




Zofia Rzeźnicka (Łódź)

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8566-4946>

## HARE IN SAUCE ACCORDING TO ANTHIMUS' RECIPE: MEAT\*

**Abstract.** The present article examines the beginning of the recipe for hare meat (*leporis vero si novellae* [...]) preserved in Chapter 13 of the dietetic treatise *De observatione ciborum* written in the first half of the 6<sup>th</sup> cent. by the Byzantine physician Anthimus.

In the initial part of the study, the author briefly discusses key events in the doctor's life, explaining the circumstances which brought him to the royal court of the Frankish ruler, Theuderic. Next, the author analyses Anthimus' competence in the field of dietetics and proves that he composed his treatise in line with ancient and Byzantine *materia medica*.

The key part of the article scrutinises the most popular methods of preparing hare meat according to ancient gastronomic literature (*Ἡδονάθεια* by Archestratus of Gela, *De re coquinaria*) and compares them with Anthimus' recommendations. This allows the author to reconstruct the culinary techniques that Anthimus most probably proposed be applied in the preparation of hare meat.

The author concludes that Anthimus' treatise is a clear example of the practical application of both dietetics and *materia medica* in culinary practices performed in the physician's lifetime.

**Keywords:** history of medical literature, history of gastronomic literature, history of medicine, history of dietetics, food history, Anthimus, melancholic meat, hare meat

---

\* The present study is an extended, English, version of the article „*Leporis vero si novellae...*”, czyli o powiązaniu medycyny i sztuki kulinarnej w *De observatione ciborum Antimusa* published in VP 81, 2022, p. 91–110. It was written thanks to a scholarship granted to the author by The De Brzezie Lanckoronki Foundation in 2018.

Little is known about Anthimus' life<sup>1</sup>. We do learn that he was a physician<sup>2</sup> from the account by Malchus of Philadelphia (5<sup>th</sup>/6<sup>th</sup> cent. AD)<sup>3</sup>, despite Anthimus not mentioning his medical profession in the introduction to *De observatione ciborum*. Instead, he describes himself as *vir inlustris, comes et legatarius ad gloriosissimum Theudoricum regem Francorum*<sup>4</sup>, i.e., an illustrious man, a holder of high office in the royal court, and an emissary to his highness Theuderic, king of the Franks. Linguistic analysis of the treatise indicates that it was not written by a native speaker of Latin<sup>5</sup>, and such phrases as *afratus Graece quod Latine dicitur spumeo*<sup>6</sup>; *oxygala vero Graece, quod Latine vocant melca*<sup>7</sup> show that Anthimus knew Greek. Indeed, by writing: *nos Graeci dicimus*<sup>8</sup>, he clearly reveals that it was his mother tongue<sup>9</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> On Anthimus and his treatise, for instance, cf. G. BAADER, *Early Medieval Latin Adaptations of Byzantine Medicine in Western Europe*, DOP 38, 1984, p. 251–252; C. DEROUX, *Anthime, un médecin gourmet du début des temps mérovingiens*, RBPH 80.4, 2002, p. 1107–1124; B. EFFROS, *Creating Community with Food and Drink in Merovingian Gaul*, New York–Houndmills, Basingstoke 2002, p. 63–64; E. KISLINGER, *Anthimus*, [in:] *Antike Medizin. Ein Lexikon*, ed. K.-H. LEVEN, München 2005, col. 56; J. SCARBOROUGH, *Anthimus (of Constantinople?) (ca 475–525 CE)*, [in:] *The Encyclopedia of Ancient Natural Scientists. The Greek Tradition and its Many Heirs*, ed. P.T. KEYSER, G. IRBY-MASSIE, London–New York 2008, p. 91–92; M. KOKOSZKO, *Anthimus and his Work, or On Aromatics and Wildfowl in De observatione ciborum*, SPP 31.2, 2021, p. 59–62; IDEM, *Anthimus the Dietician*, AlmH 23.1, 2021, p. 12–15; IDEM, *On Anthimus and his Work*, VP 81, 2022, p. 65–89.

<sup>2</sup> MALCHUS OF PHILADELPHIA, *Exc. de Leg. Gent.*, 15, 33, [in:] *The Fragmentary Classicising Historians of the Later Roman Empire: Eunapius, Olympiodorus, Priscus and Malchus. Text, Translation, and Historiographical Notes*, vol. II, ed., trans. R.C. BLOCKLEY, Liverpool 1983 (cetera: MALCHUS PHILADELPHIENSIS, *Exc. de Leg. Gent.*), p. 422.

<sup>3</sup> On the historian, see: B. BALDWIN, *Malchus of Philadelphia*, DOP 31, 1977, p. 91–107.

<sup>4</sup> *Anthimi De observatione ciborum ad Theodoricum regem Francorum epistula*, proemium (CML VIII 1: 1, 2–3), ed., trans. E. LIECHTENHAN, Berlin 1963 [= CMLat, 8.1] (cetera: ANTHIMUS, *De observatione ciborum*). In the present study I will refer to the text of *De observatione ciborum* in Eduard Liechtenhan's edition. In case of using other editions, the editor's name will be given.

<sup>5</sup> We do not know when and where Anthimus learned Latin. Valentine ROSE (*Die Diätetik des Anthimus an Theuderic König der Franken*, [in:] *Anecdota graeca et graecolatina. Mitteilungen aus Handschriften zur Geschichte der griechischen Wissenschaft*, vol. II, ed. IDEM, Berlin 1870, p. 46–48) suggested that he acquired the language during his exile in northern Italy. The hypothesis was later (at least partly) doubted by LIECHTENHAN (*Ad lectorem praefatio*, [in:] *Anthimi de observatione ciborum...*, p. X, note 2). Cf. C. DEROUX, *Anthime et les tourterelles: un cas d'intoxication alimentaire au très haut moyen âge*, [in:] *Maladie et maladies dans les textes latins antiques et médiévaux. Actes du V<sup>e</sup> Colloque international «Textes médicaux latins» (Bruxelles, 4–6 septembre 1995)*, ed. IDEM, Bruxelles 1998, p. 372; B. EFFROS, *Creating Community with Food and Drink in Merovingian Gaul*, New York–Basingstoke 2002 [= NMA], p. 64; A. DALBY, *Food in the Ancient World from A to Z*, London–New York 2003, p. 12; J.N. ADAMS, *Bilingualism and the Latin Language*, Cambridge 2004, p. 448–449; M. GRANT, *Introduction*, [in:] ANTHIMUS, *On the Observance of Foods. De observatione ciborum*, ed., trans. IDEM, Blackawton–Totnes 2007, p. 16.

<sup>6</sup> ANTHIMUS, *De observatione ciborum*, 34 (CML VIII 1: 16, 3).

<sup>7</sup> ANTHIMUS, *De observatione ciborum*, 78 (CML VIII 1: 29, 4).

<sup>8</sup> ANTHIMUS, *De observatione ciborum*, 64 (CML VIII 1: 24, 1).

<sup>9</sup> Cf. J.N. ADAMS, *Bilingualism...*, p. 448–449, 496.

The circumstances that brought the physician to the west of Europe have long been a subject of historical research. He is said to have been one of the plotters against Byzantine emperor Zeno, which led to his banishment from Constantinople. This event took place in 478, when Zeno was conducting negotiations to improve the then tense diplomatic relations between Byzantium and Ostrogoth tribes. Malchus of Philadelphia writes about intercepted letters informing the Ostrogoth leader, Theodoric, about the situation in Constantinople. The historian states that these letters were signed by the physician Anthimus, by Marcellinus and Stephanus. Moreover, from the same passage we learn that these men passed themselves off as high-rank public officials, wishing to assure the Ostrogoth ruler that he could count on allies in the capital. Once the intrigue was uncovered, they were all arrested, questioned, whipped, and forced into exile<sup>10</sup>. Today, researchers believe that Anthimus most likely joined the Ostrogoths<sup>11</sup>, initially becoming a member of Theodoric the Great's entourage, before finding himself at the royal court in Ravenna after 493.

On the basis of the fact that Anthimus only purported to be a public official, we can infer that he probably was not a member of the emperor's entourage and never held any significant post, e.g., he never was a court physician. In all likelihood, he was running a medical practice in Constantinople in 478, the city where he might also have been educated. Since Malchus of Philadelphia precisely identifies his profession, we can assume that he was already a recognised figure at the time of the conspiracy. Although we possess no detailed knowledge of his medical achievements, the subject matter discussed in *De observatione ciborum*, and the manner in which he described the individual foodstuffs<sup>12</sup> leads us to the conclusion that he also took a keen interest in dietetics during his Constantinopolitan years<sup>13</sup>.

<sup>10</sup> MALCHUS PHILADELPHIENSIS, *Exc. de Leg. Gent.*, 15, 30–39, p. 422.

<sup>11</sup> Valentine ROSE (*Die Diätetik...*, p. 49), Mark GRANT (*Introduction...*, p. 16) and Yitzhak HEN (*Food and Drink in Merovingian Gaul*, [in:] *Tätigkeitsfelder und Erfahrungshorizonte des ländlichen Menschen in der frühmittelalterlichen Grundherrschaft (bis ca. 1000)*. *Festschrift für Dieter Hägermann zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. B. KASTEN, München 2006, p. 101) conclude that the physician first joined Theodoric Strabo and, subsequently, after his death, Theodoric Amal.

<sup>12</sup> From the analysed treatise we learn that Anthimus treated foods as ἀπλὰ φάρμακα, which is clearly illustrated, for instance, in the chapters devoted to dried figs (ANTHIMUS, *De observatione ciborum*, 93 [CML VIII 1: 33, 1–3]) and raisins (ANTHIMUS, *De observatione ciborum*, 94 [CML VIII 1: 33, 4–5]), which the author believed to have therapeutic properties in the treatment of early stages of rhinorrhoea, sore throat, and hoarseness. On healing properties of foodstuffs in *De observatione ciborum*, cf. C. DEROUX, *Garlic, Dropsy, and Anthimus's Aquae diuersae (De obseruatione ciborum, LXI)*, [in:] *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History*, vol. V, ed. IDEM, Bruxelles 1989 [= *COLL.*, 206], p. 508–515; IDEM, *Anthime, un médecin...*, p. 1111–1112.

