and pain of the eyes and gout.’

- 2 144.1 Wiþ **homan**.<sup>769</sup>

<sup>766</sup> Ayoub, ‘Old English *wæta*,’ p. 341.

<sup>767</sup> ‘*Oman*’ in Bosworth and Toller, ed., *An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary* and Toller, ed., *Supplement*.

<sup>768</sup> De Vriend, ed., *Herbarium*, p. 23.

<sup>769</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 24.

‘Against *ignis sacer*.’

- 3 173.4 Wiþ **oman** 7 wið fotadle<sup>770</sup>

‘Against *ignis sacer* and against gout.’

*OEH*

Pseudo-Musa, *LMHF*<sup>771</sup>

- 4 139.1 Wið **oman**.<sup>772</sup>

**ignem sacrum** sanat

‘For *ignis sacer*.’

‘treats *ignis sacer*.’

- 5 144.1 Wið **oman**...<sup>773</sup>

... **ignem sacrum** sanant.

- 6 173.4 eac swylce þeos sylfe wyrt wið  
**oman** wel fremap on þas ylcan wisan  
gemetegud.

... haec temperata etiam **ignem sacrum**  
refigerat.

‘Also this same herb does well with *ignis sacer* in the beginning applied in the same way.’

‘That prepared moreover cools *ignis sacer*.’

#### *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 drenca 7 sealfa wiþ eallum **omum**
- 13 H I.41 Læcedomas þry æpele wiþ innanonfealle & **omum**.

#### *Leechbook I:*

- 14 I.2.5 Eft of **homena** æþme 7 stieme 7 of wlættan cymð eagna mist 7 sio scearpnes 7  
rogoþa þæt deþ wiþ þon is þis to donne.

<sup>770</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 28.

<sup>771</sup> Text of the *Liber medicinae ex herbis femininis* from de Vriend’s parallel text edition.

<sup>772</sup> De Vriend, ed. *Herbarium*, pp. 180–1.

<sup>773</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 218–19.



15	I.35.1 Be asweartedum 7 adeadedum lice sio adl cymð oftost of <b>omum</b> æfter adle welme on weg gewitenre weorþeð hwilum lic asweartod	<i>Passionarius Galieni</i> V.34 <b>Herisipila</b> est feruor in summa cute/ ex sanguine/ & felle rufo commisto & in temperato fit ex sanguine feruenti tantum & tenui
16	I.35.3 mid wyrtdrencum utyrnendum oþþe spiwlum oþþe migolum mid þy þu meaht clænsian þæt <b>omcyn</b> 7 þæs geallancoðe þa readan. ge þeah þæt yfel cumen ne sie of	
17	þara <b>omena</b> welme swa þeah deah swilcum mannum se scearpa wyrtdrenc	
18	I.35.4 Gif þa <b>omihtan wannan þing</b> oþþe þa readan syn utan cumen of wundum oþþe of sniþingum oððe of slegym	<i>Pass</i> V.35 Illam vero <b>herisipilam</b> quam extrinsecus accidit: et causas habet euidentes ac manifestas .i.e. ex vulneribus: vel compunctionibus vel incisionibus:
19	I.39.t Her sint læcedomas wiþ ælces cynnes <b>omum</b> 7 onfeallum 7 bancopum	
20	I.39.2 Wiþ <b>omum</b> utablegnedum.	
21	I.39.3 Uið <b>omum</b> eft.	
22	I.39.3 lege on wiþ <b>omena</b> geswelle.	
23	I.39.4 Wiþ <b>omena</b> geberste.	
24	I.39.13 Wiþ hatum <b>omum</b> .	
25	I.39.14 Wiþ hatum <b>omum</b> .	
26	I.39.15 Wiþ hatum <b>omum</b> .	
27	I.39.17 Wiþ hatum <b>omum</b> .	
28	I.39.18 Wiþ seondum <b>omum</b> .	
29	I.39.20 Wiþ bancoþe, þæt is <b>oman</b> .	

*Leechbook II: Table of Contents*

30	II H.15. hu sio ablawung þæs magan cymð of þam blacum <b>omum</b> .
31	II H.16 Læcedomas 7 tacn þas hatan <b>omihtan</b> magan ungemetfæsta.

- 32 II H.16 Tacn hu se hata **omihta** maga ungemet þurst & swol þrowað.
- 33 II H.25 and þonne adl to þære wambe wile for þære yfelan **omihtan** wætan.
- 34 II H.42 Læcedomas gif **omihtra** blod 7 yfele wætan on þam milte syn þindende.
- 35 II H.44 þynnaþ þa **oman**.

*Leechbook II*

- 36 II.1.1 *and* he onfindeþ swile 7 þæt þa **oman** beoð inne betynde þurh þa ablawunge.
- 37 II.1.2 *and* unrotnessa butan þearfe 7 **oman** 7 ungemetlica mete socna 7 ungemetlice unlustas 7 cisnessa. *PAL* ii.14 et tristicias sina causa, 7 **timores melancolicos** 7 alia multa .i. appetitiones irrationabiles cibi 7 fastidium 7 nauseas
- 38 II.1.7 *and* wiþ þon þe mon sie on þam magan **omigre** wætan gefylled *PAL* ii.37.11 quibus stomachus **flegmate** repletus frigidus est
- 39 II.1.9 Gif hie þonne cumað of oþrum biterum 7 yfelum wætum þa þe wyrceað **oman**. *PAL* ii.38. De nausea 7 vomitu. Si autem ex humorum acredine fit **cacochimia** est.
- 40 II.3.1 *and* sele wermod on wearmum wætere twam nihtum ær ofgotenne þæt se þam **omum** stille. *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 mutantur.
- 41 II.15.2 sio ablawunge hæto cymeð of þam blacum **omum**
- 42 II.16.t Þis sint tacn þæs hatan magan **omihtan** ungemetfæstlican. 7 þæs ofercealdan. *PAL* ii.22 *Curatio si ex calore nimio fuerit imbecilla cateltica* virtus
- 43 þæs hatan magan ungemetfæstan tacn sindon þonne he bið mid **omum** geswenced Si autem ex colerico humore nimia facta fuerit **distemperantia cateltice**
- 44 II.21.1 and fefer mid speowunga **omena** *PAL* II. 58 *Signa si in cirta 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 līpum 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 gegadrap **oman**. Oribasius, *Syn.* v.52 Sicci et humidis  
temperantia et ut crescunt et  
conroborentur calor in eis.
- 48 II.30.6 oððe sio healfdeade adl oþþe fyllewærc oððe sio hwhite riefþo þe mon  
on suþerne *lepra* hæst oþðe tetra oþþe heafod hriefðo oþþe **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 deþ *PAL* ii.142 et alvum mollit et **choleram**  
extenuat et ructationes amputat.
- 51 II.56.10 and þa seaw þa ðe beoð gemengedu of mettum wiþ blod 7 wiþ **oman** geondgeotaþ þonne innoþ *PAL* ii.80 Eorum enim qui in cibis  
accipiuntur succus dum mutantur in  
sanguinem refunditur in intestina 7 sic  
wyrceað yfelne utgang. excernitur cum coleribus mixtum
- 52 II.56.10 and for þære grimnesse þara **omena** ne mæg beon gehæfd þy se mete. et propter acredinem colerum non pone  
containeri cum cibo.

#### *Lacnunga*

- 53 87 (94) Her syndon læcedomas wið ælces cynnes **omum** 7 onfeallum.<sup>774</sup>  
‘Here there are treatmenst for every kind of ignis sacer and disease.’
- 54 88 (95) Wið **omum** 7 blegnum.<sup>775</sup> ‘For *ignis sacer* and ulcers’
- 55 89 (96) Wið **omum** 7 ablegnedum.<sup>776</sup> ‘For ulcerated *ignis sacer*’

<sup>774</sup> Pettit, ed., *Lacnunga* I, 74; Again, paragraph numbers in parentheses refer to Grattan and Singer’s edition.

<sup>775</sup> *Ibid.*, I, 76.

<sup>776</sup> *Ibid.*, I, 76.

56 90 (97) Eft... lege on wið **omena** geswelle.<sup>777</sup>

‘Again, apply for swelling of the *ignis sacer*.’

57 91 (98) Eft, wið **omena** geberste.<sup>778</sup>

‘Again, for bursting of the *ignis sacer*.’

58 169 (177) Wið **oman**.<sup>779</sup>

‘For *ignis sacer*.’

#### *Peri didaxeon*

59 2. Wið **oman**. Þus man sceal wyrren þa Ter 15. De vesicis capitis.

60 sealf e wið **oman**.<sup>780</sup>

For *ignis sacer*. One should make this salve  
for *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 *oman* and the related adjectives.

Table 5.8 Distribution of Orthographic Forms on the Stem *om-*

Form	<i>OEH</i>	<i>BLB I</i>	<i>BLB II</i>	<i>Lacn</i>	<i>Peri D</i>
[h]oman	6	2	8	1	2
[h]omena (gen)	-	5	4	2	-
omum (dat)	-	15	2	3	-
om-cyn	-	1	-	-	-
omig	-	-	2	-	-
omiht	-	-	7	-	-

<sup>777</sup> *Ibid.*, I, 76.

<sup>778</sup> *Ibid.*, I, 76.

<sup>779</sup> *Ibid.*, I, 116.

<sup>780</sup> 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 7 felle rufo commisto 7 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,<sup>781</sup> 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* (κακόχῆμια) 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.t 'þæs hatan omihtan magan ungemetfæsta' (item 42), the Latin term in operation seems to be 'distemperantia cateltice ex colerico humore' (a *cateltic*<sup>782</sup> intemperance 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), 'omihte 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

---

<sup>781</sup> 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.

<sup>782</sup> 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.<sup>783</sup>

### *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

Term	<i>Enchiridion</i>	<i>Peri D</i>	<i>Leechbook</i>
sanguis	blod	blod	blod
fel/choler niger	sweart incoðan	swerta gealle	oman / yfele wæte
fel/choler rubea	read incoða	ruwa gealla	oman / yfele wæte
phlegma	hraca oððe geposu	wæte	slipig wæte / oman

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.

<sup>783</sup> 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.<sup>784</sup>

In analysing the uses of the substantives *wæta* and *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 *wæta* in Anglo-Saxon medical texts is consistently chosen to render references in Latin sources to the doctrine of the humours.'<sup>785</sup> While *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'<sup>786</sup> seems to ring false, given that there is no specific term for 'humour' in Old English, just as there is none in Latin,<sup>787</sup> *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 *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.

---

<sup>784</sup> Cameron, *Anglo-Saxon Medicine*, p. 64.

<sup>785</sup> Ayoub, 'Old English *wæta*', p. 341.

<sup>786</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 341.

<sup>787</sup> L. *humor* seems to be as semantically broad as OE *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 *mupes 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 (*tacn*) 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 regimen 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 wyrceað ærest geswel þæt is aþundenes þære lifer. Oþer is þæs geswelles toberstung. Þridde is wund þære lifre. Feorþe is welmes hæto mid gefelnesse 7 mid sare geswelle. 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 agnoscuntur uel demonstratur, id est: Apostema in iecore, syrrexis id est ruptio apostematis, helcosis id est uulneratio, phlegmone hoc est feruor uel tumor, scleria hoc est duritia cum sensu et dolore, scirrosis id est nimia duritia sine

dolore et sine sensu, quia in iecore  
habetur.<sup>788</sup>

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, *syrrexsis*, 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, *scirrhusis* that is excessive hardness without pain and without sensation, because it is held in the liver.

These six terms, *apostema*, *syrrexsis*, *helcosis*, *phlegmon*, *scleria* and *scirrhusis* 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’<sup>789</sup> 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 *OE* 125, which translates pseudo-Apuleius 124.1, *ad apostema* is translated ‘Wið ealle gegaderunga 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

*LT* 36.1 **apostema** in iecore

II.17.2 **geswelles** toberstung

*LT* 36.1 ruptio **apostematis**

II.19.2 oððe se **apundena** swa aswollen  
gebip... swa se **swile** ne geberstep

*Pass* II.41 si **apostema** non eruperit<sup>790</sup>

<sup>788</sup> Fischer, ed., *Liber tertius*, p. 311

<sup>789</sup> Langslow, *Medical Latin*, p. 478.

<sup>790</sup> Cf. *LT* 38.1 ‘et non se ruperit,’ Fischer, ed. *Liber tertius*, p. 311.

II.19.4 Wiþ <b>geswollenum</b> sare	LT 41.4 Incipit <b>apostematis</b> cura
II.20.t þonne se <b>swile</b> gewyrsmæd to byrst	LT 42.1 postquam <b>apostema</b> ruperit
II.22.5 þæt <b>geswel</b> biþ gehweled 7 tobyrst 7 wyrð unsarre	LT 45.1 Quae cum facta fuerit, dolor <b>apostematis</b> quiescit
II.22.8 Gif þonne se <b>swile</b> 7 þæt worms upstihð	LT 47.1 Quod si <b>apostema</b> sursum set ad carnem dederit

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.

## ii *helcosis* (ἑλκωσις)

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,<sup>791</sup> so probably entered the Latin medical lexis later in the Middle Ages.

II.9.t Wiþ <b>inwunde</b> magan.	LT 23.1 Incipiunt de <b>perihelcoseos</b> , id est de uulnera in stomacho.
II.17.2 <b>wund</b> þære lifre.	LT 36.1 <b>helcosis</b> id est uulneratio.
II.19.2 bið þær <b>wund</b> on þære lifre.	LT 38.1 <b>helcosis</b> erit, hoc est uulneratio iecoris.

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.

## iii *phlegmone* (φλεγμονή)

The term *phlegmone*, meaning ‘an inflamed tumour’<sup>792</sup> 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.

II.3.t Be <b>geswelle</b> 7 sare þæs magan.	LT 13.1 De phlegmone id est tumor.
---	------------------------------------

<sup>791</sup> The term is certainly absent from Langslow’s index and glossary of Greek pathological terms in *Medical Latin*, pp. 477–94.

<sup>792</sup> 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 Bære lifre geswel oþþe **apundenesse**  
þu meaht þus ongitan.

LT 37.1 **Phlegmone**, id est tumor iecoris,  
intelligitur sic.

II.18.1 Viþ bære lifre swile oððe  
**apundenesse**.

LT 40.1 **Phlegmonen** autem curabis sic.

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.’<sup>793</sup> The term is translated twice in the *Leechbook* as OE *aheardung* ‘hardening’ and *aheardodre* ‘hardened.’

II.17.2 **aheardung** bære lifre butan  
gefelnesse

LT 36.1 **scirrosis** id est nimia duritia sine  
dolore

II.21.t Her sint taen **aheardodre** lifre

LT 48.1 Incipit de **scirro**, id est duritia  
iecoris<sup>794</sup>

#### v *scleria* (σκληρία) and *sclerosis* (σκλήρωσις)

Neither *scleria* or *sclerosis* are attested as Latinised medical terms in Langslow’s index.<sup>795</sup> 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  
gefelnesse 7 mid sare.

LT 36.1 **scleria** hoc est duritia cum sensu et  
dolore.

<sup>793</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 492.

<sup>794</sup> The *Passionarius* has ‘sclirosis, idest duritia’ suggesting a confusion between the similar sounding *scirrhosis* and *sclerosis*. See Talbot, ‘Notes on Anglo-Saxon Medicine,’ pp. 163–4.

<sup>795</sup> Langslow, *Medical Latin*, pp. 477–94.

II.22.t Wiþ þære gefelan **heardnesse** þære lifre. LT 43.1 Incipit curatio **scleriae**.

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, ‘Empneumosis, 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, ‘Wiþ heardum swile þæs magan’ translates *scleroma* rather than *empneumosis*.

vi *syrrexix* (σύρρηξις)

The term is not attested in Langslow. It literally means ‘an internal rupture’ according to Liddle and Scott.

II.17.2 þæs geswelles toberstung	<i>LT</i> 36.1 syrrexix id est ruptio apostematis
II.22.5 siþþan þæt geswel biþ gehweled 7 tobyrst 7 wyrð unsarre	<i>LT</i> 45.1 Incipit de syrrexi, id est ruptio apostematis. Quae cum facta fuerit

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 *apundena*, 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 (ζύκωσις) [cimosis]*

The disease term *cimosis* appears in *Leechbook* I.2.51: 'Wip þeoradle on eagum þe mon gefigo hæť 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 English*<sup>796</sup> 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 ζύκωσις, as meaning 'an ulcer resembling a ripe fig,' which can pertain to the eye.<sup>797</sup> 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 *supern* 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.'<sup>798</sup>

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.<sup>799</sup>

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.

---

<sup>796</sup> 'Gefigo' in Cameron, et al., ed., *Dictionary of Old English: A to H online*.

<sup>797</sup> Langslow, *Medical Latin*, p. 493.

<sup>798</sup> 'And other are seen to suffer either *exantematas* or similar roughness, such as *lepra* or *impetigo*,' Molinier, ed., *Oeuvres d'Oribase*, VI, 413.

<sup>799</sup> Demaitre, L., *Leprosy in Premodern Medicine: A Malady of the Whole Body* (Baltimore, 2007), pp. 85–91.



Monige men þæs ne gymdon ne ne gumað  
þonne becymð of þam yflum wætum. oððe  
sio healfdeade adl opþe fyllewærc oððe sio  
hwhite riefþo þe mon on suþerne *lepra* hæť  
opðe tetra opþe heafod hriefðo opþe 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

‘Many people have not heeded this nor pay no  
heed; then, from those harmful humours come  
either hemiplegia or epilepsy or the white scab  
that is called *lepra* in the Mediterranean, or  
*tetter*, or head-scabs or erysipelas. Therefore one  
should cleanse the harmful humours away  
before those mischiefs come (having) increased  
in winter, and run throughout the limbs.’

Multi ergo negligentes aut paralisin aut  
apoplexia de subito inciderunt in ipsas facti  
deferunt, et alii pati uidentur exantematas  
similia aut aspera, qualia sunt lepre aut  
impetigines, alii acoras in capite, aerisipilas  
et aerpitas. Ut ergo hanc predicat aliqua  
neque aliud nihil malum fiat, purgare  
oportet antequam ebullescant collecti  
humores de hieme resoluentur et currant per  
membra.<sup>800</sup>

‘Therefore many neglecting to reduce (the  
humour) suffer from what has ascended to cause  
either apoplexy or paralysis in themselves, and  
others are seen to suffer either *exantematas* or  
similar roughness, such as *lepra* or impetigo,  
others *acoras* in the head, erysipelas or herpes.  
Therefore in order that none of the dire  
aforementioned things may happen it is  
necessary to purge the humours collected in  
winter before they boil over and run throughout  
the limbs.’

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).<sup>801</sup>

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

<sup>800</sup> Molinier, ed., *Oeuvres d'Oribase*, VI, 413.

<sup>801</sup> 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 impetigines’ 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 superne lepra hæť,’ 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 *hreoƿl* and the adjective *leprosus* was translated *licprower* when the Latin term was used substantively to refer to sufferers, but as *hreoƿl* in agreement with another substantive indicative of a sufferer.<sup>802</sup> This rule is not absolute, however, as the adjective *hreoƿl* 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

	lepra > hreoƿl	leprosus > hreoƿl(lig)	leprosus > licprower
Ælfric’s Glossary <sup>803</sup>	-	1	1
Lindisfarne Gospels	4	5	4
Rushworth Gospels <sup>804</sup>	2	9	1

### OE *hreoƿl* 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.*

<sup>802</sup> For more on the uses of these terms see C. Lee, ‘Changing Faces: Leprosy in Anglo-Saxon England,’ in *Conversion and Colonization in Anglo-Saxon England*, ed. K. E. Karkov et al. (Tempe, AZ, 2006), pp. 59–81.

<sup>803</sup> Zupitza, ed., *Ælfrics Grammatik*, pp. 297–322.

<sup>804</sup> 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 **hreoðan**.<sup>805</sup>

91.2 Ad elephantiosos<sup>806</sup>

110.3 Wið **hreoðan**.<sup>807</sup>

109.4 Ad lichenas qui est lepras<sup>808</sup>

146.4 Wið **hreoðan** genim þas ylcan wyrte  
7 meluw 7 eced, cnuca togædre, lege to þam  
**hreoðan**, he bið gelacnud.<sup>809</sup>

*LMHF*

Cum polenta et aceto trita **leprosis** imposita  
medetur.

‘For *herofl*, take this same herb, and meal and  
vinegar, grind together, apply to the *herofl*, he  
will be healed.’

‘The *lepra* sufferer is relieved with barley meal  
and vinegar ground and applied.’

*MdQ*

*MEA α*

7.10 Wið **hreoðe** 7 wið toflogen lic.<sup>810</sup>

v.11 Ad **peduculos**.<sup>811</sup>

*Bald’s Leechbook*

I.H.32...7 wiþ **hreoðum** lice 7 wið adeadedum lice bæþ 7 sealfa wiþ þon

I.H.88 Læcedomas wiþ horses **hreoðe**

I.32.6 Læcedom wiþ **hreoðum** lice

I.32.9 Wiþ **hreoðe**

I.32.10 Wiþ **hreoðe** eft

I.32.11 Bæþ wiþ **hreoðe**

I.88.1 Wiþ horses hreoðe

I.88.2 gif sio **hreoðol** sie micel

*Lacnunga*

36. Wið **hreoðum** lice... þæt bið god sealf wið **hreoðum** lice<sup>812</sup>

135. Wið poccum & sceapa **hreoðan**<sup>813</sup>

<sup>805</sup> De Vriend, ed. *Herbarium*, p. 134.

<sup>806</sup> Howald and Sigerist, ed., *Herbarius*, p. 164.

<sup>807</sup> De Vriend, ed. *Herbarium*, p. 154.

<sup>808</sup> Howald and Sigerist, ed., *Herbarius*, p. 192.

<sup>809</sup> Old English and Latin from de Vriend, ed., *Herbarium* pp. 188–9.

<sup>810</sup> De Vriend, ed., *Herbarium*, p. 256.

<sup>811</sup> Howald and Sigersit, ed., *Herbarius*, p. 252.

<sup>812</sup> Pettit, ed., *Lacnunga* I, 20; this recipe is the same as *Leechbook* I.32.6.

<sup>813</sup> Pettit, ed., *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*

### Latin Parallel

II.30.6 sio hwite **riefþo** ... opþe heafod  
**hriefþo**.<sup>814</sup>

*Euporistes* I.9 **exantematas** ... alii **acoras** in  
capite

II.41.4 Þonne deah þis wiþ hunige geyced ge  
wið milte adle. ge wiþ magan. ge wið hrean. ge  
wiþ þon þe mon blode spiwe. ge wiþ eallum  
innan adlum. eac þon **riefþo** & gicþa sona  
aweg deþ.

*PPFP* II.18.29 et hoc non solum spleneticis  
saluberrimum est, sed et stomaticis et  
ptysicis<sup>815</sup> plurimum prodest nec non et  
sanguinem exscreantibus; sed et contra omnes  
morbos interaneos facit et **scabiem** ac

II.41.5 Þes læcedom deah ge wiþ **hriefþo** wyrce  
of ecede weaxsealfe. genim þæs ecedes .v.  
cucler mæl...

pruriginem statim tollit. Fiet autem sic: mittes  
ex ipso aceto in ollam nouam colearia V...<sup>816</sup>

‘Mixed with honey, this helps against spleen-  
disease, and for the stomach, and for wasting<sup>817</sup> 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...’

‘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.’

<sup>814</sup> The text and translation are given at the start of this section above, pp. 214–15.

<sup>815</sup> Gr. *φθισικός* (*phthisikos*) meaning ‘atrophy, emaciation, consumption.’ The Greek term *φθίσις* (*phthisis*) literally means ‘wasting.’ See Langslow, *Medical Latin*, p. 491

<sup>816</sup> Wachtmeister, ed., *Physica Plinii Florentino-Pragensis*, II, 110; cf. *PPB* 83.43 ‘Non solum autem spleniticis saluberrimum est, sed etiam stomachicis ac ptysicis plurimum prodest nec non et sanguinem ex ore iactantibus; sed et contra omnes morbos interaneos facit. Preterea **scabiem** ac prodiginem statim tollit fiat autem sic: mittis ex ipso aceto in ollam noua coeliaria V cum olei emina.’ (ed. Önnersfors, p. 114).

<sup>817</sup> OE *hrean*. Bosworth and Toller give ‘indigestion’ as the meaning based on cognate evidence from Icelandic, rejecting *phthisis* 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.<sup>818</sup>

‘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 *hriefðo* 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 *hreoƿ*- 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*, *ptysicis* 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 *hreoƿlige*, one of which gives the synonym *wærrehte*. Since OE *hreoƿl* 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 *paralysin* þæt is on englisc 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

<sup>818</sup> Wachtmeister, ed., *Physica Plinii Florentino-Pragensis*, II, 110; cf. PPB 83.43 ‘tollis et agitan, hinc infundis **scabiem** et prudiginem perungues.’ (ed. Önnersfors, p. 114).

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*

<i>Leechbook II</i>	<i>Source</i>
II.7.4 Þis synd tacn <b>adeadodes magan</b> .	LT 21.1 <b>Paralysis stomachi</b> ita cognoscitur. <sup>819</sup>
‘These are the signs of the deadened stomach.’	‘Paralysis of the stomach is to be recognised thus’
II.59.14 Soðlice seo adl <sup>820</sup> cymð on monnan æfter feowertigum oððe fiftigum wintra.	LT 79.1 Omnis <b>paralysis</b> non nascitur, nisi cum aetas coeperit declinare, id est post quadragesimum et quintum annum. <sup>821</sup>
‘Truly, the disease comes on one after forty or fifty winters.’	‘All <i>paralysis</i> is not produced until the lifetime begins to decline, that is after forty or fifty years.’
II.59.16 Ne bið hit seo <b>healfdeade adl</b> ac hwilc <hw>æthwega yfel wæte bið gegoten on þæt lim.	LT 79.2 sed non est <b>paralysis</b> , sed cuiuscumque humoris deriuatio, qui partem corporis tenet. <sup>822</sup>
‘It is not the half-dead disease, but some other harmful humour is engendered in the limb.’	‘But that is not <i>paralysis</i> , but the derivation of some humour, which holds that part of the body.’