<sup>13</sup> His interest in dietetics is confirmed by, inter alia, a sentence in the introduction to his treatise, in which the author directly links good health to an appropriate diet ([...] *prima sanitas hominum in cibis congruis constat*, cf. ANTHIMUS, *De observatione ciborum*, premium [CML VIII 1: 1, 8–9]). In the same fragment, while describing the consequences of eating inappropriate food, he presents them as an effect of bad digestion and absorption disturbance, and gives examples of the

From the treatise, we might also conclude that the author had spent enough time among the Goths to learn the elementary vocabulary belonging to their *ars coquinaria*<sup>14</sup>. Some modern scholars maintain that Anthimus held high offices in Ravenna<sup>15</sup>, where – as a token of the king's trust – he was sent as an emissary

malfunctioning of the digestive system ([...] *si [cibi] bene adhibiti fuerint, bonam digestionem corporis faciunt; si autem non bene fuerint cocti, gravitatem stomacho et ventri faciunt; etiam et crudus humoris generant et acidivas carbunculus et ructus gravissimus faciunt. Exinde etiam fumus in capite ascendit, unde escotomaticis et caligines graves fieri solent. Etiam et ventris corruptilla ex ipsa indierie fiet, aut certe desursum per ore vomitus fit, quando stomachus cibus crudus conficere non potuerit*, cf. ANTHIMUS, *De observatione ciborum*, proemium [CML VIII 1: 1, 9 – 2, 2]). Additionally, Anthimus justifies his interest in food and its appropriate preparation by showing that its proper processing is a prerequisite for healthy digestion and contributes to the production of good humours ([...] *si autem bene praeparati fuerint cibi, digestio bona et dulcis fiet, et humoris boni nutriuntur*, cf. ANTHIMUS, *De observatione ciborum*, premium [CML VIII 1: 2, 3–4]). On dietetics in Anthimus' treatise, cf. C. DEROUX, *Tradition et innovation dans la Diététique d'Anthime*, [in:] *Tradición e innovación de la medicina latina de la antigüedad y de la alta edad media. Actas del IV Coloquio Internacional sobre los «textos médicos latinos antiguos»*, ed. M.E. VÁZQUEZ BUJÁN, Santiago de Compostela 1994, p. 171–182. On the idea of digestion presented in *De observatione ciborum*, cf. C. DEROUX, *La digestion dans la Diététique d'Anthimus: langage, mythe et réalités*, [in:] *Le latin médical. La constitution d'un langage scientifique. Réalités et langage de la médecine dans le monde romain. Actes du III<sup>e</sup> Colloque international «Textes médicaux latins antiques» (Saint-Étienne, 11–13 septembre 1989)*, ed. G. SABBAH, Saint-Étienne 1991, p. 407–416; IDEM, *Tradition...*, p. 175; IDEM, *Anthime, un médecin...*, p. 1113, 1121. On foodstuffs recommended by Anthimus, cf. J. KODER, *Cuisine and Dining in Byzantium*, [in:] *Byzantine Culture, Papers from the Conference 'Byzantine Days of Istanbul' Held on the Occasion of Istanbul being European Cultural Capital 2010, Istanbul, May 21–23 2010*, ed. D. SAKEL, Ankara 2014, p. 428, 431–432, 434; IDEM, *Die Byzantiner. Kultur und Alltag im Mittelalter*, Wien–Köln–Weimar 2016, p. 213, 216–219, 223–224. On the importance of food in maintaining health and wellbeing, cf. I.M. LONIE, *A Structural Pattern in Greek Dietetics and the Early History of Greek Medicine*, *MHis* 21, 1977, p. 235–260; M. GRANT, *Introduction*, [in:] *DiETING for an Emperor. A Translation of Books 1 and 4 of Oribasius' Medical Compilations*, praef., comm. IDEM, Leiden–New York–Köln 1997 [= SAM, 15], p. 4–9; J. JOUANNA, *Dietetics in Hippocratic Medicine: Definition, Main Problems, Discussion*, [in:] *Greek Medicine from Hippocrates to Galen. Selected Papers by Jacques Jouanna*, trans. N. ALLIES, ed. Ph. VAN DER EIJK, Leiden–Boston 2012 [= SAM, 40], p. 137–153.

<sup>14</sup> Cf. ANTHIMUS, *De observatione ciborum*, 64 (CML VIII 1: 24, 1–2) ([...] *nos Graeci dicimus alfita, Latine vero polenta, Gothi vero barbarice fenea* [...]).

<sup>15</sup> V. ROSE (*Die Diätetik...*, p. 49) maintained that Anthimus was a *comes* and a governor of a province during the reign of Theodoric the Great. He also claimed that Anthimus was court physician to the Goths (*Die Diätetik...*, p. 49–50), and held the position prior to it being taken over by Helpidius (*Praefatio*, [in:] *Anthimi De observatione ciborum epistula ad Theodoricum regem Francorum*, ed. IDEM, Leipzig 1877, p. 3). Both suppositions have been recently called into question by HEN (*Food...*, p. 102–103), who argues that Anthimus was absent from Theodoric's court (cf. note 16). Nevertheless, one should conclude that Rose's theory seems, at least partly, plausible as we know that Helpidius was present at the court of Theodoric from as late as 508 (cf. J.R. MARTINDALE, *The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire*, vol. II, 395–527, Cambridge–London–New York–New Rochelle–Melbourne–Sydney 1980, p. 537). Therefore, we cannot exclude the possibility that Anthimus was the one who was looking after Theodoric's health until then (and perhaps even later, in cooperation with Helpidius).

to the Frankish ruler, Theuderic<sup>16</sup>, to whom he dedicated his work entitled *De observatione ciborum*<sup>17</sup>, in which he refers to the findings of ancient dietetics.

Since the said text was compiled by Anthimus with King Theuderic in mind, we can assume that it discusses not only foods served traditionally to the wealthiest members of the Frankish society (mentioning, on the way, some of the Gothic culinary traditions Anthimus encountered while he sought refuge with the tribe) but first and foremost those dishes of the Mediterranean which were also put on the tables in the author's lifetime<sup>18</sup>. These included dishes made from such rare and expensive ingredients as, for instance, rice<sup>19</sup> and peacock meat<sup>20</sup>. The high prices for the former primarily stemmed from the fact that rice was little known in the region and (as in the case of the whole Mediterranean) had to be imported from remote areas of the Near East and North Africa<sup>21</sup>. As for peacocks, ever since Antiquity they had been exotic birds eagerly bred and kept by eastern rulers in private menageries<sup>22</sup>, which allowed the beauty of their colourful plumage to be enjoyed and to have uninterrupted access to a meat that

---

<sup>16</sup> Hen proposes another course of events. He claims that the physician returned to Constantinople as soon as the political climate in Byzantium improved. Hen believes that this may have happened somewhere in the years 491–497, i.e., between Zeno's death and the Byzantine emperor Anastasius' recognising Theodoric the Great as ruler of Italy. The researcher also argues that Anthimus' stay among the Ostrogoths would have made the physician an ideal candidate for a diplomat secondment to the west of Europe by the Byzantine authorities. Hence, Hen argues that Anthimus may have been a legate to the court of Theuderic not on behalf of the Ostrogoth leader, but the Byzantine emperor himself, cf. Y. HEN, *Food...*, p. 102–103. Hen's supposition has been recently supported by Maciej KOKOSZKO (*Anthimus and his Work*, p. 83–84).

<sup>17</sup> According to Bonnie Effros, Anthimus' treatise was a gift from Theodoric the Great to the Frankish king, cf. B. EFFROS, *Creating...*, p. 65–66. This view is disputed by Hen, who indicates that, inter alia, *De observatione ciborum* supplies no information to support the hypothesis, and states that Anthimus never mentioned Theodoric's name, which would have been desirable from the viewpoint of principles of diplomacy in such circumstances, cf. Y. HEN, *Food...*, p. 102.

<sup>18</sup> Cf. Y. HEN, *Food...*, p. 105–106.

<sup>19</sup> ANTHIMUS, *De observatione ciborum*, 70 (CML VIII 1: 26, 1–6).

<sup>20</sup> ANTHIMUS, *De observatione ciborum*, 24 (CML VIII 1: 12, 17 – 13, 5).

<sup>21</sup> Cf. M. KOKOSZKO, K. JAGUSIAK, Z. RZEŹNICKA, *Dietetyka i sztuka kulinarna antyku i wczesnego Bizancjum (II–VII w.)*, część I, *Zboża i produkty zbożowe w źródłach medycznych antyku i wczesnego Bizancjum (II–VII w.)*, Łódź 2014 [= BL, 16], p. 518; J. KODER, *Die Byzantiner...*, p. 224. Prior to the Arab conquests in the 7<sup>th</sup> cent. AD, rice remained relatively unknown in the Mediterranean (cf. M. KOKOSZKO, K. JAGUSIAK, Z. RZEŹNICKA, *Dietetyka...*, p. 517–519; IDEM, *Rice as Food and Medication in Ancient and Byzantine Medical Literature*, BZ 108.1, 2015, p. 134–136). Rice as a rare commodity in Gaul, cf. Y. HEN, *Food...*, p. 107; M. GRANT, *Introduction...* (2007), p. 28.

<sup>22</sup> For instance, they were kept in the palace complex of Khosrow II (6<sup>th</sup>/7<sup>th</sup> cent. AD), cf. *Theophanis Chronographia*, 322, 9–14, vol. I, ed. C. DE BOOR, Leipzig 1883. An analogous practice might have been adopted in the Byzantine court, cf. M. LEONTSINI, *Hens, Cockerels and other Choice Fowl. Everyday Food and Gastronomic Pretensions in Byzantium*, [in:] *Flavours and Delights. Tastes and Pleasures of Ancient and Byzantine Cuisine*, ed. I. ANAGNOSTAKIS, Athens 2013, p. 115.

was prized for its rarity value<sup>23</sup>. In all probability, this same practice took place in the court of the Frankish king<sup>24</sup>.

Another foodstuff described in *De observatione ciborum* that indicated the high social status of the target readership was hare meat<sup>25</sup>. Even though a common species in Europe, the animal had never been domesticated<sup>26</sup>. It was, however, regularly hunted for its meat – an activity which was among the most favourite forms of recreation for the rich since Antiquity<sup>27</sup>. In the times of *Imperium Romanum*,

<sup>23</sup> Initially, peacocks were bred by wealthy landowners for aesthetic purposes. Varro states that it was Hortensius (2<sup>nd</sup>/1<sup>st</sup> cent. BC) who first served their meat in Italy, and was later followed by other Roman gourmets, causing the prices of peacocks, and subsequently also their eggs, to soar within a short period of time (VARRO, *De re rustica*, III, 6, 6, [in:] MARCUS PORCIUS CATO, *On Agriculture*, MARCUS TERENTIUS VARRO, *On Agriculture*, trans. W.D. HOOPER, rev. H.B. ASH, Cambridge Mass.–London 1934 [= LCL, 283] (cetera: VARRO, *De re rustica*), p. 460. Cf. M. GRANT, *Commentary on Book 4 of Oribasius' Medical Compilations*, [in:] *Dieting for an Emperor...*, p. 285–286; J.M.C. TOYNBEE, *Animals in Roman Life and Art*, Barnsley 2013, p. 250; Z. RZEŹNICKA, *Rola mięsa w okresie pomiędzy II a VII w. w świetle źródeł medycznych*, [in:] *Dietetyka i sztuka kulinarna antyku i wczesnego Bizancjum (II–VII w.)*, część II, *Pokarm dla ciała i ducha*, ed. M. KOKOSZKO, Łódź 2014 [= BL, 19], p. 342.

<sup>24</sup> M. Grant stresses that peacocks were such a rare commodity in Gaul that their meat must have been very expensive, cf. M. GRANT, *Introduction...* (2007), p. 28. On the same issue, cf. Y. HEN, *Food...*, p. 107. Archaeological research proves that the birds were, for instance, kept on the estates of the Merovingian elite, cf. J.-H. YVINEC, M. BARME, *Livestock and the Early Medieval Diet in Northern Gaul*, [in:] *The Oxford Handbook of the Merovingian World*, ed. B. EFFROS, I. MOREIRA, Oxford–New York 2020, p. 741. On the consumption of peacock meat in medieval Europe, cf. M.W. ADAMSON, *Food in Medieval Times*, Westport CT–London 2004, p. 35.