When we examine the source for *Leechbook* II.59.1, we find something of a confusion in terminology, however:

<i>Leechbook</i> II.59	Oribasius <i>Synopses</i>
II.59.t Wið þære healf deadan adle 7 hwanon seo cume.	VIII.14 <i>De paralyisin</i> Apoplexia haec passio nominatur; in

<sup>819</sup> Fischer, ed., *Liber tertius*, p. 304.

<sup>820</sup> Understand *healfdeade*.

<sup>821</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 337

<sup>822</sup> *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 drensum  
7 læcedomum onweg adon.

‘Concerning 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, paralyisin vocant  
illa scilicet partem in qua resoluti sunt nervi.  
Contingit ergo haec passio ex humoribus  
glutinosus et pinguissimis constipantis  
nervus, per quos secundum voluntaria  
motionem faciunt. Manifestum est ergo quia  
evacuari oportet tales humores.<sup>823</sup>

‘Concerning paralysis. That disease is called  
*apoplexia*, if it arises on a single side, either the  
right or the left. Those parts are called paralysed  
in which the nerves<sup>824</sup> are dissolved. The disease  
arises, moreover, from thick sticky humours  
blocking the nerves, from which voluntary  
motion is made. It is evident, therefore that those  
humours should be purged.’

In his analysis of the sections of the *Leechbook* on *lyftadl* and *sio healfdeade adl*, McIlwain attempts to retrospectively differentiate between *apoplexia* and *paralysis*, as disambiguated by the *Liber tertius*, suggesting that *apoplexia* ‘seizes all parts’ while *paralysis* ‘comes unperceived and kills quickly.’<sup>825</sup> 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 *apoplexia* and *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, *lyftadl* and *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.

<sup>823</sup> Molinier, ed., *Synopsis in Oeuvres d'Oribase*, ed. Bussemaker and Daremberg, VI, 222–3.

<sup>824</sup> L. *nerua* can also mean ‘sinew’.

<sup>825</sup> McIlwain, ‘Theory and Practice’, pp. 67–8.

iv *neurisne* (ἀνεύρυσμα, ἀνεύρυνσις or ἀνευρυσμός)

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* banwyrþ 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.

<i>OEH</i>	<i>Herb.</i>
43.3 Wið þa <b>adle</b> þe Grecas <i>paronichias</i> nemnað  ‘For the disease that the Greeks call <i>paronychia</i> .’	42.3 Herba scilla: Ad panaricia. <sup>826</sup>  ‘For <i>paronychia</i> ,’
91.5 Wið þa adle ðe man <i>litargum</i> hateð, þæt ys on ure geþeode ofergytulnys cweden.  ‘For the disease that one calls <i>lethargy</i> , that is in called forgetfulness in our language.’	90.9 Herba ruta hortensis: Ad litargos excitandus. <sup>827</sup>  ‘The herb <i>ruta hortensis</i> , for the waking of lethargics’
96.2 Wið þa adle þe Grecas <i>frenesis</i> nemnað, þæt is on ure geþeode gewitleast þæs modes...	95.2 Herba peucedanum: Ad freneticos <sup>828</sup>

<sup>826</sup> Howald and Sigerist, ed., *Herbarius*, pp. 90–1. De Vriend’s parallel text retains the spelling *paronychiam* from Montecassino, Archivio della Badia, v. 97, p. 486, in de Vriend, ed., *Herbarium*, pp. 91.

<sup>827</sup> De Vriend, ed., *Herbarium*, pp. 134–5; Howald and Sigerist, ed., *Herbarius*, p. 162.

<sup>828</sup> De Vriend, ed., *Herbarium*, pp. 142–3; Howald and Sigerist, ed., *Herbarius*, p. 172.



‘For the disease that the Greeks call *frenesis*,  
that is witlessness of the mind in our language.’

165.2 Wiþ misenlice leahtras ðæs  
bæcþearmes þa *ragadas* hatað, þæt is  
swaþeah swiðost þæs blodes utryne...<sup>829</sup>

‘For the many injuries of the anus that are called  
*ragadas*.’

184.3 Eac hyt afeormaþ ðone leahtor þe  
Grecas *hostopyturas* hatað, þæt ys scurf þæs  
heafdes, 7 eac þone þe hy *achoras* nemnað,  
þæt ys sceb se foroft þæt heafod fexe  
bereafað<sup>831</sup>

‘It also helps the injury that the Greeks call  
*ostopyturas*, that is dandruff of the head, and  
also that which they call *achoras*, that is scab,  
which very often deprives the head of hair.’

#### *MdQ*

iii.7 Wið wifa earfodnyssum, þas uncyste  
Grecas hatað *hystem cepnizam*.<sup>833</sup>

‘For the hardships of women that Greeks call  
*hysterica pnix*.’

#### *Lacnunga*

120 Wið ðære miclan <siondan> fotadle,  
þære ðe læceas hatað *podagre*.<sup>835</sup>

‘The herb *peucedanum*: For frenetics’

#### *LMHF*

(Herba viola aurosa) Folias eius tunsa et  
ceroto mixta **ragadas** curant.<sup>830</sup>

‘Its leaves beaten and mixt with a wax salve cure  
*ragadas*.’

(Herba bulbus rufus) cum nitro asso trita  
pytiras id est furfures capitis et achoras, id  
est scabiem quae caput capillo despoliat,  
abstergent.<sup>832</sup>

‘(That herb) rubbed with potash cleanses  
*pytiras*, that is scaling of the head, and *achoras*,  
that is a scab which despoils the head of hair.’

#### *MEA α*

i.7. Mulier si a uulua obfucatur, quad  
nequissimum uitium Graece isterice pnix  
dicitur.<sup>834</sup>

‘If a woman is strangled by the womb, which  
dreadful disease the Greeks call *hysterica pnix*’

‘For the great weeping gout that doctors call  
*podagra*.’

<sup>829</sup> De Vriend, ed., *Herbarium*, p. 188.

<sup>830</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 189.

<sup>831</sup> De Vriend, ed., *Herbarium* pp. 230–2.

<sup>832</sup> De Vriend, ed., *Herbarium* pp. 231–3.

<sup>833</sup> De Vriend, ed. *Herbarium* p. 242.

<sup>834</sup> Howald and Sigerist, ed., *Herbarius*, p. 236. De Vriend reads ‘*hystem cepnizan*’ from Lucca, Biblioteca Governativa, 296, f. 19, in his *Herbarium*, p. 243.

<sup>835</sup> Pettit, ed., *Lacnunga* I, 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*

Standard Latinisation	Form in Texts	Greek Term	Meaning
<i>achor</i>	<i>achoras</i>	ἄχωρ, ἀχώρ	dandruff, parasite of the scalp
<i>phrenesis, -ticos</i>	<i>frenesis, -ticos</i>	φρένιτις, φρενιτικός	inflammation of the brain, insanity
<i>paronychia</i>	<i>paranichia, panarichia</i>	παρωνυχία	an infection of the finger or fingernail
<i>pityriasis</i>	<i>hostopyturas, pytiras</i>	πιτυρίασις	a bran-like eruption of the skin
<i>hysterica pnix</i>	<i>hystem cepnizam</i>	ὕστερική πνίξ	suffocation of the womb
<i>lethargos</i>	<i>litargos, litargum</i>	λήθαργος	lethargy, forgetfulness
<i>rhagades</i>	<i>ragadas</i>	ῥαγάδες	fissures, cracks
<i>podagra</i>	<i>podagre</i>	ποδάγρα	gout

### *i achor*

The Greek term ἄχωρ, ἀχώρ is noted by Langslow as denoting a parasite of the scalp in Theodorus and Cassius Felix,<sup>836</sup> and lemmatised by Liddle and Scott as meaning ‘scurf, dandruff.’<sup>837</sup> The term occurs with an Old English calque *sceb*, glossing L. *scabies*. The term’s meaning is quite explicit

<sup>836</sup> Langslow, *Medical Latin*, p. 477.

<sup>837</sup> Liddle, H. G., R. Scott and H. S. Jones, ed., *A Greek-English Lexicon*, 8th edition (Oxford, 1940).

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.<sup>838</sup> 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, ὑστερική πνίξ 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.’<sup>839</sup> 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

<sup>838</sup> Langslow, *Medical Latin*., p. 490; see also pp. 368–9 on the semantics of lexemes in the *-icus* / *-ικός* suffix.

<sup>839</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 486.

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.<sup>840</sup> 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 bæcþearmes 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.<sup>841</sup> 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.*

---

<sup>840</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 491.

<sup>841</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 490.

*Ad emoptoycos*<sup>842</sup> þæt Greccas hateð *amatostax*<sup>843</sup>, þæt ys on <ledene> genemned *reiectatio*, and on englice ys haten blodrine.

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.<sup>844</sup>

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 *-wærc* 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 substantivally 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

---

<sup>842</sup> Probably *haemoptycus* (αἱμοπτύκος). See Langslow, *Medical Latin*, p. 485.

<sup>843</sup> Probably *haematos* from *anagoge haematos* (ἀναγωγή αἵματος), glossed *reiectatio sanguinis* in Cassius Felix. See Langslow, *Medical Latin*, p. 478.

<sup>844</sup> D. Banham, 'A Millennium in Medicine', p. 235.

terminology; examples include *bræcseoc* (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,<sup>845</sup> 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.<sup>846</sup>

#### 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

---

<sup>845</sup> Bonser, ‘Anglo-Saxon Medical Nomenclature’, p. 14; Lambert, ‘The Old English Medical Vocabulary’, pp. 13–14.

<sup>846</sup> 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*.

- 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 (wiþ adla 7 wið ealle yfelu),<sup>847</sup> and in *Lacnunga* 16 (wið adle).<sup>848</sup>

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.

<i>OEH</i>	<i>LMHF</i>
140.3 Ðeos wyrð soðlice ealle ealde & hefige 7 unlacnigendlice <b>adlu</b> tofereþ. <sup>849</sup>	(elleborum album) Haec autem herba omnes <b>morbos</b> inveteratos, graves, insanabiles destruet <sup>850</sup>
‘This herb drives away all old and heavy and incurable diseases.’	‘This herb, moreover, drives away all old, heavy and incurable diseases.’
<i>MdQ</i>	<i>Tax. α</i>
1.4 Mid his gelynde smyre þa hors þa þe syn on feofre oþþe on ænigre <b>adle</b> .	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.’	‘You will smear the sick horse with its fat, the fevers immediately decline.’
1.6 and þeah man sy on hwylcre ungewendendlicre <b>adle</b> 7 unhalwendlicre seo wise hine hæleð 7 lacnað. <sup>851</sup>	ll. 47–8 et quod insanabile uidetur, remediabit. <sup>852</sup>
‘And though one may be in whatever chronic and incurable disease, that method heals and treats him.’	‘and whatever incurable thing is seen, will be cured.’

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. *morbos*, but the term can often be used to restate

<sup>847</sup> ‘For disease, and for all evils.’ De Vriend, ed. *Herbarium*, p. 23.

<sup>848</sup> ‘For disease.’ Pettit, ed. *Lacnunga* I, 10.

<sup>849</sup> De Vriend, ed., *Herbarium*, p. 182.

<sup>850</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 183.

<sup>851</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 236.

<sup>852</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 230–1.

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*,<sup>853</sup> and a single instance in *Peri didaxeon* 52.<sup>854</sup>

By contrast, the term is used to refer to a pre-determined term 82 times.<sup>855</sup> 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 wiþ  
sidan sare 7 þis sindon þære **adle** tacn gelic  
lungenadle tacnum 7 liferwærces tacnum.

‘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.’

LT 34.1 [Incipit de] pleuresis id est lateris  
dolor, qui signa similia cum epaticis et  
peripneumonicis habet; sed pleuresis his  
signis agnoscitur.<sup>856</sup>

‘Pleurisy, that is pain of the side, which has  
signs similar to liver disease and pneumonia, but  
pleurisy is recognized by these signs.’

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*.’

<sup>853</sup> 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

<sup>854</sup> ‘Þanne þu þas tacnunge seo on þan manna, þanne scealt þu him blod lætan; and gif þu ne dest, hit cym hym to mucle and stranga adle.’ Löweneck, ed., *Peri didaxeon*, p. 33.

<sup>855</sup> The occurrences are as follows: *Herb.* 66.1, *MdQ* 1.4, *BLB* I.H.4, I.H.35 (twice), I.H.42, I.H.62, I.H.64 (twice), I.1.18 (x4), I.2.3, I.4.8 (twice), I.4.10, I.4.16, I.4.19 (twice), I.4.19, I.35.1 (twice), I.47.2, I.47.11, I.63.4, I.64.2, I.65.1, II.H.2, II.H.5, II.H.31, II.H.36, II.H.39, II.H.43, II.H.46, II.H.51, II.H.56, II.H.58, II.H.59, II.19.3, II.21.4, II.21.5, II.25.2, II.25.3, II.25.5, II.28.5, II.28.6, II.29.2, II.31.1, II.32.1, II.32.2, II.32.3, II.33.1, II.33.12, II.36.t, II.36.2, II.36.10, II.39.4, II.39.6, II.43.1, II.45.1, II.46.t, II.46.1, II.46.3, II.46.4, II.46.8, II.47.3, II.56.7, II.59.1, II.59.2 (twice), II.59.14 (twice), II.59.15, II.59.18, II.59.19, *Lacn* 127, *Peri D* 6 (twice), 18, 43, and 59.

<sup>856</sup> Fischer, ed., *Liber tertius*, p. 309.



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 ‘bið 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 paralyisin 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*.<sup>857</sup> 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*.<sup>858</sup> 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, *brægnas* (brain) once, *fienda* (demons), *lifre* (liver) twice, *magan* (stomach) three times, *smalþearmes* (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.<sup>859</sup> For the sake of simplicity, it will be assumed that these two instances are in fact metathesised instances of *liferadl*.

<sup>857</sup> *OEHL* 143.1 and *MdQ* 14.4 in de Vriend, ed., *Herbarium*, pp. 186, 270.

<sup>858</sup> *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*. 170.

<sup>859</sup> Hogg, R. M., ‘Old English r-Metathesis and Generative Phonology’, *Journal of Linguistics* 13 (1977), 165–75.

Genitival collocations: *blædran adl*

II.33.8 Be latre 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.’

*Herb*, 89.4 Ad urinae difficultatem. Herbae  
millefolium sucus cum aceto bibitur, mire  
sanat.<sup>860</sup>

‘For difficulty of urine. Juice of the herb milfoil  
is drunk with vinegar, it heals marvelously.’

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** superne eced drence

‘...oxymel, the southern vinegar drink which we wrote about before about bladder disease.’

II.59.20 ...þis 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 *brægenes adl* occurs only once:

*Leechbook* II.27.4

Sio wambe sio ðe bið cealdre oððe wætre  
gecyndo oððe misbyrdo. him cymð  
**brægenes adl** 7 ungewitfæstnes him bið.

Oribasius, *Synopsis* V.47

*Ventris et intestine cognitio.*

Si autem frigidam est temperantiam ventris,  
**cerebri alienatio** sit.<sup>861</sup>

<sup>860</sup> Howald and Sigerist, ed., *Herbarius*, p. 160.

<sup>861</sup> 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.’

‘If, moreover, the temperament of the intestine is cold, the brain may become numb.’

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 uocant*, in which OE *fienda adl* ‘fiends’ disease,’ appears to translate Gr. *spasmos* (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 ‘wip magan adlum,’ suggesting not just one disease, but several. The Old English term *smælþearmes 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 ‘Wip 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 ‘*wip 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*

Compounds	<i>Herb</i>	<i>BLB</i>	<i>Leech III</i>	<i>Lacn</i>	Misc	Totals	Translates
ælf			1			1	-
wæterælf			1			1	-

cancer		3				3	cancer
cealf		1				1	-
ceoc			2			2	-
circul		3				3	-
fefer		3				3	feber
feorh			1		1	2	-
fic			2			2	ficus
fot	34			2	2	38	podagra
geal		2				2	-
horh <sup>862</sup>		2				2	reumaticus
hringc				1		1	-
hrið		1				1	-
in		3				3	dolor intrinsecorum, morbus interaneos
lencten		7	2			9	-
lenden		2				2	nefreticos
lifer <sup>863</sup>	3	9			1	13	(passiones) epatis
lið	1					1	morbum articulorum
lond		2				2	-
lungen	8	14	5	5	2	34	peripneumonicis dolor pulmonem
lyft		2	2			4	paralysis
milt		1				1	spleneticus
poc		4				4	-
þeor		8				8	-
utsiht		1	2			3	*disintericos morbos
wamb		1				1	-
wæter	4					4	ydrops
totals						151	

<sup>862</sup> Both instances appear with the form *hornadl* in Royal 12. D. XVII, but are emended to *horhadl* in the text employed by the *DOEC*.

<sup>863</sup> 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 tacn **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 OE *H* 81.2: ‘Wið **adligende** genim þas wyrte *rosmarinum*, cnuca mid ele, smyre ðone **adligendan**.’<sup>864</sup> This usage appears to preserve the syntax of the Latin participle *languens* in the *Herbarium* while being semantically less specific.

### OE *cōpu*

#### i OE *cōpu* as a simplex

As a simplex, the word occurs quite infrequently in medical prose<sup>865</sup>, 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.H.32 be þære **cōðe** hu man lyste utgang 7 ne mæg

‘concerning the disease where one wants to defacate but cannot.’

II.H.33 wið þære frecnan **cōðe** 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 **cōpu** is þære wambe þæt þone seocan monnan lysteð 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 **cōpe** þe se mon his  
utgang þurh ðone muð him fram weorpe  
sceal aspiwan.

CDM 4.20.1 Si superior pars adfecta est,  
cibus, si inferior, stercus per os redditur.<sup>866</sup>

<sup>864</sup> De Vriend, ed. *Herbarium*, p. 120; cf. *Herb* 80.2 ‘Ad Languentes, Herba rosmario trita cum oleo, mire sanabit;’ Howald and Sigerist ed., *Herbarius*, p. 144.

<sup>865</sup> Five times in total. Not listed is *BLB* II.H.30, which does not contain a relative clause.

<sup>866</sup> 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<sup>867</sup> 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 *choler*, 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*

	<i>BLB</i> I	<i>BLB</i> II	<i>Lacn</i>	misc	Translates
ban	3		1		-
breost		2			-
fær		2			-
heort		3			<i>cardiacus passio</i>
in		2			-
lungen				1	-
sweor	6	2			<i>synanches,</i> <i>parotidis</i>
wambe		15			<i>uentris dolor (uel</i> <i>uitia)</i>
Totals	9	26	1	1	

<sup>867</sup> Langslow, *Medical Latin*, p. 46.

It is difficult to tell whether *wambe-copu* 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: *bancopu*, defined by the *DOE* as a ‘pernicious disease’ and *færcopu*, which possibly means a disease which occurs suddenly. Occurring alongside *færcopu* in the *Leechbook* is *incopu*, 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 incope 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

*OE*H 3.3 Wiþ muðes **ece** 7 wið tungan 7  
wið þrotan genim fifleafan wyrtwalan, wyll  
on wætere; syle him supan; ðonne clænsaþ  
hit ðone 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 linguae aut gulae.  
Herbae quinquefolii radices ex aqua coctas  
dabis, gargarizet, etiam ubi sanies, tollet et  
arteriam purgat.<sup>868</sup>

‘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 *OE*H 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,

<sup>868</sup> Howald and Sigerist, ed., *Herbarius*, 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*: *eagena ece* twice in *BLB* I.2, *earena ece* three times in *BLB* I.3 and its Table of Contents, *healdes 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*, *eagena ece*; *heafodece*, *heafdes 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 *emicraneā*.

## 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

	Herb	BLB I	BLB II	Leech III	Lacn	misc	Translates
bān	4	3					<i>sciatica</i>
eag		4					<i>dolor oculorum</i>
fot		5			1	1	<i>dolor pedum</i>
heafod	28	4	1	6	4	3	<i>dolor capitis</i>
heort	3	3	1		2		<i>cardiacos</i>
hypeban	2						<i>sciatica</i>
lenden	1	3	2		1		<i>dolor lumbarum</i>
sid					2		-
toð	11	4		2	1		<i>dolor dentium</i>
þeoh		2			1		-
totals	49	28	4	8	12	4	105



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-cōþu* is actually a compound on the nominal stem *bana*, meaning ‘slayer, killer, the agent who causes death,’ so that *ban-cōþu* literally means ‘killer-disease’ or fatal malady. Luckily, it seems that there is no confusion within the texts between *bancōþu* (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.<sup>869</sup>

### 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*)<sup>870</sup> and once as a substantive without demonstrative in the *Lacnunga*.<sup>871</sup> 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 occurrences 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*.<sup>872</sup>

### 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

<sup>869</sup> 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.

<sup>870</sup> *Herb OEH* 69.1, 171.1 and 173; *Peri D* 63.43.27 (twice)

<sup>871</sup> *Lacn.* 21 ‘and drince seoca of bræmelberian gewrungene oft.’ (ed. Pettit, I, 12) The form is weak in each case.

<sup>872</sup> *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), *monað-* 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*

	<i>OEH &amp; MdQ</i>	<i>OEH</i> (seocness)	<i>BLB I</i>	<i>BLB II</i>	<i>Leech III</i>	Translates
bræc			3			* <i>epilepticus</i>
deofol		6			2	<i>daemonia, daemonicos</i>
feond			3			* <i>diamonicos</i>
fylle	3	2				<i>epilepticus</i>
gewit					2	-
lenden				3		<i>nefreticus</i>
lifer	1	9		2		<i>epatis dolorem, epaticus</i>
milt	1			3		<i>spleneticus</i>
monað	5	2			2	<i>lunaticus</i>
scin	1					<i>caducos</i>
wamb				2		<i>colicus</i>
wæter	6	15				<i>ydropicus</i>
Totals	17	34	6	10	6	73

## OE *wærc*

Unlike *adl*, OE *wærc* or *wræc* is very infrequent as a simplex in medical prose unless in collocation with an anatomical term in the genitive.<sup>873</sup> 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 *wærcan* occurs in the subjunctive form *wærce* twice in the medical corpus at *Leech*. II.52.13 ‘Gif hine innan **wærce**’ and *Leechbook* III.7 ‘Gif þa þeoh **wærce** smire þone heals mid þære sealfe’

<sup>873</sup> The one exception is the table of contents entry for *BLB* II.H.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-*,<sup>874</sup> 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.<sup>875</sup>

Table 6.7 Compounds and Collocations on OE *-wærc*

	MdQ	BLB I	BLB II	Leech III	Lacn	Misc	Translates
blædder				2			-
breost		4	3	3	1		<i>ypocondria</i>
ceol				2			-
cneow		2			2		-
eag	2			2		2	<i>*oculorum dolor</i>
eagena*		1		2			<i>*oculorum dolor</i>
ear		1		2			<i>*aurium dolor</i>
fot	1		1				<i>*podagra</i>
fylle (felle)			4				<i>epilepsia, apoplexia</i>
heafod	1	5			4		<i>*pituitas in capite</i>
heals				3			<i>*struma, synanches, parotidas</i>
heort		3			2		-
innopa*	1						
lend(en)		1	3	3		1	<i>*nephreticos</i>
lifer			7				<i>epaticus</i>
lið		3	1	2	1		-
magan*				6			-
milt(e)	1		9	2			<i>spleneticus</i>
miltan*					1		
rysel				1			-
sculdor		3		2			-
sid		1	5		1		<i>pleuresis</i>

<sup>874</sup> For a discussion of this term see Cameron, ‘On *þeor* and *þeoradl*’, pp. 124–9.

<sup>875</sup> Similarly the *scitefinger*, (L. *index*), is so named due to its utility as a pointing tool.

sweor		1					<i>struma</i>
toð	1	7					<i>*dentium dolor</i>
þeoh	1					1	-
þeor		1					-
ut			11				<i>dysenteriae</i>
wambe*	1			3			-
Total	9	33	44	35	12	4	137

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

		adl	copu	ece	seoc(ness)	wærc
1	blædder-					2
1a	blæddran	4				
2	breost-		2			11
3	eag-			4		6
3a	eagena			2		3
4	ear-					3
4a	earena			3		
5	fær-/ færlic	1	2			
6	fot-	38		7		2
7	fylle-				5	4
8	geal-	2				
8a	geallan		1			
9	heafod-			46		10
9a	healfes heafdes			5		
10	heort-		3	9		5
11	in-	4	2			0
11a	innan	1				
12	lenden-	2	0	7	3	9
12a	lendena*			1		
13	lifer	13			12	7
14	lið-	1				6
15	lungen-	34	1			
16	magan	1				6
17	milt-	1			4	12
17a	miltan					1
18	sid-			2		7
19	sweor-		8			1
20	toþ			18		8
21	(smæl)þearma	1		4		
22	þeoh-			3		2
23	þeor-	8				1
24	wamb-	1			2	
24a	wambe	1	15			4
25	wæter-	4			20	

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, *cōpu* 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*, *-cōpu* and *-seoc*. Of these, there are only ten: *eag(ena)* (*ece*, *wærc*), *ear* (*ece*, *wærc*), *fot* (*adl*, *ece*, *wærc*), *heafod* (*ece*, *wærc*), *heort* (*ece*, *cōpu*, *wærc*), *lenden* (*adl*, *ece*, *seoc*, *cōpu*), *sid* (*ece*, *wærc*), *top* (*ece*, *wærc*), *(smæl)þearmes* (*adl*, *ece*) and *þeoh* (*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 *eagena ece* and *earena ece* 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*.<sup>876</sup> 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.<sup>877</sup> 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 (*uneapþlacna 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

<sup>876</sup> De Vriend, ed., *Herbarium*, pp. 30–31.