<sup>25</sup> ANTHIMUS, *De observatione ciborum*, 13 (CML VIII 1: 8, 5–8). There is Mark Grant's suggestion (included in his interpretation of Anthimus' recipe for the sake of modern cuisine) that hare might be substituted with wild rabbit in the dish, cf. M. GRANT, *Roman Cookery. Ancient Recipes for Modern Kitchens*, London 2002, p. 123. In fact, rabbits were fairly common in the West (cf. M.W. ADAMSON, *Food...*, p. 36). As it was shown by Henriette KROLL (*Tiere im Byzantinischen Reich. Archäozoologische Forschungen im Überblick*, Mainz 2010 [= MRGZ, 87], p. 176), in the period between the 4<sup>th</sup> and the 6<sup>th</sup> cent. AD, we can observe rabbit domestication in the monasteries located in modern Southern France. It is held that this practice originates from the fact that unborn and newly born animals were said to be an acceptable foodstuff on fasting days, cf. M.W. ADAMSON, *Food...*, p. 36; H. KROLL, *Tiere...*, p. 176. On the other hand, Jean-Hervé Yvinec and Maude Barme do not list any rabbit remains when discussing domestic livestock available in the Northern Gaul in the Merovingian period which leads to the conclusion that in Anthimus' lifetime the animals were not bred in that area yet, cf. J.-H. YVINEC, M. BARME, *Livestock...*, p. 738–751. Neither do the researchers mention rabbits as game hunted by the Franks, cf. J.-H. YVINEC, M. BARME, *Livestock...*, p. 751–755. Therefore, it is highly likely that rabbit meat was rather not served (or served only sporadically) at Theuderic's court.

<sup>26</sup> M.W. ADAMSON, *Food...*, p. 36.

<sup>27</sup> Mentions of aristocratic youth hunting for hares can be found as early as in *Odysea*, cf. HOMERUS, *Odysea*, XVII, 294–295, rec. M.L. WEST, Berlin–Boston 2017 [= BSGR]. This country pursuit was still popular among the elites in the Byzantine period, cf. B. SCHRODT, *Sports of the Byzantine Empire*, JSpH 8.3, 1981, p. 53. Certain Byzantine emperors have been described as avid hunters, cf. A. KARPOZILOS, J.W. NESBITT, A. CUTLER, *Hunting*, [in:] *The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, vol. II, ed. A.P. KAZHDAN, New York–Oxford 1991, p. 958. For instance, from MICHAEL PSELLUS (*Chrono-*

wealthy landowners would customarily erect special pens for hares and other wild animals<sup>28</sup>. According to Varro, such places were referred to as *leporaria*<sup>29</sup>, which allows us to assume that they were initially built exclusively for hares, only later housing other game species, e.g., deer, wild goats, sheep<sup>30</sup> and boars<sup>31</sup>. Such facilities remained popular also in the Byzantine period<sup>32</sup>.

Since hare meat (just like other types of game) was most likely consumed by the nobility and the rich<sup>33</sup>, we may assume that it never became an important

---

*graphie ou histoire d'un siècle de Byzance (976–1077)*, [Isaac I] VII, 72, 1–15, vol. II, ed., trans. É. RE-NAULD, Paris 1928, p. 128 [cetera: MICHAEL PSELLUS, *Chronographia*] we learn that Isaac Comnenus (11<sup>th</sup> cent. AD) killed hares and cranes in great numbers, and that Michael VII Ducas (11<sup>th</sup> cent. AD) was a keen hunter of hares, red deer, and bears (cf. MICHAEL PSELLUS, *Chronographia*, [Michael VII] VII, 6, 3–16, p. 175–176; VII, 17, 1–8, p. 181–182). Hares as one of the most commonly hunted wild species in Byzantium, cf. A. DALBY, *Tastes of Byzantium. The Cuisine of a Legendary Empire*, London–New York 2010, p. 71; H. KROLL, *Tiere...*, p. 192–193; EADEM, *Animals in the Byzantine Empire: An Overview of the Archaeozoological Evidence*, *ArM* 39, 2012, p. 100. Hare remains were also unearthed in Constantinople, cf. V. ONAR, G. PAZVANT, H. ALPAK, N. GEZER İNCE, A. ARMUTAK, Z.S. KIZILTAN, *Animal Skeletal Remains of the Theodosius Harbor: General Overview*, *TJVAS* 37, 2013, p. 81, 83; V. ONAR, *Animals in Food Consumption during the Byzantine Period in Light of the Yenikapı Metro and Marmaray Excavations, Istanbul*, [in:] *Multidisciplinary Approaches to Food and Foodways in the Medieval Eastern Mediterranean*, ed. S.Y. WAKSMAN, Lyon 2020, p. 335. Hare meat as a luxury food in Byzantium, cf. J. KODER, *Cuisine and Dining...*, p. 433; IDEM, *Die Byzantiner...*, p. 222; A. ZUCKER, *Zoology*, [in:] *A Companion to Byzantine Science*, ed. S. LAZARIS, Leiden–Boston 2020 [= BCBW, 6], p. 290. One should, however, note that hares were said by some Byzantines to be unclean, as it was believed that their consumption might lead to licentiousness, cf. L. PLOUVIER, *L'alimentation carnée au Haut Moyen Âge d'après le De observatione ciborum d'Anthime et les Excerpta de Vinidarius*, *RBPH* 80.4, 2002, p. 1368; B. CASEAU, *Dogs, Vultures, Horses and Black Pudding: Unclean Meats in the Eyes of the Byzantines*, [in:] *Multidisciplinary Approaches...*, p. 235. On the other hand, Byzantine peasants hunted for hares (as well as other wild animals) in order to supplement their everyday diet with their meat, cf. J. KODER, *Die Byzantiner...*, p. 127. The latter practice (in regard to turtledoves) is also depicted by ANTHIMUS himself (*De observatione ciborum*, 25 [CML VIII 1: 14, 3–6]), cf. M. KOKOSZKO, *Anthimus and his Work...*, p. 74–84. It is accepted that an analogous hunting pattern is said to have been characteristic of Gaullish society as well, cf. J.-H. YVINEC, M. BARME, *Livestock...*, p. 753–755. As far as the importance of hare meat in the diet of the inhabitants of Early Medieval Northern Gaul is concerned, on the basis of osteal remains we know that hares were one of the most popular game, cf. J.-H. YVINEC, M. BARME, *Livestock...*, p. 752–753.

<sup>28</sup> VARRO, *De re rustica*, III, 12, 1–7, p. 488, 490, 492; LUCIUS JUNIUS MODERATUS COLUMELLA, *On Agriculture*, IX, proemium; IX, 1, 1–9, vol. II, *Books 5–9*, rec., trans. E.S. FORSTER, E.H. HEFFNER, London–Cambridge Mass. 1954 [= LCL, 408] (cetera: COLUMELLA, *De re rustica*), p. 420, 422, 424, 426.

<sup>29</sup> VARRO, *De re rustica*, III, 12, 1, p. 488 ([...] *ac nomine antico a parte quadam leporarium appellatum*).

<sup>30</sup> VARRO, *De re rustica*, III, 12, 1, p. 488.

<sup>31</sup> COLUMELLA, *De re rustica*, IX, proemium, p. 420.

<sup>32</sup> N.P. ŠEVČENKO, *Wild Animals in the Byzantine Park*, [in:] *Byzantine Garden Culture*, ed. A. LITTLEWOOD, H. MAGUIRE, J. WOLSCHKE-BULMAHN, Washington D.C. 2002, p. 72–74.

<sup>33</sup> Hares as game eaten chiefly by the rich in the Middle Ages, cf. M.W. ADAMSON, *Food...*, p. 36; J.-H. YVINEC, M. BARME, *Livestock...*, p. 755.

constituent of the Frankish everyday diet. The same conclusion can also be drawn for other species of wild animals, which may explain why Anthimus devoted only four chapters to game in his treatise<sup>34</sup>. The exclusive nature of the foodstuff is also implied in a passage from the mentioned recipe for hare, which includes a sauce with exotic, and thus expensive, spices<sup>35</sup>.

The recipe is worded as follows: *leporis vero si novellae fuerint, et ipsi sumendi in dulci piper habentem, parum cariofilum et gingiber, costo et spicanardi vel folio*<sup>36</sup> (hares, if young, should be eaten in a sweet [sauce] spiced with pepper, some cloves and ginger, putchuk and spikenard or leaf). In editions by Rose<sup>37</sup> and Liechtenhan<sup>38</sup> in the discussed chapter one can also find a medical annotation<sup>39</sup>. In Liechtenhan's edition it reads: *leporem licet comedere et bona est pro dissenteria, et fel eius miscendum cum pipere pro dolore aurium* (hare should be eaten and is beneficial for dysentery, and its bile ought to be mixed with pepper for ear pain). As for the recipe itself, one should mention that the author only lists individual ingredients, with no detailed advice on how to prepare the dish. Nevertheless, on the basis of other meat-based recipes taken from *De observatione ciborum* and other sources, we may attempt to reconstruct the stages of its preparation. Since the preparation of the sauce according to the mentioned recipe has recently been discussed by Maciej Kokoszko<sup>40</sup>, in the present study I shall only focus on its initial section reading: *leporis vero si novellae [...]*. I will also briefly refer to the piece of therapeutic advice concerning hare meat which follows the recipe proper.

The long-standing tradition of eating hare meat in the Greco-Roman world is confirmed by the writings of ancient and Byzantine physicians, who described the impact it had on the human body. One of the earliest remarks on the subject

<sup>34</sup> ANTHIMUS, *De observatione ciborum*, 6 (CML VIII 1: 6, 8–10); 7 (CML VIII 1: 6, 11–12); 8 (CML VIII 1: 6, 13–15); 13 (CML VIII 1: 8, 5–8). When it comes to the chapters devoted to the meat of quadrupeds (ANTHIMUS, *De observatione ciborum*, 3 [CML VIII 1: 4, 16–5, 15]; 4, [CML VIII 1: 5, 16–6, 5]; 5 [CML VIII 1: 6, 6–7]; 6 [CML VIII 1: 6, 8–10]; 7 [CML VIII 1: 6, 11–12]; 8 [CML VIII 1: 6, 13–15]; 9 [CML VIII 1: 7, 1–7]; 10 [CML VIII 1: 7, 8–13]; 11 [CML VIII 1: 7, 14–16]; 12 [CML VIII 1: 8, 1–4]; 13 [CML VIII 1: 8, 5–8]; 14 [CML VIII 1: 8, 9–10, 5]), the physician focuses on livestock (Chapters 3–5, 9–12 and 14), which indicates that the Franks ate the meat and offal (ANTHIMUS, *De observatione ciborum*, 16 [CML VIII 1: 10, 12–14]; 17 [CML VIII 1: 10, 15–16]; 18 [CML VIII 1: 11, 1]; 19 [CML VIII 1: 11, 2]; 20 [CML VIII 1: 11, 3–4]; 21 [CML VIII 1: 11, 5–9]) of domesticated animals more commonly than game.

<sup>35</sup> For instance, cf. F. ROTELLI, *Trade and Exploration*, [in:] *A Cultural History of Plants in the Post-Classical Era*, vol. II, ed. A. TOUWAIDE, London–New York–Oxford–New Delhi–Sydney 2022, p. 63.

<sup>36</sup> ANTHIMUS, *De observatione ciborum*, 13 (CML VIII 1: 8, 5–6). For modern interpretation of the recipe, cf. M. GRANT, *Roman Cookery...*, p. 123–124.

<sup>37</sup> ANTHIMUS, *De observatione ciborum*, 13, 1–2, p. 73 (Rose 1870).

<sup>38</sup> ANTHIMUS, *De observatione ciborum*, 13 (CML VIII 1: 8, 7–8).

<sup>39</sup> The annotation is present in two codices, Londiniensis (Ayscough) 3107 (saec. XVII) and Londiniensis Harleianus 4986 = 5294 (saec. XI). On codices, cf. V. ROSE, *Die Diätetik...*, p. 58–60; E. LIECHTENHAN, *Ad lectorem...*, p. XII–XIV.

<sup>40</sup> Cf. M. KOKOSZKO, *Anthimus and his Work...*, p. 62–74; IDEM, *Anthimus the Dietician*, p. 15–30.



can be found in *De diaeta*, a treatise dating back to the late 5<sup>th</sup> and early 4<sup>th</sup> cent. BC and constituting part of the so-called *Corpus Hippocraticum*<sup>41</sup>. A laconic description in the text reveals that the meat is dry and slows down the excretory system, and yet it still has a mild diuretic effect<sup>42</sup>. Slightly more information is provided by Galen of Pergamon (2<sup>nd</sup>/3<sup>rd</sup> cent. AD)<sup>43</sup>. For instance, from *De alimentorum facultatibus* we learn that the consumption of hare meat thickens the blood and, thus, may disturb humoral balance, but to a lesser extent than beef and mutton. Later the author compares hare and deer meat, presumably in order to imply that both are equally tough (most likely as a consequence of the lack of moisture) and hard to digest<sup>44</sup>. The toughness is confirmed in another passage therein, which states that hare meat should not be salted since the process makes it even tougher, as salt absorbs its moisture<sup>45</sup>. Furthermore, in *De victu attenuante*, the author also claims that the discussed food is as dry as dog and fox meat<sup>46</sup>. Analysis of Byzantine medical treatises proves that subsequent generations of physicians used the data provided by Galen when describing the dietary properties of hares. Such authors as Oribasius (4<sup>th</sup> cent. AD)<sup>47</sup>, Aetius of Amida (6<sup>th</sup> cent. AD)<sup>48</sup>, and Paul of Aegina (7<sup>th</sup> cent. AD)<sup>49</sup> expressed similar opinions on the qualities of hare meat as those previously listed by the physician of Pergamon.

Byzantine physicians do express that there were a few issues in eating hare, which is clearly visible, for instance, in the fragments by Oribasius and Aetius of Amida who included its meat in their catalogues containing products generating

<sup>41</sup> Cf. J.M. WILKINS, *Hippocratic Corpus, Regimen (ca 430–370 BCE)*, [in:] *The Encyclopedia...*, p. 416–417.

<sup>42</sup> *Hippocratis De diaeta*, II, 46 (CMG I 2, 4: 168, 25–26), ed., trans., comm. R. JOLY, S. BYL, Berlin 2003 [= CMG, 1.2.4] (cetera: *De diaeta*).

<sup>43</sup> On the physician, cf. R.J. HANKINSON, *Galen of Pergamon (155–215 CE)*, [in:] *The Encyclopedia...*, p. 335–399.

<sup>44</sup> *Galenus De alimentorum facultatibus libri III*, III, 1, 8 (CMG V 4, 2: 334, 13–15 = Kühn VI: 664), ed. G. HELMREICH, Leipzig–Berlin 1923 [= CMG, 5.4.2] (cetera: GALENUS, *De alimentorum facultatibus*).

<sup>45</sup> GALENUS, *De alimentorum facultatibus*, III, 40, 4 (CMG V 4, 2: 384, 9–11 = Kühn VI: 746).

<sup>46</sup> *Galenus De victu attenuante*, 8, 68 (CMG V 4, 2: 443, 28–29), ed. K. KALBFLEISCH, Leipzig–Berlin 1923 [= CMG, 5.4.2].

<sup>47</sup> *Oribasii Collectionum medicarum reliquiae: Libri I–VIII*, II, 28, 10–11 (CMG VI 1, 1: 36, 28–31); III, 16, 4–5 (CMG VI 1, 1: 78, 18–20), ed. I. RAEDER, Leipzig–Berlin 1928 [= CMG, 6.1.1] (cetera: ORIBASIUS, *Collectiones medicae*). On the physician, cf. J. SCARBOROUGH, *Oreibasios of Pergamon (ca 350 – ca 400 CE)*, [in:] *The Encyclopedia...*, p. 595–596.

<sup>48</sup> *Aetii Amideni Libri medicinales I–IV*, II, 121 (CMG VIII 1: 197, 20–23); II, 253 (CMG VIII 1: 245, 5–7), ed. A. OLIVIERI, Leipzig–Berlin 1935 [= CMG, 8.1] (cetera: AETIUS AMIDENUS, *Libri medicinales*). On the physician, cf. J. SCARBOROUGH, *Aëtios of Amida (500–550 CE)*, [in:] *The Encyclopedia...*, p. 38–39.

<sup>49</sup> *Paulus Aegineta. Libri I–IV*, I, 84 (CMG IX 1: 61, 5–7), ed. J.L. HEIBERG, Leipzig–Berlin 1921 [= CMG, 9.1] (cetera: PAULUS AEGINETA, *Epitome*). On the physician, cf. P.E. PORMANN, *Paulos of Aigina (ca 630–670 CE?)*, [in:] *The Encyclopedia...*, p. 629.

black bile<sup>50</sup>, i.e., a dry and cold humour<sup>51</sup> which was believed to be particularly thick<sup>52</sup> and sticky<sup>53</sup>. For that reason, it was said to be difficult to remove from the body, and its excess was believed to lead to internal blockages, which increased the probability of various ailments occurring<sup>54</sup>. However, from the aforementioned words by Galen, we may conclude that hare meat was not as melancholic as beef and mutton, since it upset the humoral balance to a lesser degree. Therefore, it can be argued that hare was considered not to be particularly harmful when eaten sporadically and in small amounts. On the other hand, the risk of health complications increased if hare meat was consumed during a season that favoured the formation of black bile, e.g., in autumn<sup>55</sup>.

This theory is reflected in the Byzantine dietary calendar compiled by Hierophilus<sup>56</sup>, who states that hare meat should be avoided in September as it is a month

<sup>50</sup> ORIBASIIUS, *Collectiones medicae*, III, 9, 1 (CMG VI 1, 1: 73, 17); AETIUS AMIDENUS, *Libri medicinales*, II, 246 (CMG VIII 1: 242, 19).

<sup>51</sup> *Galenus In Hippocratis De natura hominis commentaria III*, I, 41 (CMG V 9, 1: 51, 31–32 = Kühn XV: 98), ed. J. MEWALDT, Leipzig–Berlin 1914 [= CMG, 5.9.1] (cetera: GALENUS, *In Hippocratis De natura hominis*). As hare meat was dry it was recommended by Anthimus as an element of a diet to those suffering from dysentery, though the dysentery mentioned by the physician cannot have been the one that was caused by black bile, cf. K.A. STEWART, *Galen's Theory of Black Bile. Hippocratic Tradition, Manipulation, Innovation*, Leiden–Boston 2019 [= SAM, 51], p. 12, 125–127, 144–145.

<sup>52</sup> GALENUS, *In Hippocratis De natura hominis*, I, 26 (CMG V 9, 1: 36, 3–5 = Kühn XV: 66).

<sup>53</sup> GALENUS, *In Hippocratis De natura hominis*, II, 22 (CMG V 9, 1: 85, 6–8 = Kühn XV: 167). Characteristics and properties of black bile have been recently discussed by Keith Andrew STEWART (*Galen's Theory... passim* [especially p. 60–74]).

<sup>54</sup> For instance, adverse effects from meat consumption that triggers the production of melancholic juices are discussed by Galen in the passage on beef within *De alimentorum facultatibus*. The author states that it increases the risk of cancer, elephantiasis, scabies, leprosy, four-day fever, and the disease called melancholia, while in some people it may also result in enlargement of the spleen, cf. GALENUS, *De alimentorum facultatibus*, III, 1, 3 (CMG V 4, 2: 333, 1–7 = Kühn VI: 661). The passage is quoted by AETIUS OF AMIDA (*Libri medicinales*, II, 121 [CMG VIII 1: 1–8]).

<sup>55</sup> Autumn (φθινόπωρον, i.e. the period when weather is naturally cold and dry) as a season in which black bile dominates in the human body, cf. GALENUS, *In Hippocratis De natura hominis*, I, 36 (CMG V 9, 1: 45, 17–18 = Kühn XV: 85); I, 41 (CMG V 9, 1: 51, 31–32 = Kühn XV: 98). On how humoral balance was associated with the cycle of the seasons, cf. J. JOUANA, *Dietetics...*, p. 149–151.

<sup>56</sup> Despite there being no concrete evidence of when the author lived, modern scholars try to determine the time of his activity on the basis of his treatise. According to Alain TOUWAIDE (*Botany*, [in:] *A Companion to Byzantine...*, p. 346, note 159) it may have been the period between 7<sup>th</sup> and 9<sup>th</sup> cent. On other possible dates, cf. E. DELACENSERIE, *Le traité de diététique de Hiérophile: Analyse interne*, B 84, 2014, p. 102–103; B. CASEAU, *Nourritures terrestres, nourritures célestes. La culture alimentaire à Byzance*, Paris 2015, p. 149–150; M. ΛΕΟΝΤΣΙΝΗ, *Διατροφικές συνήθειες και υγεία: Παρατηρήσεις για τη διατροφή με ζωικά λίπη στις βυζαντινές βιολογικές πραγματείες (7<sup>ος</sup>–12<sup>ος</sup> αι.)*, [in:] *Ιατρική θεραπεία ἔστι μὲν πον καὶ σώματος, ἔστι δ' ἄρα καὶ ψυχῆς: Ὀψεις τῆς Ἰατρικῆς στο Βυζάντιο (14 Δεκεμβρίου 2018, Ἱστορικό Ἀρχεῖο του Πανεπιστημίου Ἀθηνῶν)* ΠΡΑΚΤΙΚΑ, ed. K. ΝΙΚΟΛΑΟΥ, K. ΓΑΡΔΙΚΑ, Athens 2021, p. 46; B. CASEAU, *Quelques réflexions sur les interdits alimentaires dans le christianisme byzantin*, [in:] *Religion et interdits alimentaires. Archeozoologie et sources littéraire*, ed. ΕΑΔΕΜ, H. ΜΟΝΧΟΤ [= O&M, 38], p. 100 (forthcoming). On Byzantine dietetic calendars, cf. A. TOUWAIDE, *Botany...*, p. 346; IDEM, *Medicine and Pharmacy*, [in:] *A Companion to Byzantine...*

that contributes to the generation of black bile<sup>57</sup>. Moreover, the author warns against eating the food when discussing the correct diet for those months when the human body was not dominated by this particular humour. Namely, from his work we learn that hare meat ought not to be consumed in October<sup>58</sup> and November<sup>59</sup> (when the human body is dominated by [moist and cold] phlegm<sup>60</sup>) nor in May<sup>61</sup> (when it tends to produce mainly [moist and hot] blood<sup>62</sup>). On the other hand, the author finds the food acceptable (provided that it is combined with some vinegar<sup>63</sup> or ὀξύμελι<sup>64</sup>) in July<sup>65</sup> and August (until the 15<sup>th</sup> day of the month)<sup>66</sup>, i.e. in the period which was believed to generate (dry and hot) bile<sup>67</sup>. As for October and November, we may assume that providing the body with a tough (due to its dryness) foodstuff such as hare was inadvisable as its digestion required a lot

---

*tine...*, p. 379. In the present study I refer to Hierophilus' calendar edited by Roberto Romano, which combines three texts, two of which were originally edited by Jean François Boissonade in 1827 (col. I) and 1831 (col. II) and one edited by Armand Delatte in 1939 (col. III), cf. below.