<sup>877</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 36–7.

be located.<sup>878</sup> It is likely that given the chronic (*uneaplacna*) 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*,<sup>879</sup> 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.<sup>880</sup> 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 *heortcopu* 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 *heortcopu* can be seen as an attempt to calque *cardiacos* directly, it is safe

---

<sup>878</sup> 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.'

<sup>879</sup> Marginalia from London, British Library Harley 6258B. Printed in Cockayne, ed., *Leechdoms*, I, 380–2.

<sup>880</sup> 'Læcedomas wiþ miclum heafodece 7 wærce'.

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 wyxþ 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,'<sup>881</sup> 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.'<sup>882</sup> 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 *heortcōpu* 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,<sup>883</sup> 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.<sup>884</sup> In *Leechbook* II.46 'ad pleuresis, id est lateris dolorem' (*LT* 34.1)<sup>885</sup> is directly translated as 'wiþ 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*

<sup>881</sup> Fradin, ed., *Practica Alexandri*, 34v.

<sup>882</sup> Langslow, *The Latin Alexander*, p. 164.

<sup>883</sup> Pettit, ed., *Lacnunga*, I, 84.

<sup>884</sup> *Ibid.*, I, 26.

<sup>885</sup> 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 *smælbearma* 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 *bearma* simplex is no more common in collocations, *bearma ece* occurring only once in the *OEH* 90.10, which seems to be an interpolation to the known recensions of pseudo-Apuleius 89.<sup>886</sup>

The compounds *topece* and *toþwærc* 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 dentition, as well as twice in *Leechbook* III and once in the *Lacnunga*. The compound *toþwærc*, 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 *toþwræce* 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 ‘Wip toðece’ (*OEH* I.8), while the *Leechbook* translates it as ‘Wip 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 *þeoh* compounds are relatively rare, *þeohce* occurring three times, twice in *Leechbook* I.23 and its heading and once in *Lacnunga* 173,<sup>887</sup> *þeohwærc* occurring only twice in the *MdQ* 7.19, and the Omont fragment.<sup>888</sup> 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 *þeohce* 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.

<sup>886</sup> 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.

<sup>887</sup> Chapter 170 according to Pettit, who rejects the reading *þeohce* in favour of *þeorece*. Pettit, ed., *Lacnunga* I, 118.

<sup>888</sup> *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, *blædran adl* and *blædderwærc*. The phrasal term *blædran 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 diffultatem*, 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.

### Breostcōpu and breostwærc

The compound *breostcōpu* 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 *praecordium* (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 'Wyr̃t drencas wið eallum liferadlum' which is roughly analogous to the chapter rubric from the *PAL* ii.67 'De potionibus et antidotis ad epatis passionēs' from which source two of the thirteen recipes have been identified.

The adjective *liferseoc* has been noted above as referring to the sufferer of a disease elsewhere described as *liferadl*, in the case of *OEH* 124.1 and its table of contents entry. The term appears only twice in the *Leechbook*, both cases modifying *man* in instructional phrases such as *BLB* II.24.1 'Wyr̃ce mon to drencum liferseocum mannū' (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 *liferwærc* 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 *liferwærc* 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 *-wærc*. 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 *liferwærc*.

## 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 *tysicos* 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,’<sup>889</sup> 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.<sup>890</sup> 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 passionibus vel accidentia *quem cardiacam*

---

<sup>889</sup> ‘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 liferwærces 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).

<sup>890</sup> The instance at *Leechbook II.1.1*, ‘Þis sint tacn **adlies** magan’ is a case of agreement between *magan* (genitive) and the adjective *adlig*.

vocant aliam' (*PAL* II.14).<sup>891</sup> The occurrence in *BLB* II.16.6 is certainly not a lexicalised phrasal term, due to the syntactic arrangement: 'Be þære ofer miclan friclo þonne of þære selfan cealdan adle þæs magan' which roughly translates the *PAL* II.15 *De stomachi frigida distemperantia*<sup>892</sup> 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'<sup>893</sup> is translated as 'Þonne deah þis wiþ hunige geyced ge wið milte adle'<sup>894</sup> in *Leechbook* II.41.4. Elsewhere L. *spleneticus* tends to be translated as *miltseoc*, mostly to facilitate syntactical rendering of the Latin adjectival form as in *Herbal* 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 sie... miltewærc,'<sup>895</sup> which translates *LT* 69.4 'putant et inde splenicum.'<sup>896</sup> 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,'<sup>897</sup> 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'.<sup>898</sup>

<sup>891</sup> Fradin, ed., *Practica Alexandri*, 34v.

<sup>892</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>893</sup> 'That is not only beneficial for splenetics.' Önnersfors, ed., *Physica Plinii Bambergensis*, p. 114.

<sup>894</sup> 'Then this, mixed with honey also benefits against spleen disease.'

<sup>895</sup> 'Ignorant doctors believe that it is spleen-disease.'

<sup>896</sup> 'Hence they believe him to be splenic.' Fischer, ed., *Liber tertius*, p. 328.

<sup>897</sup> 'Concerning spleen-disease, and that it is on the left side, and the signs of the disease.'

<sup>898</sup> '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.

## OE *sweor*

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 *sweorcōpu* which occurs six times in *Leechbook* I and twice in *Leechbook* II, and *sweorwærc* which occurs only once in *Leechbook* I. OE *sweorcōpu* 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 *healswærc* 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 *sweorcōpu*; 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 *sweorcōpu* 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 *wambe-cōpu* 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 *wambecōpu* 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 *wambecōpu* is common, II.26, II.30 and II.31. In *BLB* II.26 'Be wambe cōpum 7 gif hio innan wund biþ' the *wambe cōpu* appears to be an over-translation, as the source, *LT* 28–9 has merely 'De uulnera si nascantur in uentre' with no more

specific disease terms mentioned. In *BLB* II.30.8 the collocation ‘*wip 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 *fær(lic)*, *fylle*, *in*, *þeor* and *wæter*. 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 færcopu*

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 *færcopu* 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 *færcopu* may infer a sudden onset of diarrhoea 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 *bræcseoc* in *Leechbook* I.16.1.

### OE *inadl*, *innan adl* and *incopu*

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’<sup>899</sup> in the *PPB* 83.43, which is rendered into Old English: ‘ge wip eallum innan adlum.’<sup>900</sup> 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 *incopu* is only found in one strictly medical text, *BLB* II.55.2, and its Table of Contents, where the context, a recipe ‘Wip incope’ 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 incope’; ‘incommoditates, inconuenientias uel infirmitates: incoþa’ and ‘melancolias: incoþan.’<sup>901</sup>

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 *incopu* in that instance.

<sup>899</sup> ‘It also works against all internal diseases.’ Önnersfors ed., *Physica Plinii Bambergensis*, p. 114.

<sup>900</sup> ‘Also for all internal diseases.’

<sup>901</sup> ‘L. Goosens, ed., *The Old English Glosses of MS. Brussels, Royal Library, 1650 (Aldhelm’s De laudibus virginitatis)*, Verhandelingen van de Koninklijke Academie voor Wetenschappen, Letteren en Schone Kunsten van België, Klasse der Letteren 74 (Brussels, 1974).



### OE *þeoradl* and *þeorwærc*.

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: ‘Wip þeoradle on eagum þe mon *gefigo* hæť on læden hatte *cimosi*s,’<sup>902</sup> where the Old English appears to paraphrase Cassius Felix’ *De medicina* 29.55.1 ‘ad trachomata id est asperitates palpebrarum et ad sycosin.’<sup>903</sup>

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), *þeorwurm* (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 wip þeoradle 7 wip lungenadle 7 wip utwærce.’<sup>904</sup> At first this would appear to be a list of diseases completely distant to the dermatological disorders we can infer are intended by *þeoradl* in *BLB* I.47; however the lost chapter also contained recipes ‘wip blæce on *andwlitan*,’ that is, ‘for blotch on the face’, suggesting that the chapter contained rather an odd mix of dermatological and internal cures, and that *þeoradl* may well have been a dermatological 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.’<sup>905</sup>

### 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 *ydripos* (*wæteradl*, *wæterseoc*) to the more obscure in etymology such as

<sup>902</sup> ‘For *þeor* disease in the eyes which one calls *gefigo*, in Latin it is called *cimosi*s.’

<sup>903</sup> ‘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.

<sup>904</sup> ‘Recipe for *þeor* disease and for lung disease and for dysentery.’

<sup>905</sup> Sisam and Sisam, ed., *The Salisbury Psalter*.

*wæterelfadl*, which was seen at one stage as evidence of residual animism in Anglo-Saxon medical theory. Alaric Hall sees *wæterelfadl* as a hyponym of *ælfadl*, and possibly a bahuvrihi compound, ‘any associations with *aelfe* being forgotten’ and ‘part of a reasonably well defined association of *aelfe* with cutaneous ailments.’<sup>906</sup>

The compound *wæteradl* 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 *ydronicos*. The compound adjective *wæterseoc* and its nominalized form *wæterseocness* occur very frequently in the *OEH*, and occasionally in the *MdQ*. *Wæterseoc* 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 *ydronicos* or the adjectival form *ydronicus*. The term occurs once with the same meaning in *MdQ* 10.16 where *\*se wæterseoc man* glosses *\*ydronicus*.

In the *Leechbooks*, *wæterseoc* and *wæteradl* are not used. However the term *wæterbolla* is used twice in *Leechbook* I and nine times in *Leechbook* II. Interestingly, the very first appearance of *wæterbolla* in *Leechbook* I.43.1 is a translation of *DHVL* 25 (*Ad idronicos*) which is absent from the later eleventh-century *OEH*. Of the seven separate recipes in *Leechbook* II which contain the compound *wæterbolla* (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 *wæterbolla* clearly translates *ydrops* or *ydronicos*.

### *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 *færcopu*, the meaning of which

<sup>906</sup> A. Hall, *Elves in Anglo-Saxon England: Matters of Belief, Health, Gender and Identity*, Anglo-Saxon Studies 8 (Woodbridge, 2007), pp. 106–8. See also A. Hall ‘Calling the Shots: The Old English Remedy *gif hors ofscoten sie* and Anglo-Saxon “Elf Shot”’, *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen: Bulletin of the Modern Language Society* 106 (2005), 195–209.

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 idiosyncrasy 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.<sup>907</sup> 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,<sup>908</sup> 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.<sup>909</sup>

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.<sup>910</sup>

---

<sup>907</sup> Cockayne, ed., *Leechdoms*.

<sup>908</sup> Grattan and Singer, *Anglo-Saxon Magic and Medicine*, p. 94.

<sup>909</sup> 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’.

<sup>910</sup> 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.<sup>911</sup>

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.<sup>912</sup>

---

<sup>911</sup> On the specific dating of the *Passionarius*, see above p. 80 and Glaze, 'The Perforated Wall' and 'Galen Refashioned.'

<sup>912</sup> K. Heller, 'Der Wortschatz unter dem Aspekt des Fachwortes', after Langslow, *Medical Latin*, pp. 13–16.

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.'<sup>913</sup>

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,<sup>914</sup> 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.'<sup>915</sup>

### *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.'<sup>916</sup>

---

<sup>913</sup> Langslow, *Medical Latin*, pp. 21–2.

<sup>914</sup> Langslow, *Medical Latin*, pp. 377–430 at p. 377.

<sup>915</sup> Langslow, *Medical Latin*, pp. 378–9.

<sup>916</sup> '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.’<sup>917</sup>

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* (OE*H*) 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).<sup>918</sup>

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

---

<sup>917</sup> ‘For bite of a snake. The herb *plantago* ground in wine and eaten will be suitable.’ Howald and Sigerist, ed., *Herbarius*, p. 23.

<sup>918</sup> Adams and Deegan, ‘Bald’s *Leechbook* and the *Physica Plinii*’ pp. 87–114.

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 its 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



in verbose constructions such as ‘ðā wyrt þe hatte on suþerne *terebintina*.’<sup>919</sup> 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 *hreoþl*.

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.<sup>920</sup> 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).<sup>921</sup>

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.<sup>922</sup> 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 *hreoþl* 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 *hreoþl* occurs in preference to *hriefþo*.

<sup>919</sup> ‘The herb that is called *terebinthina* in the south.’ See table 1.3 above for a list of such occurrences.

<sup>920</sup> Langslow, *Medical Latin*, pp. 383–93, esp pp. 383–4.

<sup>921</sup> Rissanen, ‘Latin Influence on an Old English Idiom’.

<sup>922</sup> 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<sup>923</sup> 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.<sup>924</sup> 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* / *-ικος* 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 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.

<sup>923</sup> These rubrics are actually written in red ink throughout the text as recorded in London, British Library Harley 6258B.

<sup>924</sup> Löweneck, ed., *Peri didaxeon*, pp. 19–21.