<sup>57</sup> *Il calendario dietetico di Ierofilo*, 9, col. I, 575–576; 9, col. III, 581–585, ed. R. ROMANO, AAP n.s. 47, 1999 (cetera: HEROPHILUS, *De cyclo ciborum*), p. 214. Cf. J. KODER, *Stew and Salted Meat – Opulent Normality in the Diet of Every Day?*, [in:] *Eat, Drink, and Be Merry (Luke 12:19) – Food and Wine in Byzantium Papers of the 37<sup>th</sup> Annual Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, in Honour of Professor A.A.M. Bryer*, ed. L. BRUBAKER, K. LINARDOU, Aldershot–Burlington VT 2007, p. 71.

<sup>58</sup> HEROPHILUS, *De cyclo ciborum*, 10, col. I, 633–634, p. 215; 10, col. II, 634–635, p. 215. Cf. J. KODER, *Stew and Salted...*, p. 71. On the basis of humoral theory, one can conclude that Hierophilus' remark on October as a month when blood is less thick (αἷμα λεπτόν [...]) can be interpreted as his pointing to the exact time which heralded the season when the human body started to produce larger amounts of phlegm (which, just like blood, was considered to be moist by nature but was likelier to be generated in this particular period than blood owing to the coldness typical of the month). Cf. HEROPHILUS, *De cyclo ciborum*, 10, col. III, 615–616, p. 214–215.

<sup>59</sup> HEROPHILUS, *De cyclo ciborum*, 11, col. I, 669–673, p. 216; 11, col. II, 674–676, p. 216.

<sup>60</sup> Winter (χειμῶν, i.e. the time when weather is naturally cold and humid) as a season in which phlegm dominates in the human body, cf. GALENUS, *In Hippocratis De natura hominis*, I, 41 (CMG V 9, 1: 51, 29–30 = Kühn XV: 98).

<sup>61</sup> HEROPHILUS, *De cyclo ciborum*, 5, col. I, 327–336, p. 208.

<sup>62</sup> Spring (ἔαρ, i.e. the period which is naturally warmer than winter but still humid) as a season in which blood dominates in the human body, cf. GALENUS, *In Hippocratis De natura hominis*, I, 41 (CMG V 9, 1: 51, 30 = Kühn XV: 98).

<sup>63</sup> Vinegar was effective in stopping the secretion of bile (for instance, cf. *Simeonis Sethi Syntagma de alimentorum facultatibus*, o, 79, 5, ed. B. LANGKAVEL, Leipzig 1868 [= BSGR]) because it was cooling (for instance, cf. AETIUS AMIDENUS, *Libri medicinales*, I, 299 [CMG VIII 1: 116, 1–3]).

<sup>64</sup> For an explanation when the food ought to be consumed with ὀξύμελι, cf. above.

<sup>65</sup> HEROPHILUS, *De cyclo ciborum*, 7, col. II, 464–467, p. 211; 7, col. III, 465–468, p. 211.

<sup>66</sup> HEROPHILUS, *De cyclo ciborum*, 8, col. I, 516–520, p. 212; 8, col. II, 515–519, p. 212; 8, col. III, 519–522, p. 212. In all probability hare meat was considered to be an acceptable foodstuff only until the 15<sup>th</sup> day of August as from the second part of the month the human body was said to start to produce greater amounts of black bile, and therefore such melancholic foods as hare should be entirely excluded from the menu until the end of September.

<sup>67</sup> Summer (ἔρος, i.e. the time when weather is naturally hot and dry) as a season in which bile dominates in the human body, cf. GALENUS, *In Hippocratis De natura hominis*, I, 41 (CMG V 9, 1: 51, 31 = Kühn XV: 98).

of internal heat, the deficit of which in the stomach could eventually lead to the production of black bile. In May, in turn, a threat was posed to health as any extra amount of the dry foodstuff could contribute to a stoppage in digestion by means of triggering a deficit of moisture (which was just as indispensable as heat for the process to take place) in the alimentary tract. On the other hand, there was no danger in consuming moderate amounts of hare meat in July and August as long as the food was eaten with vinegar-based condiments since, on the one hand, these were supposed to balance hare's dryness and, on the other, the vinegar was meant to counteract the viscosity of the humour generated in the process of πέψις.

Even though Anthimus provides no detailed characteristics of hare meat, some of his recommendations prove that he was perfectly aware of how its consumption impacts the human body. Firstly, by specifying the product in the treatment of dysentery, the physician showed that he knew both the food's dietetic properties and how to use them in order to cure the mentioned illness. Thus, he recommended eating hare meat, which was dry by nature, so as to minimise the excessive amount of moisture produced by the patient's body. Secondly, clear evidence of his competence in dietetics are the chapters within *De observatione ciborum* where he strongly recommends the meat of young animals (Chapters 5, 10–11, 13)<sup>68</sup>, stating that it is better than that of older animals (Chapters 6–7)<sup>69</sup>. It is important for our deliberations that these observations concern not only *novellae* hares<sup>70</sup> but also *agnelinae carnes*<sup>71</sup> (lamb meat), *edi*<sup>72</sup> (goat kids), *teneriores* oxen<sup>73</sup>, *enulei*<sup>74</sup> (fawns) and *carnes novellae* of young wild goats<sup>75</sup>, i.e., animals whose meat was said to become melancholic as they grow older. The author's remarks are a direct reference to the dietary doctrine contained, for instance, in Galen's *De alimentorum facultatibus*, where we can read that in the case of animals whose meat is dry by nature when mature<sup>76</sup> it is more advisable to eat the meat from younger creatures since their flesh contains more moisture, thus its consumption does not cause humoral disbalance<sup>77</sup>. It comes as no surprise therefore that Anthimus recommends the use of the meat of young hares in the discussed recipe.

<sup>68</sup> ANTHIMUS, *De observatione ciborum*, 5 (CML VIII 1: 6, 6–7); 10 (CML VIII 1: 7, 8–13); 11 (CML VIII 1: 7, 14–16); 13 (CML VIII 1: 8, 5–6).

<sup>69</sup> ANTHIMUS, *De observatione ciborum*, 6 (CML VIII 1: 6, 9–10); 7 (CML VIII 1: 6, 11–12).

<sup>70</sup> ANTHIMUS, *De observatione ciborum*, 13 (CML VIII 1: 8, 5).

<sup>71</sup> ANTHIMUS, *De observatione ciborum*, 5 (CML VIII 1: 6, 6).

<sup>72</sup> ANTHIMUS, *De observatione ciborum*, 5 (CML VIII 1: 6, 6).

<sup>73</sup> ANTHIMUS, *De observatione ciborum*, 11 (CML VIII 1: 7, 14). In this case, the adjective *tenerior* indicates that Anthimus had in mind veal, which is far tenderer and softer than beef, and thus easier to digest. Hence, it was believed that the product does not stimulate such large amounts of harmful juices as meat obtained from older animals. On the subject cf. further part of the article.

<sup>74</sup> ANTHIMUS, *De observatione ciborum*, 7 (CML VIII 1: 6, 11–12).

<sup>75</sup> ANTHIMUS, *De observatione ciborum*, 7 (CML VIII 1: 6, 11).

<sup>76</sup> Hence, it can facilitate the production of black bile.

<sup>77</sup> GALENUS, *De alimentorum facultatibus*, III, 1, 5 (CMG V 4, 2: 333, 15–22 = Kühn VI: 662–663). The doctrine stating that meat obtained from goat kids, lambs and calves (i.e. young melancholic an-

Having analysed the aforementioned information from *De observatione ciborum* and other relevant medical treatises, we can now strive to establish the manner in which Anthimus would have recommended hare meat be treated before cooking. On the basis of accounts preserved by Oribasius, who states that – following teachings provided by Rufus of Ephesus (1<sup>st</sup>/2<sup>nd</sup> cent. AD)<sup>78</sup> – wild game ought not to be cooked immediately after slaughter, we can conclude then that wild game would undergo a process of tenderisation<sup>79</sup>. This advice was also likely to include hare meat, and since the recipe suggested the use of the meat of a young animal, the process would have been relatively short (in comparison to the time required to tenderise the meat of older creatures). Perhaps, just as in the case of peacocks, the procedure lasted no longer than two days. Following on from this process, the meat was prepared, but we have no information whether it was also deboned. This action is recommended in recipes preserved in a Latin compilation of recipes (4<sup>th</sup> cent. AD) known as *De re coquinaria*<sup>80</sup>, but it is mentioned only twice<sup>81</sup>, which implies that it was not a common practice. In addition, it was never recommended by Anthimus himself, so we may assume that it would not have been applied in the discussed case either.

Next, the hare meat was exposed to heat treatment<sup>82</sup>. The exact method was not specified in the recipe, so in order to gain greater insight, we must turn to

---

imals) is more tender and contains more moisture (i.e. it is easier to digest) than that of mature animals was present in Greek medicine long before Galen as it is found, for instance, in *De diaeta* (II, 46, [CMG I 2, 4: 168, 16–18]). Book II of the latter treatise was translated into Latin (5<sup>th</sup>/6<sup>th</sup> cent. AD), excerpted and compiled together with fragments of *De observatione ciborum* into a collection of dietetic advice present, for instance, in the manuscript Vaticanus Reg. Lat. 1004 written in the 12<sup>th</sup> cent. AD, cf. C. DEROUX, *Des traces inconnues de la "Diététique" d'Anthime dans un manuscrit du Vatican* ("Reg. Lat. 1004"), L 33.3, 1974, p. 683–687. Greek teachings on the subject are present in works composed by medics following Galen's theory, i.e. by ORIBASIUS (*Collectiones medicae*, II, 28, 1–16 [CMG VI 1, 1: 36, 4–37, 14]), AETIUS OF AMIDA (*Libri medicinales*, II, 121 [CMG VIII 1: 196, 26–198, 8]) and PAUL OF AEGINA (*Epitome*, I, 84 [CMG IX 1: 60, 26–61, 9]), to mention but a few.

<sup>78</sup> On the physician, cf. J. SCARBOROUGH, *Rufus of Ephesus (ca 70–100 CE)*, [in:] *The Encyclopedia...*, p. 720–721.

<sup>79</sup> ORIBASIUS, *Collectiones medicae*, IV, 2, 7 (CMG VI 1, 1: 98, 2–3). The technique seems to be fairly popular, which is testified to by Galen's commentary on *Prorrheticus*. Technical term applied for tenderisation of meats used by medical doctors reads ἐωλιζειν, and the final product was called κρέα ἔωλα. In everyday language this formal term was substituted with κρέα σαχνά, cf. *Galenus In Hippocratis Prorrheticum I commentaria III*, III, 23 (CMG V 9, 2: 133, 12–17 = Kühn XVI: 760–761), ed. H. DIELS, Leipzig–Berlin 1915 [= CMG, 5.9.2].

<sup>80</sup> On the cookbook, for instance, cf. H. LINDSAY, *Who was Apicius?*, SO 72.1, 1997, p. 144–154; S. GRAINGER, *The Myth of Apicius*, *Gast* 7.2, 2007, p. 71–77.

<sup>81</sup> *Apicius. A Critical Edition with an Introduction and an English Translation of the Latin Recipe text Apicius*, VIII, 8, 6, p. 280; VIII, 8, 7, ed. Ch. GROCOCK, S. GRAINGER, Blackawton–Totnes 2006 (cetera: APICIUS, *De re coquinaria*), p. 280.

<sup>82</sup> We can draw this conclusion on the basis of proemium, where the physician argues that if the food is not carefully heat processed, it becomes hard to digest and harmful (*si autem [cibi] non bene*

gastronomic literature, which presents the whole spectrum of potentially applicable techniques. One of the experts in *ars coquinaria* who covers the subject is Archestratus of Gela (4<sup>th</sup> cent. BC)<sup>83</sup>. In his poem entitled *Ἡδυνάθεια*, preserved by Athenaeus of Naucratis (2<sup>nd</sup>/3<sup>rd</sup> cent. AD), he states that hare meat is best when served hot and rare after being roasted on a skewer with only the addition of salt<sup>84</sup>. Thus, we can conclude that the author preferred hare meat to be roasted briefly and directly over an open fire. Though Anthimus was aware of this method, he disapproved of it for health reasons<sup>85</sup>. In the chapters devoted to preparing mutton and boar meat he definitively states that they should be subjected to heat treatment for a longer period of time and not too close to the fire<sup>86</sup>. Otherwise, as he explains in one of the passages, the meat is done only on the outside, and remains raw inside ([...] *si proxima fuerit foco, ardet caro deforis et deintus devenit cruda* [...])<sup>87</sup>. If this were the case, the outside would become dry while the inside would remain uncooked. This would chill down the intestines, and, as a result, meat roasted in such a way would contribute to the production of a humour that is dry and cold. As these recommendations refer to animals whose meat was melancholic and thus of properties similar to those of the hare<sup>88</sup>, we may assume that hare meat should

---

*fuerint cocti, gravitatem stomacho et ventri faciunt*, cf. ANTHIMUS, *De observatione ciborum*, proemium [CML VIII 1: 1, 10–11]). On the subject, cf. C. DEROUX, *Tradition...*, p. 175; IDEM, *Anthime, un médecin...*, p. 1121. Moreover, Anthimus mentions the practice of eating raw meat outside the Greco-Roman world (*gentes alias*, cf. ANTHIMUS, *De observatione ciborum*, proemium [CML VIII 1: 3, 4–5]), which included Gaul inhabited by the Franks (ANTHIMUS, *De observatione ciborum*, 14 [CML VIII 1: 9, 8–9]). Carl DEROUX (*Tradition...*, p. 178–181) maintains that the physician was not opposed to that habit and was particularly interested in the therapeutic properties ascribed to raw *laredum* by the Franks.

<sup>83</sup> On Archestratus, cf. A. DALBY, *Food...*, p. 23–24. On Archestratus' work in the *Deipnosophistae*, cf. J. WILKINS, *Dialogue and Comedy: The Structure of the Deipnosophistae*, [in:] *Athenaeus and his World. Reading Greek Culture in the Roman Empire*, ed. D. BRAUND, J. WILKINS, Exeter 2000, p. 35–36.

<sup>84</sup> *Archestratos of Gela. Greek Culture and Cuisine in the Fourth Century BCE*, 57, 2–6 (57 Brandt, SH 188), text, trans., comm. S.D. OLSON, A. SENS, Oxford–New York 2000 (cetera: ARCHESTRATUS GELOUS, *Ἡδυνάθεια*), p. 207; ATHENAEUS, *The Learned Banqueters*, vol. IV, *Books 8–10.420e*, IX, 399d–e (= Kaibel IX, 61), ed., trans. S.D. OLSON, Cambridge Mass.–London 2008 [= LCL, 235], p. 358, 360 (cetera: ATHENAEUS NAUCRATITA, *Deipnosophistae*).

<sup>85</sup> ANTHIMUS, *De observatione ciborum*, 21 (CML VIII 1: 11, 5–9).

<sup>86</sup> ANTHIMUS, *De observatione ciborum*, 4 (CML VIII 1: 5, 16 – 6, 5); 8 (CML VIII 1: 6, 13–15). The described practice is called in modern Greek *αντικριστό*, i.e. “facing the flames”, cf. I. ANAGNOSTAKIS, “*The Raw and the Cooked*”: *Ways of Cooking and Serving Food in Byzantium*, [in:] *Flavours and Delights...*, p. 177. In all probability, the same technique was recommended in the case of beef (ANTHIMUS, *De observatione ciborum*, 11 [CML VIII 1: 7, 14–16]). Since the physician emphasizes the fact that the meat should be prepared at some distance from the fire we may presume that the process was rather prolonged.

<sup>87</sup> ANTHIMUS, *De observatione ciborum*, 4 (CML VIII 1: 6, 1–2).

<sup>88</sup> Beef as a foodstuff stimulating the production of thick blood and melancholic juices, cf. GALENUS, *De alimentorum facultatibus*, III, 1, 3 (CMG V 4, 2: 333, 1–4 = Kühn VI: 661). Mutton as a food that

also be exposed to heat treatment long enough to both make it tender and well-done throughout. Even if such practices in no way correspond with the recommendations provided by Archestratus of Gela, it does not mean that they were not applied in the Mediterranean, because, as expressed by the author of *Ἡδυνπάθεια*, there were numerous methods and advice on cooking hare meat (τοῦ δὲ λαγῶ πολλοὶ τε τρόποι πολλαὶ τε θέσεις σκευασίας εἰσὶν)<sup>89</sup>.

The confirmation of the Greek poet's words can be found in *De re coquinaria*, where (in Chapter 8 of Book VIII) we find thirteen recipes devoted to hare meat, as well as accompanying sauces. Importantly, as many as nine contain information on the ingredients of said sauces, which include dates<sup>90</sup>, raisins<sup>91</sup>, boiled wine must (*caroenum*)<sup>92</sup>, honey<sup>93</sup>, straw wine (*passum*)<sup>94</sup>, and Damascene plums<sup>95</sup>, i.e., products that lie behind the dish's sweet taste. When we compare the data presented above with the recipe for hare meat served *in dulci* from *De observatione ciborum*, we can conclude that there was a Mediterranean tradition of serving hare meat in sweet sauces<sup>96</sup>. Intriguingly, besides hare, Anthimus also recommended sweet sauce for beef<sup>97</sup> and peacock meat<sup>98</sup>, i.e., foodstuffs whose dietetic properties were similar to those attributed to hare<sup>99</sup>. Additionally, a comparative analysis of both

---

is περιττωματικά and stimulates the production of harmful juices, cf. GALENUS, *De alimentorum facultatibus*, III, 1, 7 (CMG V 4, 2: 334, 5–6 = Kühn VI: 663). Beef, mutton, and the meat of wild boars as a food inducing the production of black bile, cf. *Oribasii Libri ad Eunapium*, I, 25, 1 (CMG VI 3: 336, 11–12), [in:] *Oribasii Synopsis ad Eustathium filium et libri ad Eunapium*, ed. J. RAEDER, Leipzig 1926 [= CMG, 6.3]; AETIUS AMIDENUS, *Libri medicinales*, II, 246 (CMG VIII 1: 241, 18–20).

<sup>89</sup> ARCHESTRATUS GELOUS, *Ἡδυνπάθεια*, 57, 1–2 (57 Brandt, *SH* 188), p. 207; ATHENAEUS NAUCRATITA, *Deipnosophistae*, IX, 399d (= Kaibel IX, 61), p. 360.

<sup>90</sup> APICIUS, *De re coquinaria*, VIII, 8, 2; VIII, 8, 3; VIII, 8, 12; VIII, 8, 13, p. 278, 280, 282.

<sup>91</sup> APICIUS, *De re coquinaria*, VIII, 8, 2, p. 278; VIII, 8, 12, p. 282.

<sup>92</sup> APICIUS, *De re coquinaria*, VIII, 8, 2, p. 278; VIII, 8, 3, p. 278, 280; VIII, 8, 11, p. 282; VIII, 8, 12, p. 282; VIII, 8, 13, p. 282.

<sup>93</sup> APICIUS, *De re coquinaria*, VIII, 8, 6, p. 280.

<sup>94</sup> APICIUS, *De re coquinaria*, VIII, 8, 10, p. 282.

<sup>95</sup> APICIUS, *De re coquinaria*, VIII, 8, 13, p. 282.

<sup>96</sup> Recipes found in *De re coquinaria* (for instance VI, 1, 1, p. 222; VI, 2, 2, p. 224; VIII, 1, 8, p. 264; VIII, 2, 3, p. 266; VIII, 3, 2, p. 266; VIII, 5, 1, p. 268) and *De observatione ciborum* (3 [CML VIII 1: 4, 16 – 5, 15]; 10 [CML VIII 1: 7, 8–13]; 24 [CML VIII 1: 12, 17 – 13, 5]), indicate that other types of meat were also served this way.

<sup>97</sup> The sauce for beef was additionally acidified with vinegar and flavoured with hot spices (ANTHIMUS, *De observatione ciborum*, 3 [CML VIII 1: 5, 3–10]), which made the final product sweet, sour, and spicy.

<sup>98</sup> Owing to the pepper, the sauce for peacock meat (ANTHIMUS, *De observatione ciborum*, 24 [CML VIII 1: 13, 3]) became more of a sweet-and-spicy kind.

<sup>99</sup> Peacock meat was described as tough, heavy, and sinewy. On the issue, cf. GALENUS, *De alimentorum facultatibus*, III, 18, 3 (CMG V 4, 2: 356, 15–16 = Kühn VI: 701); ORIBASIIUS, *Collectiones medicarum*, II, 42, 4 (CMG VI 1, 1: 40, 29–30); AETIUS AMIDENUS, *Libri medicinales*, II, 130 (CMG VIII 1: 200, 14–15); PAULUS AEGINETA, *Epitome*, I, 82 (CMG IX 1: 60, 7–8). Also cf. M. GRANT, *Commentary on Book 4...*, p. 285. On the analogy between the dietary properties of beef and hare meat, cf. earlier parts of the text.

texts shows that beef and peacock meat were exposed to similar heat treatment, which may suggest that hare meat was prepared likewise<sup>100</sup>.

On the basis of Recipe no. 1 within Chapter 8 of Book VIII of *De re coquinaria*, one can presume that the initial stage of meat processing might have involved pre-cooking<sup>101</sup>. However, it was clearly an optional procedure, since recipes for beef and peacock meat in *De observatione ciborum* allow us to conclude that stewing remained the predominant cooking technique applied to melancholic meats. When elaborating on the types of cooking processes for the discussed meats, Anthimus recommends they be stewed in *iuscellum*, which enables us to infer that this was a method he considered optimum for meats which were dry by nature. The same technique is also suggested in *De re coquinaria*. Recipe no. 6 for *ex suo iure* hare states that the meat was to be stewed in olive oil, fish sauce (*liquamen*), and stock (*coctura*) with the addition of leek, coriander, and dill<sup>102</sup>. Even though we have no detailed data on the ingredients of the *coctura*, the aforementioned Recipe no. 1 hints that it may have been a meat stock made from boiled hare. In addition, from Recipe no. 13 we learn that the latter could be substituted with a mixture of water, wine, and fish sauce, spiced with mustard, dill, and a whole leek<sup>103</sup>.

The ingredients mentioned above (especially wine, fish sauce, and olive oil) were commonly used in the cuisine of the Mediterranean since Antiquity<sup>104</sup>, so Anthimus would have been well familiar with them. However, it is important to note here that in *De observatione ciborum* the application of the first two is a rarity<sup>105</sup>, and the vast majority of recipes recommend substituting them with other ingredients.