## 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 *-þearm* 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 *lendenbræd* for *lumbus* or *renes*,<sup>925</sup> *neweseoða* for *ilium*, and *bæcþearm* for *anus*. OE *innoð* could translate a much broader range of terms including *intus*, *uenter*, *uisus* 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,

---

<sup>925</sup> 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*, *syrrexsis*, *helcosis*, *phlegmon*, *scleria* and *scirrhis*. The Old English terms for *apostema* (*apundenes*, *geswel*, *swile*), *helcosis* (*wund*), *phlegmone* (*apundenes*, *swile*), *scirrhis* (*aheardung butan gefelnesse*), *sclerosis* (*aheardung mid gefelnesse*) and *syrrexsis* (*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 *inrius*, before being lexicalised in a phrasal term *æt and wæt* to translate *cibus et potus*, maintaining the ‘inherent, natural inalienable function’ of terms like *potus*.<sup>926</sup> 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 *wæta*, *-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

---

<sup>926</sup> 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*,<sup>927</sup> 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

---

<sup>927</sup> 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.<sup>928</sup>

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,<sup>929</sup> but must have arisen from practical necessity or pragmatism due to the sheer economic cost of their production alone.<sup>930</sup>

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

---

<sup>928</sup> Langslow, *Medical Latin*, pp. 12–16.

<sup>929</sup> Bonser, *The Medical Background of Anglo-Saxon England*, p. 54.

<sup>930</sup> 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 quantitatively discussed above.<sup>931</sup>

---

<sup>931</sup> Specifically the strong neuter dative singular in *-e* rather than *-um*.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adams, J. N., and Deegan, M., 'Bald's Leechbook and the *Physica Plinii*', *ASE* 21 (1992), 87–114.
- D'Aronco, M. A., 'How "English" is Anglo-Saxon Medicine? The Latin Sources for Anglo-Saxon Medical Texts', in *Britannia Latina: Latin in the Culture of Great Britain from the Middle Ages to the Twentieth Century*, ed. C. Burnett, N. Mann and W. F. Ryan, Warburg Institute Colloquia 8 (London and Turin, 2005), pp. 27–41.
- D'Aronco, M. A., and M. L. Cameron, *The Old English Illustrated Pharmacopoeia: British Library Cotton Vitellius C. III*, EEMF 27 (Copenhagen, 1998).
- Assman, B., ed., *Angelsächsische Homilien und Heiligenleben*, BDASP 3 (Kassel, 1964).
- Ayoub, L., 'Old English *wæta* and the Medical Theory of the Humours', *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 94 (1995), 332–46.
- Baader, G., 'Early Medieval Latin Adaptations of Byzantine Medicine in Western Europe', *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 38 (1984), 251–9.
- Baker P., and M. Lapidge, ed., *Byrhtferth's Enchiridion*, EETS SS 15 (Oxford, 1995).
- Banham, D., 'A Millennium in Medicine? New Medical Texts and Ideas in England in the Eleventh-Century', in *Anglo-Saxons: Studies Presented to Cyril Roy Hart*, ed. S. Keynes and A. P. Smyth (Dublin, 2006), pp. 230–42.
- Banham, D., and C. Doyle, 'An Instrument of Confusion: the Mystery of the Anglo-Saxon Syringe', in *Recipes for Disaster*, ed. J. Rampling, D. Banham and N. Jardine (Cambridge, 2010), pp. 27–38.
- Barney, S., W. Lewis, J. Beach, and O. Berghof, ed., *The Etymologies of Isidore of Seville* (Cambridge, 2006).
- Bately, J., ed., *The Old English Orosius*, EETS SS 6 (Oxford, 1980).
- Beccaria, A., *I codici di medicina del periodo presalernitano* (Rome, 1956).
- Bethurum, D., ed., *The Homilies of Wulfstan* (Oxford, 1957).
- Bieler, L., ed., *Anicii Manlii Severini Boethii Philosophiae consolatio*, CCSL 94 (Turnholt, 1957).
- Bierbaumer, P. *Der botanische Wortschatz des Altenglischen*, 2 vols., Grazer Beiträge zur englischen Philologie 1–2 (Bern and Frankfurt, 1975–6).



- Biggam, C. P., 'Hæwenhnydele: an Anglo-Saxon Medicinal Plant', *Botanical Journal of Scotland* 46 (1994), 617–22.
- Bonser, W., 'Anglo-Saxon Medical Nomenclature', *English and Germanic Studies* 4 (1952), 13–19.
- Bonser, W., *The Medical Background of Anglo-Saxon England: a Study in History, Psychology and Folklore* (London, 1963).
- Bosworth J., and T. N. Toller, ed., *An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary Based on the Manuscript Collections of the Late Joseph Bosworth* (London, 1898).
- Bremmer, R. H. J., 'Leiden, Vossianus Lat. Q. 69 (part 2): Schoolbook or ProtoEncyclopaedic Miscellany', in *Practice in Learning: The Transfer of Encyclopaedic Knowledge in the Early Middle Ages*, ed. R. H. J. Bremmer and K. Dekker (Paris, 2010), pp. 19–54.
- Brenessel, B., M. D. C. Drout and R. Gravel, 'A Reassessment of the Efficacy of Anglo-Saxon Medicine', *ASE* 34 (2006), 183–95.
- 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).
- Brotanek, R., ed., 'Synodalbeschlüsse aus Ms. lat. 943', in *Texte und Untersuchungen zur altenglischen Literatur und Kirchengeschichte* (Halle, 1913), pp. 27–8.
- Brunet, F., ed., *Œuvres médicales d'Alexandre de Tralles: Le dernier auteur classique des grands médecins Grecs de l'Antiquité* (1933–6).
- Bussemaker, U. C., and C. Daremberg, eds., *Oeuvres d'Oribase, Collection des médecins grecs et latins*, 6 vols. (Paris, 1851–76).
- Cameron, A., and R. Frank, eds. *A Plan for the Dictionary of Old English* (Toronto, 1973).
- Cameron, A., A. C. Amos, A. P. Healey et al., ed., 'Dictionary of Old English: A to H online', <http://tapor.library.utoronto.ca/doe/>
- Cameron, M. L., 'The Sources of Medical Knowledge in Anglo-Saxon England', *ASE* 11 (1982), 135–55.
- Cameron, M. L., 'Bald's Leechbook: Its Sources and their Use in its Compilation', *ASE* 12 (1983), 153–82.
- Cameron, M. L., 'On þeor and þeoradl', *Anglia* 106 (1988), 124–9.
- Cameron, M. L., 'What Plant was Attorlothe (atorlaþe)?', *Parergon* 10 (1992), 27–34.
- Cameron, M. L., *Anglo-Saxon Medicine*, CSASE 7 (Cambridge, 1993).

- Campbell, A. P., *Old English Grammar* (Oxford, 1959).
- Campbell, A. P., ed., *Enlarged Addenda and Corrigenda to the Supplement by T. Northcote Toller* (Oxford, 1972).
- Campbell, A. P., ed., *The Tiberius Psalter*, Publications médiévales de l'Université d'Ottawa 2 (Ottawa, 1974).
- Chardonnens, L. S., 'A New Edition of the Old English "Formation of the Foetus"', *N&Q* 47 (2000), 10–11.
- Chardonnens, L. S., *Anglo-Saxon Prognostics, 900–1100* (Leiden, 2007).
- Chardonnens, L. S., 'Context, Language, Date and Origin of Anglo-Saxon Prognostics', in *Foundations of Learning: The Transfer of Encyclopaedic Knowledge in the Early Middle Ages*, ed. R. H. J. Bremmer and K. Dekker, Storehouses of Wholesome Learning 1 (Paris, 2007), 317–40.
- Cilliers, L., 'Vindicianus Gynaecia: Text and Translation of the Codex Monacensis (Clm 4622)', *Journal of Medieval Latin* 15 (2005), 153–236.
- Clemons, P., ed., *Ælfric's Catholic Homilies: The First Series Text*, EETS SS 17 (Oxford, 1997).
- Cockayne, T. O., ed., *Leechdoms, Wortcunning, and Starcraft of Early England. Being a Collection of Documents, for the Most Part Never Before Printed, Illustrating the History of Science in this Country Before the Norman Conquest*, RS 35 (London, 1864–6).
- Colgrave, B. and R. A. B. Mynors, eds. *Bede's Ecclesiastical History of the English People*, (Oxford, 1969).
- Cornelius, R., ed., *Die altenglische Interlinearversion zu "De vitiis et peccatis" in der Hs. British Library, Royal 7 C. IV* (Frankfurt am Main, 1995).
- Corsetti, P.-P., K.-D. Fischer and G. Sabbah, ed., *Bibliographie des textes médicaux latins: Antiquité et haut moyen âge* (Saint-Étienne, 1987).
- Cross, J. E., 'De ordine creaturarum liber in Old English Prose', *Anglia* 90 (1972), 132–40.
- Daremberg, C., 'Liber Aurelius', *Janus* 2 (1847), 468–99, 690–731.
- Deegan, M., 'A Critical Edition of MS B.L. Royal 12. D. XVII Bald's Leechbook' (University of Manchester, 1988).

- Dekker, K., 'Anglo-Saxon Encyclopaedic Notes: Tradition and Function' in *Foundations of Learning: The Transfer of Encyclopaedic Knowledge in the Early Middle Ages*, ed. R. H. J. Bremmer and K. Dekker, Mediaevalie Groningana New Series 9 (Paris, 2007), 279–315.
- Demaitre, L., *Leprosy in Premodern Medicine: A Malady of the Whole Body*, (Baltimore, 2007).
- Díaz y Díaz., M. C., ed., *Liber de ordine creaturarum : Un anónimo irlandés del siglo VII*, Monografías de la Universidad de Santiago de Compostela 10 (Santiago de Compostela, 1972).
- 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)
- Dictionary of Old English Web Corpus*, ed. A. Di Paulo Healey, J. P. Wilkin and Xin Xiang, <http://tapor.library.utoronto.ca/doecorpus/> (viewed 12 September, 2017)
- Dobbie, E. V. K. ed., *The Anglo-Saxon Minor Poems*, ASPR 6 (London, 1942).
- Doyle, C., 'Dweorg in Old English: Aspects of Disease Terminology,' *Quaestio Insularis* 9 (2009), 99–117.
- Drabkin, I. E., ed., *Caelii Aureliani Methodici Siccensis celerum vel acutarum passionum*, (Chicago, 1950).
- Drabkin, I. E. and M. Drabkin, eds. *Caelius Aurelianus, Gynaecia: fragments of a Latin version of Soranus' Gynaecia from a thirteenth century manuscript*, Supplements to the Bulletin of the History of Medicine 13 (Baltimore, 1951).
- Fausser, A., 'Ein Dillinger Fragment einer therapeutischen Schrift aus einer Unixialhandschrift des 8. Jahrhunderts', *Archiv für Geschichte der Medizin* 10 (1956), 243–50.
- Fehr, B., ed., *Die Hirtenbriefe Ælfrics in Altenglischer und Lateinischer Fassung*, BDASP 9, 146–227.
- Fell, C., 'Old English *Beor*,' *Leeds Studies in English* 8 (1975), 76–95.
- Fischer, K.-D., 'Beiträge zu den Pseudosoranischen Quaestiones medicinales' in *Text and Tradition: Studies in Ancient Medicine and its Transmission*, ed. K.-D. Fischer, D. Nickel and P. Potter, *Studies in Ancient Medicine* 18 (Leiden, 1998), 1–54.
- Fischer, K.-D., 'Dr Monk's Medical Digest', *Social History of Medicine* 13 (2000), 139–251.
- Fischer, K.-D., 'Der Pseudogalenische "Liber tertius"' in *Galenismo e Medicina Tardoantica Fonte Greche, Latine e Arabe Atti del Seminario Internazionale di Siena*, ed. I. Garofalo and A. Roselli, *Annali Dell'istituto Universitario Orientale di Napoli* 7 (Naples, 2003), 101–32.

- Fischer, K.-D., 'Galenī qui fertur ad Glauconem liber tertius ad fidem codicis Vindocinensis 109', in *Galenismo e Medicina Tardoantica Fonti Greche, Latine e Arabe Atti del Seminario Internazionale di Siena*, ed. I. Garofalo and A. Roselli, Annali Dell'istituto Universitario Orientale di Napoli 7 (Naples, 2003), 283–346.
- Förster, M., 'A New Version of the Apocalypse of Thomas in Old English', *Anglia* 73 (1955), 6–36.
- Fowler, R., 'A Late Old English Handbook for the Use of a Confessor', *Anglia* 83 (1965), 1–34.
- Fradin, F., ed. *Practica Alexandri yatroꝝ greci cum expositione glose interlinearis Jacobi de partibus et Januensis in margine posite* (Lyons, 1504).
- Franzen, C., *The Tremulous Hand of Worcester: A Study of Old English in the Thirteenth Century*, (Oxford, 1991).
- Getty, S. S., 'An Edition with Commentary of the Latin/Anglo-Saxon Liber scintillarum' (Unpubl. PhD dissertation, Univ. of Pennsylvania, 1969).
- Glaze, F. E., 'The Perforated Wall: The Ownership and Circulation of Medical Books in Europe c. 800–1200' (Unpubl PhD dissertation, Duke Univ., 2000).
- Glaze, F. E., 'Galen Refashioned: Gariopontus in the Later Middle Ages and Renaissance', in *Textual Healing: Essays on Medieval and Early Modern Medicine*, ed. E. L. Furdell, Studies in Medieval and Reformation Traditions: History, Culture, Religion, Ideas 110 (Leiden, 2005), pp. 53–75.
- Glaze, F. E., 'Gariopontus and the Salernitans: Textual Traditions in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries', in *La Collectio Salernitana di Salvatore De Renzi*, ed. D. Jacquart and P. Bagliani, Edizione Nazionale La Scuola Medica Salernitana 3 (2008), 149–90.
- Gneuss, H., 'Anglicae linguae interpretatio: Language Contact, Lexical Borrowing and Glossing in Anglo-Saxon England', *Proceedings of the British Academy* 82 (1992), 107–48.
- Gneuss, H., *Handlist of Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts: A List of Manuscripts and Manuscript Fragments Written or Owned in England up to 1100*, Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies 241 (Tempe, Ariz., 2001).
- Godden, M., ed., *Ælfric's Catholic Homilies: The Second Series Text*, EETS SS 5 (Oxford, 1979).
- Godden, M., ed., *Ælfric's Catholic Homilies: Introduction, Commentary and Glossary* EETS SS 18 (Oxford, 2000).
- Godden, M., and S. Irvine, eds. *The Old English Boethius: an Edition of the Old English Versions of Boethius's De consolazione philosophiae*, 2 vols. (Oxford, 2009).

- Gonser, P., ed. *Das angelsächsische Prosa-Leben des heiligen Guthlac*, Anglistische Forschungen 27 (Heidelberg, 1909).
- Goosens, L., ed., *The old English glosses of ms. Brussels, Royal Library, 1650 (Aldhelm's De laudibus virginitatis)*, Verhandelingen van de Koninklijke Academie voor Wetenschappen, Letteren en Schone Kunsten van België, Klasse der Letteren 74 (Brussels, 1974).
- Grattan, J. H. G. and C. Singer, eds., *Anglo-Saxon Magic and Medicine Illustrated specially from the Semi-Pagan Text 'Lacnunga'* (Oxford, 1952).
- Gretsch, M., *The Intellectual Foundations of the English Benedictine Reform*, CSASE 25 (Cambridge, 1999).
- Haddan, A. W. and W. Stubbs, ed., 'Poenitentiale Theodori', in *Councils and Ecclesiastical Documents relating to Great Britain and Ireland* (Oxford, 1871), pp. 173–203.
- Hall, A., 'Calling the Shots: The Old English Remedy *gif hors ofscoten sie* and Anglo-Saxon "Elf Shot"', *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen: Bulletin of the Modern Language Society* 106 (2005), 195–209.
- Hall, A., *Elves in Anglo-Saxon England: Matters of Belief, Helath, Gender and Identity*, Anglo-Saxon Studies 8 (Woodbridge, 2007).
- Harrison, F., A. E. L. Roberts, R. Gabriliska, K. P. Rumbaugh, C. Lee and S.P. Diggle. 'A 1,000-year-old Antimicrobial Remedy with Antistaphylococcal Activity,' *mBio* 6(4) (2015), <http://mbio.asm.org/content/6/4/e01129-15>. (Viewed 14 Jan. 2017)
- Harsley, F., ed., *Eadwine's Canterbury Psalter*, EETS OS 26 (London, 1889).
- Hecht, H., *Bischof Wærferths von Worcester Übersetzung der Dialoge Gregors des groÿens*, BDASP 5 (Darmstadt, 1900–7).
- Heine, B., and T. Kuteva, 'On Contact-induced Grammaticalization', *Studies in Language* 27 (2003), 529–72.
- Heller, K., 'Der Wortschatz unter dem Aspekt des Fachwortes: Versuch einer Systematik' in *Fachsprach*, ed. W. von Hahn, (Darmstadt, 1981), pp. 218–38.
- Henel, H., ed., *Ælfric's De temporibus anni*, EETS OS 213 (London, 1942).
- Hessels, J. H., ed. *An Eighth-Century Latin-Anglo-Saxon Glossary*, (Cambridge, 1890).
- Hogg, R. M., 'Old English r-Metathesis and Generative Phonology', *Journal of Linguistics* 13 (1977), 165–75.

- Holthausen, F., 'Altenglische Interlinearversionen lateinischer Gebete und Beichten', *Anglia* 65 (1941), 230–54.
- Horden, P., 'What's Wrong with Early Medieval Medicine?', *SHM* 24 (2011), 5–25.
- Howald, E. and H. E. Sigerist, ed., *Antonii Musae De herba uettonica liber. PseudoApulei Herbarius. Anonymi De taxone liber. Sexti Placiti Liber medicinae ex animalibus*, CML 4 (Leipzig, 1927).
- Irvine, S., ed., *Old English Homilies from MS Bodley 343*, EETS OS 302 (Oxford, 1993).
- Jones, C. W., ed. *Bedae opera didascalica*, CCSL 123 (Turnholt, 1975–80).
- Jost, K., ed., *Die "Institutes of Polity, Civil and Ecclesiastical"*, Schweizer anglistische Arbeiten 47 (Bern, 1959).
- Juhani, N., 'Notes on the Study of English Medical Vocabulary from the Historical Point of View', in *Neophilologica Fennica*, ed. L. Kahlas-Tarkka, Mémoires de la Société Néophilologique de Helsinki 45 (Helsinki, 1987), pp. 335–50.
- Kästner, H. F., 'Pseudo-Dioscoridis de herbis femininis', *Hermes* 31 (1896–7), 587–636.
- Ker, N. R., *Catalogue of Manuscripts Containing Anglo-Saxon*, (Oxford, 1957).
- Kimmens, A. C., ed., *The Stowe Psalter*, Toronto Old English Series 3 (Toronto, 1979).
- Kindschi, L., 'The Latin-Old English Glossaries in Plantin–Moretus MS 32 and British Museum MS Additional 32246' (Unpubl. PhD dissertation, Stanford Univ., 1955).
- Kitson, P., 'Two Old English Plant-Names and Related Matters', *ES* 69 (1988), 97–112.
- Kitson, P., 'Topography, Dialect and the Relation of Old English Psalter Glosses', *ES* 84 (2003), 9–32.
- Kotzor, G., ed., *Das altenglische Martyrologium*, Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften Philosophisch-Historische Klasse 88 (Munich, 1981).
- Kuhn, S. M., ed., *The Vespasian Psalter*, (Michigan, 1965).
- Kuypers, A. B., ed., *The Prayer Book of Aedelwald the Bishop, Commonly Called the Book of Cerne*, (Cambridge, 1902).
- Lambert, C., 'The Old English Medical Vocabulary', *Proceedings of the Royal Society of Medicine* 33 (1940), 137–45.

- Langefeld, B., ed., *The Old English Version of the Enlarged Rule of Chrodegang*, Münchener Universitätsschriften Texte und Untersuchungen zur Englischen Philologie 26 (Frankfurt am Main, 2003).
- Langslow, D. R., *Medical Latin in the Roman Empire*, (Oxford, 2000).
- Langslow, D. R., *The Latin Alexander: The Text and Transmission of a Late Latin Medical Book*, Journal of Roman Studies Monograph 10 (London, 2006).
- Lapidge, M., 'The Hermeneutic Style in Tenth-Century Anglo-Latin Literature', *ASE* 4 (1975), 67–111.
- Lazius, W., ed., *Abdiae episcopi Babyloniae Historia certaminis apostolorum* (Basel, 1560).
- Lee, C., 'Changing Faces: Leprosy in Anglo-Saxon England' in *Conversion and Colonization in Anglo-Saxon England*, ed. C. E. Karkov and N. Howe, (Tempe, AZ, 2006), pp. 59–81.
- Leonhardi, G., *Kleinere angelsächsische Denkmäler*, BDASP 6 (Kassel, 1905).
- Lieberman, A., 'Gothic þrutsfill, Old English þrustfell 'Leprosy,' and the Names of some other Skin Diseases in Germanic' in *Germanisches Altertum und christliches Mittelalter: Festschrift für Heinz Klingenberg zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. B. Brogyanyi and T. Krömmelbein, Schriften zur Mediävistik 1 (Hamburg, 2006), 197–211.
- Liddle, H. G., R. Scott and H. S. Jones, ed., *A Greek-English Lexicon*, 8th edition (Oxford, 1940).
- Lindelöf, U., ed., *Der Lambeth-Psalter*, Acta societatis scientiarum Fennicae 35.i and 43.iii (Helsinki, 1909).
- Lindelöf, U., 'Die altenglischen Glossen im Bosworth-Psalter', *Mémoires de la société neophilologique de Helsingfors* 5 (1909), 137–230.
- Lindsay, W. M., ed., *Isidori Hispalensis Episcopi Etymologiarum sive Originum Libri XX*, Scriptorum Classicorum Bibliotheca Oxoniensis (Oxford, 1911).
- Loveday, L. J., *Language Contact in Japan: A Sociolinguistic History*, (Oxford, 1996).
- Löweneck, M., ed. *Peri Didaxeon: Eine Sammlung von Rezepten in Englischer Sprache aus dem 11./12. Jahrhundert. Nach einer Handschrift des Britischen Museums*, Erlanger Beiträge zur Englischen Philologie und Vergleichenden Literaturgeschichte (Erlanger, 1896).
- Maion, D., 'Edizione, traduzione e commento del Peri Didaxeon: Cultura e tradizioni letterarie del mondo germanico antico e medievale' (Unpubl. PhD dissertation, Università degli Studi Roma Tre, 1999).

- Maion, D., 'The Fortune of the So-Called *Practica Petrocelli Salernitani* in England: New Evidence and some Considerations' in *Form and Content of Instruction in Anglo-Saxon England in the Light of Contemporary Manuscript Evidence*, ed. P. Lendinara, L. Lazzari and M. A. D'Aronco, (Turnhout, 2007), pp. 495–512.
- Manitius, M., 'Angelsächsische Glossen in Dresdner Handschriften', *Anglia* 24 (1901), 428–35.
- Marx, F., ed., *Auli Cornelii Celsi quae supersunt*, CML 1 (Leipzig, 1915).
- McIlwain, J. T., 'Brain and Mind in Anglo-Saxon Medicine', *Viator* 37 (2006), 103–12.
- McIlwain, J. T., 'Theory and Practice in the Anglo-Saxon Leechbooks: the Case of Paralysis', *Viator* 39 (2008), 65–73.
- Meaney, A. L., 'The Anglo-Saxon View of the Causes of Disease' in *Health, Disease and Healing in Medieval Culture*, ed. S. Campbell, B. Hall and D. Klausner, (Houndsmills, 1992), pp. 12–33.
- Meaney, A. L., 'Variant Versions of Old English Medical Remedies and the Compilation of Bald's Leechbook', *ASE* 13 (1984), 235–64.
- Meehan, D., ed., *Adamnan's De locis sanctis*, *Scriptores Latini Hiberniae* 3 (Dublin, 1958).
- Meritt, H. D., *Old English Glosses: A Collection*, MLA General Series 16 (New York, 1945).
- Migne, J.-P., ed., *Alcuini De uirtutibus et uitis*, PL 101 (Paris, 1815–75).
- Migne, J.-P., ed., *Homiliary of Paul the Deacon*, PL 95 (Paris, 1815–75).
- Migne, J.-P., ed., *Sermones*, PL 38 (Paris, 1815–75).
- Milfull, I. B., ed., *The Hymns of the Anglo-Saxon Church: A Study and Edition of the Durham Hymnal*, CSASE 17 (Cambridge, 1996).
- Miller, T., ed., *The Old English version of Bede's Ecclesiastical History of the English People*, EETS OS 95, 96, 110, 111 (Oxford, 1890–8).
- Mombritius, B., *Sanctuarium seu vitae sanctorum*, (Paris, 1910).
- Mone, F. J., ed., 'Poenitentiale Theodori and Capitula d'Acheriana' in *Quellen und Forschungen zur Geschichte der deutschen Literatur und Sprache* (Aachen, 1830), pp. 515–27.
- Moorat S. A. J., *Catalogue of Western Manuscripts on Medicine and Science in the Wellcome Historical Medical Library* (London, 1962–73).
- Morin, G., ed., *Caesarii Arelatensis opera*, CCSL 103 (Turnholt, 1953).
- Morris, R., ed., *Legends of the Holy Rood*, EETS OS 46 (London, 1871).