Let us now ponder over the possible composition of the Byzantine physician's *iuscellum* for the hare meat stew. It seems highly unlikely that – just as in *De re coquinaria* – it was based on wine, since the treatise leads to the conclusion that the Franks did not commonly use wine for cooking. In *De observatione ciborum*, we only find five remarks on wine, with just two referring to its application in food

<sup>100</sup> Following Anthimus' recommendations concerning meat's thermal processing, DEROUX (*La digestion...*, p. 412) argues that the physician believed that the food is best for the human body when stewed or steamed.

<sup>101</sup> APICIUS, *De re coquinaria*, VIII, 8, 1, p. 278. For modern interpretation of the recipe, cf. A. DALBY, S. GRAINGER, *The Classical Cookbook*, London 2000, p. 75–76.

<sup>102</sup> APICIUS, *De re coquinaria*, VIII, 8, 6, p. 280.

<sup>103</sup> APICIUS, *De re coquinaria*, VIII, 8, 13, p. 282.

<sup>104</sup> Cf. J.-P. SODINI, *Olives*, [in:] *Late Antiquity. A Guide to the Postclassical World*, ed. G.W. BOWER-SOCK, P. BROWN, O. GRABAR, Cambridge Mass.–London 1999, p. 619–620; D. VERA, *Wine*, [in:] *Late Antiquity...*, p. 749; A. DALBY, *Food...*, p. 156–157 (fish sauce), 239–240 (olive oil), 350–352 (wine); M. DECKER, *Garum and Salsamenta*, [in:] *The Oxford Dictionary of Late Antiquity*, ed. O. NICHOLSON, Oxford 2018, p. 642; IDEM, *Olives and Olive Oil*, [in:] *The Oxford Dictionary...*, p. 1098–1099; IDEM, *Wine and Wine Trade*, [in:] *The Oxford Dictionary...*, p. 1591–1592.

<sup>105</sup> Cf. further parts of the article.



preparation<sup>106</sup>, while the other three concern therapeutics<sup>107</sup>. At the same time, Anthimus frequently recommends the use of vinegar<sup>108</sup> in *ars coquinaria* – an ingredient that had long been a staple in Mediterranean cuisine<sup>109</sup>. For our deliberations, it is worth remembering that vinegar is the base of the *iuscellum* in which the physician advised the reader to stew beef. Therefore, it seems he was perfectly aware that it would (just like wine) make the meat tender and thus easier to digest. Given this argument, there is every likelihood that the physician applied the same technique for hare meat. Possibly, just like the authors of the recipes in *De re coquinaria*, he would also opt for the *iuscellum* to be slightly diluted with water or (meat- or vegetable-based) stock to neutralise the taste of vinegar.

The overwhelming majority of the sauces for hare meat in the analysed cookery book contained olive oil<sup>110</sup>, which allows us to presume that it was also listed by Anthimus in his recipe. After all, he recommends its application<sup>111</sup> considerably more often than animal fats, which does not mean, however, that it was widely available in the Frankish state. This is evidenced in the chapter informing the reader that melted *laredum*, i.e. lard, is an additive which can replace olive oil if the latter is not at hand<sup>112</sup>.

On the basis of Anthimus' treatise, we can also assume that (going against the grain of tradition domestically) he would not use fish sauce, which was a standard ingredient to ensure the salty taste of almost all dishes in the Greco-Roman world. In fact, in the recipe for suckling pigs, the physician strongly advises the reader

<sup>106</sup> ANTHIMUS, *De observatione ciborum*, 3 (CML VIII 1: 4, 16 – 5, 15); 4 (CML VIII 1: 5, 16 – 6, 5).

<sup>107</sup> ANTHIMUS, *De observatione ciborum*, 54 (CML VIII 1: 21, 10 – 22, 3); 64 (CML VIII 1: 23, 13 – 24, 12); 76 (CML VIII 1: 27, 12 – 28, 11).

<sup>108</sup> ANTHIMUS, *De observatione ciborum*, 3 (CML VIII 1: 5, 3); 10 (CML VIII 1: 7, 11); 52 (CML VIII 1: 21, 7); 58 (CML VIII 1: 23, 2); 67 (CML VIII 1: 25, 5–6).

<sup>109</sup> Cf. A. DALBY, *Food...*, p. 343.

<sup>110</sup> Olive oil was not listed in only two out of thirteen recipes, cf. APICIUS, *De re coquinaria*, VIII, 8, 3, p. 278; VIII, 8, 9, p. 282.

<sup>111</sup> ANTHIMUS, *De observatione ciborum*, 21 (CML VIII 1: 11, 7); 42 (CML VIII 1: 19, 1); 45 (CML VIII 1: 19, 11); 52 (CML VIII 1: 21, 6); 54 (CML VIII 1: 22, 2); 56 (CML VIII 1: 22, 8); 65 (CML VIII 1: 24, 13); 66 (CML VIII 1: 24, 16); 67 (CML VIII 1: 25, 9).

<sup>112</sup> ANTHIMUS, *De observatione ciborum*, 14 (CML VIII 1: 9, 5–6). Another passage which suggests the lack of common access to olive oil is Anthimus' passage on *oxygala/melca*, cf. ANTHIMUS, *De observatione ciborum*, 78 (CML VIII 1: 29, 6–7). Conclusions analogous to those mentioned above can also be drawn from the writings by Gregory of Tours, where he often lists various kinds of foodstuffs typical of northern Gaul. Since the bishop seldom mentions olives, we may assume that they were a rare delicacy in the northern parts of *Regnum Francorum* (cf. P. PÉRIN, *Landscape and Material Culture of Gaul in the Times of Gregory of Tours According to Archaeology*, [in:] *A Companion to Gregory of Tours*, ed. A. C. MURRAY, Leiden–Boston 2015 [= BCCT, 63], p. 268). In all probability, olives as well as olive oil, were imported to Metz from southern Gaul, where olive trees were cultivated, cf. M. DECKER, *Olives...*, p. 1099.

against this ingredient, recommending salt instead<sup>113</sup>. Therefore, it seems quite likely that he would use the latter to add flavour to the discussed *iuscellum*.

In all probability, his *iuscellum* would also contain some vegetables and herbs to enhance the aroma and flavour of the dish. On the basis of the information in the analysed medical treatise, we can presume that these included celery, coriander, dill, and leek, since Anthimus considered them to be the best ingredients for preparing stocks<sup>114</sup>. What further increases the probability of their use in the recipe for hare meat is the fact that, except for celery, they were all listed in the aforementioned recipes from *De re coquinaria*. However, we should not exclude the use of celery since it was mentioned among the ingredients of the *iuscellum* described in *De observatione ciborum* which the physician recommended for stewing beef. From the same recipe, we also learn that the dish was spiced with fennel and pennyroyal. When we take into account the similar properties of both types of meat, we can presume that Anthimus would also consider the said ingredients as suitable for hare meat.

Finally, we should address the type of vessel and heat treatment that may have been recommended for cooking hare meat. In his work, the physician seldom mentions the type of pots to be used to prepare individual dishes, and on those rare occasions when the data appeared in his texts, it most often referred to a vessel called *olla*<sup>115</sup>. This is mentioned, for instance, in a recipe for beef together with a pot named *bucular*, which is significant for our deliberations, since

<sup>113</sup> ANTHIMUS, *De observatione ciborum*, 9 (CML VIII 1: 7, 5–7). ANTHIMUS (*De observatione ciborum*, 34 [CML VIII 1: 16, 6]) recommends fish sauce in only one recipe, and even then he opts for its diluted variant (*egrogarium*). Cf. C. DEROUX, *La digestion...*, p. 409–410; IDEM, *Tradition...*, p. 176–177; IDEM, *Anthime, un médecin...*, p. 1117–1119.

<sup>114</sup> ANTHIMUS, *De observatione ciborum*, 55 (CML VIII 1: 22, 4–5).

<sup>115</sup> Cf. ANTHIMUS, *De observatione ciborum*, 3 (CML VIII 1: 5, 7; 5, 12; 5, 15); 70 (CML VIII 1: 26, 5); 75 (CML VIII 1: 27, 8). One should note that ANTHIMUS equally often mentions a pot called *vas*, cf. *De observatione ciborum*, 10 (CML VIII 1: 7, 12); 76 (CML VIII 1: 28, 7); 83 (CML VIII 1: 30, 11). Kenneth Douglas WHITE (*Farm Equipment of the Roman World*, Cambridge–London–New York–Melbourne 2010, p. 203–204) thinks that the latter word is a generic term, which was used for various sorts of containers, hence it does not define any particular type of pot. Probably, that is why Andrew James DONNELLY (*Cooking Pots in Ancient and Late Antique Cookbooks*, [in:] *Ceramics, Cuisine and Culture. The Archaeology and Science of Kitchen Pottery in the Ancient Mediterranean World*, ed. M. SPATARO, A. VILLING, Oxford–Philadelphia 2015, p. 145) argues that Anthimus uses the words *olla* and *vas* interchangeably. In *De observatione ciborum* we can find more terms referring to vessels: *bucular* (ANTHIMUS, *De observatione ciborum*, 3 [CML VIII 1: 5, 14]), *gavata* (ANTHIMUS, *De observatione ciborum*, 34 [CML VIII 1: 16, 6–7]). What is more, a recipe for beef (ANTHIMUS, *De observatione ciborum*, 3 [CML VIII 1: 4, 16]) also contains the word *sodinga*, which has been discussed by researchers analysing Anthimus' treatise for many years. Some experts believe that it refers to a vessel for stewing meat. This is, however, one possible interpretation, as others argue the word may, for instance, describe meat stock. On the subject, for instance, cf. M. CAPARRINI, *Per un approfondimento dei germanismi dell'Epistula Anthimi de observatione ciborum: bridum/spiss, sodinga/prue*, LFi 29, 2009, p. 187–188.

the context in which the two vessels appear allows us to capture an important difference between them. From the sentence where the physician argues that the reader should use an earthen pot called *olla*, instead of *bucular* ([...] *et in bucculare non coquat, sed in olla fictile* [...])<sup>116</sup>, we can conclude that *bucular* was made of metal. In addition, the chapter that recommends boiling milk in an *olla* not made from bronze ([...] *in olla tamen, nam non aeramen*)<sup>117</sup> enables us to presume that *ollae* may also have been made of bronze. The last passage, together with the recipe for beef<sup>118</sup>, suggests that the noun *olla* without a modifier was understood as a vessel made of clay, which indicates that this was the most common material from which *ollae* were produced.

When we analyse these passages, it becomes clear that earthenware vessels proved more suitable than metal ones for certain dishes. We must note that Anthimus recommended their use for boiling milk<sup>119</sup>, quinces<sup>120</sup> and sauces based on vinegar<sup>121</sup>. Importantly, the mentioned foodstuffs, with the exception of milk<sup>122</sup>, were characterised by a higher or a lower level of acidity. Therefore, if we assume that hare meat was stewed with some vinegar, we should conclude that it was also advisable to use an earthenware *olla* for the purpose.

Although in the analysed recipe Anthimus does not provide us with any data on how the dish should be heated, we may presume that, analogously to the method described in the chapter devoted to beef, it ought to be stewed over a low heat (*lento foco*). One might suggest that the vessel was put on a tripod or gridiron<sup>123</sup>. As both items kept the pot at a safe distance from the flames and prevented its contents from burning, the food would have needed to be heat processed for a longer time, which also corresponds with Anthimus' recommendations concerning the preparation of meat dishes. Moreover, the said method guaranteed that the meat would keep its natural moisture.