- Morris, R., ed., *Old English Homilies, First Series*, EETS OS 29, 34 (Oxford, 1868).
- Morris, R., ed., *The Blickling Homilies*, EETS OS 58, 63, 73 (London, 1874–80).
- Napier, A., ‘Altenglische Miscellen’, *Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen* 84 (1890), 323–7.
- Niedermann, M., and E., Liechtenhan, ed. *Marcelli De medicamentis liber*, CML 5 (Berlin, 1968).
- Nokes, R. S., ‘The Several Compilers of Bald’s Leechbook’, *ASE* 33 (2005), 51–76.
- Norman, H. W., *The Anglo-Saxon Version of the Hexameron of St. Basil and the Anglo-Saxon Remains of St. Basil's Admonitio ad filium spiritualem* (London, 1848).
- Nutton, V., ‘The Rise of Medicine’ in *The Cambridge Illustrated History of Medicine*, ed. R. Porter, (Cambridge, 1996), pp. 52–81.
- Oess, G., ed., *Der altenglische Arundel-Psalter: eine Interlinearversion in der Handschrift Arundel 60 des Britischen Museums*, Altistische Forschungen 30 (Heidelberg, 1910).
- Oliphant, R. T., ed., *The Harley Latin-Old English Glossary*, Janua linguarum, series practica 20 (1966).
- Önnerfors, A., ed., *Plinii Secundi Iunioris qui feruntur de medicina libri tres*, CML 3 (Berlin, 1964).
- Önnerfors, A., ed., *Physica Plinii Bambergensis*, Bibliotheca Graeca et Latina suppletoria curantibus 2 (Hildesheim, 1975).
- Orchard, A., ed., ‘The Letter of Alexander to Aristotle’ in *Pride and Prodigies: Studies in the Monsters of the Beowulf-Manuscript*, ed. A. Orchard (Toronto, 1995), pp. 204–23.
- Oroz Reta, J. and M. A. Marcos Casquero, eds. *Etymologías: edition bilingüe San Isidoro de Sevilla*, Biblioteca de autores cristianos (Madrid, 1994).
- Palmieri, N., ed. *L’antica versione latina del ‘De Sectis’ di Galeno* (Pal. lat. 1090), Testi e studi di cultura classica proposita da Giorgio Brugnoli e Guido Paduano 7 (Pisa, 1989).
- Payne, J. F., *English Medicine in the Anglo-Saxon Times: Two Lectures delivered before the Royal College of Physicians of London, June 23 and 25 1903*, (Oxford, 1904).
- Pettit, E., ed., *Anglo-Saxon Remedies, Charms and Prayers from BL MS Harley 585: the Lacnunga*, Mellen Critical Editions and Translations 6, 2 vols. (Lewiston NY, 2001).
- Pogatscher, A., *Zur Lautlehre der griechischen, lateinischen und romanischen Lehnworte im Altenglischen*, (Strassburg, 1888).

- Puschmann, T., ed., *Nachträge zu Alexander Trallianus: Fragmente aus Philumenus und Philagrius etc.*, Berliner Studien 5 (Berlin, 1886).
- Putnam, H., 'The Meaning of "Meaning"' in *Language, Mind and Knowledge*, ed. K. Gunderson, Studies in the Philosophy of Science (Minnesota, 1975).
- Quinn, J. J., 'The Minor Latin-Old English Glosses in MS. Cotton Cleopatra A.III' (Unpubl. PhD Dissertation, Stanford Univ., 1956).
- De Renzi, S., G. E. T. Henschel and C. Daremberg, eds., *Collectio Salernitana ossia documenti inediti e trattati di medicina appartenenti alla scuola medica salernitana, raccolti ed illustrati da G. E. T. Henschel, C. Daremberg e S. de Renzi*, Biblioteca di storia della medicina 2 (Naples, 1852–1859).
- Rhodes, E. W., ed., *Defensoris Liber scintillarum*, EETS OS 93 (London, 1889).
- Rissanen, M., 'Latin Influence on an Old English Idiom' in *Inside Old English: Essays in Honour of Bruce Mitchell*, ed. J. Walmsley (Oxford, 2006), pp. 222–41.
- Roeder, F., ed., *Der altenglische Regius-Psalter*, Studien zur englischen Philologie 18 (Halle, 1904).
- Rommel, F., ed., *Règle Pastorale*, Sources Chrétiennes 381 (Paris, 1992).
- Rose, V., ed., *Anecdota Graeca et Graeco-Latina*, 2 vols. (Berlin, 1864–70).
- Rose, V., ed., *Cassii Felicis De medicina : ex graecis logicae sectae auctoribus liber, translatus sub Artabure et Calepio consulibus (anno 447) / nunc primum editus a Valentino Rose*, Bibliotheca scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana (Leipzig, 1879).
- Rose, V., ed., *Theodori Prisciani Euporiston libri III cum Physicorum fragmento et additamentis Pseudo-Theodoris, accedunt Vindicani Afri quae feruntur reliquiae*, (Leipzig, 1894).
- Rosier, J. L., ed., *The Vitellius Psalter*, Cornell Studies in English 42 (Ithaca, NY, 1962).
- Rubin, S., *Medieval English Medicine*, (Newton Abbot, 1974).
- Rumble, A. R., 'The Known Manuscripts of the Burghal Hidage' in *The Defence of Wessex*, ed. D. Hill and A. R. Rumble, (Manchester, 1996), pp. 59–68.
- de Saussure, F., *Course in General Linguistics*, trans. W. Baskin (London, 1974).
- Sauer, H., ed., *Theodulfi Capitula in England: Die antenglischen Übersetzungen, zusammen mit dem lateinischen Text*, Münchener Universitäts-schriften Institut für Englische Philologie 8 (Verlag, 1978).

- Sauer, H., 'Towards a Linguistic Description and Classification of Old English Plant Names' in *Words, Texts and Manuscripts: Studies in Anglo-Saxon Culture Presented to Helmut Gneuss on the Occasion of his Sixty-Fifth Birthday*, ed. M. Korhammer, K. Reichl and H. Sauer, (New York, 1992), pp. 381–408.
- Schauman, B. and A. Cameron, 'A Newly-Found Leaf of Old English from Louvain', *Anglia* 95 (1977), 289–312.
- Schlutter, O. B., 'Anglo-Saxonica', *Anglia* 32 (1909), 503–15.
- Schmid, P., *Contributions à la critique du texte de Caelius Aurelianus*, (Neuchatel, 1942).
- Schmitz, G., ed. *Physicae quae fertur Plinii Florentino-Pragensis liber tertius*, Lateinische Sprache und Literatur de Mittelalters 24 (Frankfurt am Main, 1988).
- Schröer, M. M. A., ed., *Die angelsächsischen Prosabearbeitungen der Benediktinerregel*, BDASP 2 (Kassel, 1885–8).
- Scragg, D., ed., *The Vercelli Homilies and Related Texts*, EETS OS 300 (Oxford, 1992).
- Sedgefield, W. J., ed., *King Alfred's Old English Version of Boethius' De consolazione Philosophiae* (Oxford, 1899).
- Scientific and Medical Writings in Old and Middle English: An Electronic Reference*, ed. L. Voigts and P. D. Kurtz, <http://cctr1.umkc.edu/cgi-bin/search>. (viewed 15 December, 2010).
- Sharpe, W. D., ed., *Isidore of Seville, the Medical Writings: an English Translation*, Transactions of the American Philosophical Society: New Series LIV.2 (Philadelphia, 1964).
- Sigerist, H., 'Early Mediaeval Medical Texts in Manuscripts of Montpellier', *Bulletin of the History of Medicine* 10 (1941), 24–47.
- Sisam, C. and K. Sisam, eds., *The Salisbury Psalter*, EETS 242 (London, 1959).
- Skeat, W. W., ed., *The Four Gospels in Anglo-Saxon, Northumbrian, and Old Mercian Versions* (Cambridge, 1871–87).
- Skeat, W. W., ed., *Ælfric's Lives of Saints*, EETS 76, 82, 94, 114 (London, 1881).
- Spencer, W. G., ed., *Celsus, De medicina*, (London, 1938).
- Spindler, R., ed., *Das Altenglische Bussbuch*, (Leipzig, 1934).
- Stanley, E. G., *The Search for Anglo-Saxon Paganism*, (Cambridge, 1964).

- Stryker, W. G., 'The Latin-Old English Glossary in MS. Cotton Gleopatra A.III' (Unpubl. PhD Dissertation, Stanford Univ., 1951).
- Stuart, H., 'Some Old English Medical Terms', *Parergon* 13 (1975), 21–35.
- Sweet, H., ed. *King Alfred's West-Saxon Version of Gregory's Pastoral Care*, EETS OS 45, 50 (London, 1871).
- Sweet, H., ed., *King Alfred's Orosius*, EETS OS 79 (London, 1883).
- Talbot, C., 'Some Notes on Anglo-Saxon Medicine', *Medical History* 9 (1965), 156–69.
- A Thesaurus of Old English*, ed. Roberts, J. and C. Kay with L. Grundy, 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition, <http://libra.englant.arts.gla.ac.uk/oethesaurus> (viewed 19 August, 2009)
- Thomason, S., *Language Contact* (Edinburgh, 2001).
- Timofeeva, O., 'Anglo-Latin Bilingualism before 1066' in *Interfaces Between Language and Culture in Medieval England: A Festschrift for Matti Kilpiö*, ed. A. Hall, O. Timofeeva, Á. Kirisci and B. Fox, *The Northern World* 48 (Leiden, 2010), 1–36.
- Timofeeva, O., *Non-Finite Constructions in Old English with Special Reference to Syntactic Borrowing from Latin*, Mémoires de la Société Neophilologique de Helsinki 80 (Helsinki, 2010).
- Toller, T. N., ed., *An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary Based on the Manuscript Collections of the Late Joseph Bosworth: Supplement* (Oxford 1921).
- Ullmann, S., *The Principles of Semantics*, (Glasgow, 1957).
- Vásquez Bújan, M. E., 'Vindiciano y el tratado De natura generis humani', *Dynamis* 2 (1982), 25–56.
- De Vogüé, A., ed., *Grégoire le Grand Dialogues*, 3 vols., Sources Chrétiennes 251, 260, 265 (Paris, 1978–80).
- Voigts, L. E., 'A New Look at a MS of the Old English Translation of the Herbarium Apuleii', *Manuscripta* 19 (1975), 84–5.
- Voigts, L. E., 'British Library, Cotton Vitellius C. III, f. 82', *OEN* 12 (1978), 12–13.
- Voigts, L. E., 'The Significance of the name Apuleius to the Herbarium Apulei', *Bulletin of the History of Medicine* 52 (1978), 214–27.
- Voigts, L. E., 'Anglo-Saxon Plant Remedies and the Anglo-Saxons', *Isis* 70 (1979), 250–268.

- Voigts, L. E., 'Catalogue of Incipits of Scientific and Medical Writings in Old and Middle English', *Manuscripta* 34 (1990), 212–13.
- Vollmer, F., ed., *Quinti Serini Liber medicinalis*, CML 2 (Leipzig, 1916).
- De Vriend, H. J., *The Old English Herbarium and Medicina de Quadrupedibus*, EETS OS 286 (London, 1984).
- Wachtmeister, W., ed., *Physica Plinii quae fertur Florentino-Pragensis liber secundus*, Lateinische Sprache und Literatur de Mittelalters 21 (Frankfurt am Main, 1985).
- Wallis, F., 'Medicine in Medieval Calendar Manuscripts' in *Manuscript Sources of Medieval Medicine: A Book of Essays*, ed. M. R. Schleissner (New York, 1995), pp. 105–44.
- Walter, G., 'Zu Pseudo-Sorans Quaestiones: Ein griechisch-lateinisches Glossar in Versform. Codex Leninopolitanus Lat. F. v. VI. fol. 39r', *Archiv für Geschichte der Medizin* 28 (1935), 267–78.
- Wanley, H., 'Librorum veterum septentrionalium catalogus' in *Linguarum veterum septentrionalium thesaurus grammatico-criticus et archæologicus*, ed. G. Hickes, (Oxford, 1703–5).
- Wellcome Library Online Catalogue of Manuscripts*, ed. J. Simpson, <http://archives.wellcome.ac.uk> (viewed 30 April, 2010)
- Wildhagen, K., ed., *Der Cambridger Psalter*, BDASP 7 (Hamburg, 1910).
- Winkler, J., ed., *Physicae que fertur Plinii Florentino-Pragensis liber primus*, Lateinische Sprache und Literatur des Mittelalters 17 (Frankfurt, 1984).
- Wormald, P., 'BL, Cotton Ms Otho B.xi: A Supplementary Note' in *Legal Culture in the Early Medieval West*, (London, 1999), pp. 71–80.
- Wright, C. E., ed., *Bald's Leechbook: British Museum Royal Manuscript 12. D. XVII, with appendix by R. Quirk*, EEMF 5 (Copenhagen, 1955).
- Wright, T., and R. P. Wücker, ed., *Anglo-Saxon and Old English Vocabularies*, (London, 1884).
- Zotter, H., ed., *Antike Medizin*, (Vienna, 1980).
- Zupitza, J., ed., *Ælfrics Grammatik und Glossar*, Sammlung englischer Denkmäler 1 (Berlin, 1880).