<sup>116</sup> ANTHIMUS, *De observatione ciborum*, 3 (CML VIII 1: 5, 14–15).

<sup>117</sup> ANTHIMUS, *De observatione ciborum*, 75 (CML VIII 1: 27, 8). Perhaps *bucular* was also made of bronze.

<sup>118</sup> [...] *agetando ipsa olla* [...] (ANTHIMUS, *De observatione ciborum*, 3 [CML VIII 1: 5, 7]) versus [...] *et in bucculare non coquat, sed in olla fictile meliorem saporem facit* (ANTHIMUS, *De observatione ciborum*, 3 [CML VIII 1: 5, 14–15]).

<sup>119</sup> ANTHIMUS, *De observatione ciborum*, 75 (CML VIII 1: 27, 8).

<sup>120</sup> ANTHIMUS, *De observatione ciborum*, 83 (CML VIII 1: 30, 11).

<sup>121</sup> ANTHIMUS, *De observatione ciborum*, 3 (CML VIII 1: 5, 3–15); 10 (CML VIII 1: 7, 10–13).

<sup>122</sup> According to the second part of the recipe, milk, together with bread pieces, should be heated up slowly in a vessel placed on charcoals. This technique fully justifies the use of the earthenware pot, as its surface takes longer to warm up and the heat is more evenly distributed than in a metal vessel. It also means that the dish can gradually be heated to the desired temperature and there is no risk of quick burning.

<sup>123</sup> Cf. J.P. ALCOCK, *Food in the Ancient World*, Westport CT–London 2006, p. 106; C. GROCOCK, S. GRAINGER, *Introduction*, [in:] *Apicius. A Critical Edition with an Introduction and an English Translation of the Latin Recipe text Apicius*, ed. EIDEM, Blackawton–Totnes 2006, p. 79.

In conclusion, we may state that even though the analysed recipe does not contain abundant details on the culinary techniques applied, it still allows us to perform a hypothetical reconstruction of the main principles of cooking hare meat when compared with other passages from *De observatione ciborum* and other source texts. The technique of heat processing proposed in the present study is justified from the perspective of dietetics.

Despite its brevity, the recipe also reveals some information on both, Anthimus' medical competences and the target reader's social standing. As for the former, the physician's qualifications in the field of pharmacology and dietetics are confirmed by the content of his treatise. Firstly, he was aware of hare meat's desiccative properties, and thus he employed it as a medicine in the treatment of dysentery, which required eliminating the excessive amount of moisture from the patient's body. This example clearly shows that Anthimus knew the meat's dietetic characteristics; characteristics which had evolved from the times of *De diaeta* and were finally shaped by Galen. Furthermore, the author recommends the meat of young animals in the analysed fragment as well as passages discussing other types of meat. The passage is not only evidence of his familiarity with the principles of *ars coquinaria*, but it also indicates that he followed the teachings of Greek dietetics, clearly recommending that the foodstuff in question (when compared to meat of older animals) should be neither excessively dry nor tough, and therefore less likely to contribute to the formation of melancholic juices. If so, we can surmise that an analogical way of reasoning is also present in other passages of *De observatione ciborum*, and formulate a hypothesis that the terms *recentior* (used in reference to the meat of boars<sup>124</sup> and pigs<sup>125</sup>) and *tenerior* (used in reference to the meat of oxen<sup>126</sup> and ducks<sup>127</sup>) have a similar meaning as the word *novellus* in the entry on the hare<sup>128</sup>. Namely, they do not relate directly to the freshness<sup>129</sup> or tenderness<sup>130</sup> of the said foods, as suggested by Mark Grant in his translation, but they are a reference to the dietary principle which considers younger animals to be a better foodstuff in terms of their dietetic qualities.

What demonstrates the high social standing of the target reader is the fact that the recipe requires the use of wild game, since only the rich could fully enjoy the luxury of hunting, in terms of time and money. And even if, they did not participate

<sup>124</sup> ANTHIMUS, *De observatione ciborum*, 8 (CML VIII 1: 6, 13).

<sup>125</sup> ANTHIMUS, *De observatione ciborum*, 9 (CML VIII 1: 7, 1–2).

<sup>126</sup> Cf. note 73.

<sup>127</sup> ANTHIMUS, *De observatione ciborum*, 32 (CML VIII 1: 15, 10).

<sup>128</sup> Analogous conclusion was made by DEROUX (*Anthimus, De obs. cib. 32 (p. 15, 1. 10–11 Liechtenhan): un texte correctement établi, mais en apparence se*, L 65.4, 2006, p. 1011) in his deliberations on *anantes teneriores*. Interestingly, in the Chapter 20 Grant also associates the adjective *tener* with the age of an animal, as he translates the phrase *vacca tenera venter* as “calf belly” (ANTHIMUS, *On the Observance...*, 20, p. 57).

<sup>129</sup> ANTHIMUS, *On the Observance...*, 8, p. 53 (Grant); 9, p. 53 (Grant).

<sup>130</sup> ANTHIMUS, *On the Observance...*, 11, p. 55 (Grant); 32, p. 63 (Grant).

in this form of pastime, they would have had enough spending power to purchase game. Another argument that speaks for the fact that the recipe was aimed at a wealthy reader is the passage [...] *si novellae* [...], which indicates that the addressee had the possibility to choose between the meat of younger and older animals. Lastly, the recipe lists a range of exotic ingredients for the sauce to be served with the meat, which is another indicator of the intended reader's high status.

## Bibliography

### Primary Sources

- Aetii Amideni Libri medicinales I–IV*, ed. A. OLIVIERI, Leipzig–Berlin 1935 [= *Corpus Medicorum Graecorum*, 8.1].
- Anthimi De observatione ciborum ad Theodoricum regem Francorum epistula*, ed., trans. E. LIECHTENHAN, Berlin 1963 [= *Corpus Medicorum Latinorum*, 8.1].
- ANTHIMUS, *On the Observance of Foods. De observatione ciborum*, ed., trans. M. GRANT, Blackawton–Totnes 2007.
- Apicius. A Critical Edition with an Introduction and an English Translation of the Latin Recipe text Apicius*, ed. Ch. GROCOCK, S. GRAINGER, Blackawton–Totnes 2006.
- Archestratos of Gela. Greek Culture and Cuisine in the Fourth Century BCE*, text, trans., comm. S.D. OLSON, A. SENS, Oxford–New York 2000.
- ATHENAEUS, *The Learned Banqueters*, vol. IV, *Books 8–10.420e*, ed., trans. S.D. OLSON, Cambridge Mass.–London 2008 [= *Loeb Classical Library*, 235], [https://doi.org/10.4159/DLCL.atheneus\\_grammarians-learned\\_banqueters.2007](https://doi.org/10.4159/DLCL.atheneus_grammarians-learned_banqueters.2007)
- Epistula Anthimi viri inlustris comitis et legatarii ad gloriosissimum Theudericum regem Francorum (de observatione ciborum)*, [in:] *Anecdota graeca et graecolatina. Mitteilungen aus Handschriften zur Geschichte der griechischen Wissenschaft*, vol. II, ed. V. ROSE, Berlin 1870, p. 63–98.
- Galen De alimentorum facultatibus libri III*, ed. G. HELMREICH, Leipzig–Berlin 1923 [= *Corpus Medicorum Graecorum*, 5.4.2], p. 200–386.
- Galen De victu attenuante*, ed. K. KALBFLEISCH, Leipzig–Berlin 1923 [= *Corpus Medicorum Graecorum*, 5.4.2], p. 432–451.
- Galen In Hippocratis De natura hominis commentaria III*, ed. J. MEWALDT, Leipzig–Berlin 1914 [= *Corpus Medicorum Graecorum*, 5.9.1].
- Galen In Hippocratis Prorrheticum I commentaria III*, ed. H. DIELS, Leipzig–Berlin 1915 [= *Corpus Medicorum Graecorum*, 5.9.2], p. 1–179.
- Hippocratis De diaeta*, ed., trans., comm. R. JOLY, S. BYL, Berlin 2003 [= *Corpus Medicorum Graecorum*, 1.2.4].
- HOMERUS, *Odyssea*, rec. M.L. WEST, Berlin–Boston 2017 [= *Bibliotheca scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana*], <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110420234>
- Il calendario dietetico di Ierofilo*, ed. R. ROMANO, “Atti dell'Accademia Pontaniana” n.s. 47, 1999, p. 197–222.

- LUCIUS JUNIUS MODERATUS COLUMELLA, *On Agriculture*, vol. II, Books 5–9, rec., trans. E.S. FORSTER, E.H. HEFFNER, London–Cambridge Mass. 1954 [= Loeb Classical Library, 408].
- MALCHUS OF PHILADELPHIA, *Exc. de Leg. Gent.*, [in:] *The Fragmentary Classicising Historians of the Later Roman Empire: Eunapius, Olympiodorus, Priscus and Malchus. Text, Translation, and Historiographical Notes*, vol. II, ed., trans. R.C. BLOCKLEY, Liverpool 1983, p. 402–462.
- MICHAEL PSELLUS, *Chronographie ou histoire d'un siècle de Byzance (976–1077)*, vol. II, ed., trans. É. RENAULD, Paris 1928.
- Oribasii Collectionum medicarum reliquiae: Libri I–VIII*, ed. I. RAEDER, Leipzig–Berlin 1928 [= Corpus Medicorum Graecorum, 6.1.1].
- Oribasii Libri ad Eunapium*, [in:] *Oribasii Synopsis ad Eustathium filium et libri ad Eunapium*, ed. I. RAEDER, Leipzig 1926 [= Corpus Medicorum Graecorum, 6.3], p. 317–498.
- Paulus Aegineta. Libri I–IV*, ed. J.L. HEIBERG, Leipzig–Berlin 1921 [= Corpus Medicorum Graecorum, 9.1].
- Simeonis Sethi Syntagma de alimentorum facultatibus*, ed. B. LANGKAVEL, Leipzig 1868 [= Bibliotheca scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana].
- Theopanis Chronographia*, vol. I, ed. C. DE BOOR, Leipzig 1883.
- VARRO, *De re rustica*, [in:] MARCUS PORCIUS CATO, *On Agriculture*, MARCUS TERENTIUS VARRO, *On Agriculture*, trans. W.D. HOOPER, rev. H.B. ASH, Cambridge Mass.–London 1934 [= Loeb Classical Library, 283], p. 159–529, <https://doi.org/10.4159/DLCL.varro-agriculture.1934>

## Secondary Literature

- ADAMS J.N., *Bilingualism and the Latin Language*, Cambridge 2004, <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511482960>
- ADAMSON M.W., *Food in Medieval Times*, Westport CT–London 2004.
- ALCOCK J.P., *Food in the Ancient World*, Westport CT–London 2006.
- ANAGNOSTAKIS I., “The Raw and the Cooked”: *Ways of Cooking and Serving Food in Byzantium*, [in:] *Flavours and Delights. Tastes and Pleasures of Ancient and Byzantine Cuisine*, ed. I. ANAGNOSTAKIS, Athens 2013, p. 175–181.
- BAADER G., *Early Medieval Latin Adaptations of Byzantine Medicine in Western Europe*, “Dumbarton Oaks Papers” 38, 1984, p. 251–259, <https://doi.org/10.2307/1291509>
- BALDWIN B., *Malchus of Philadelphia*, “Dumbarton Oaks Papers” 31, 1977, p. 91–107, <https://doi.org/10.2307/1291404>
- CAPARRINI M., *Per un approfondimento dei germanismi dell'Epistula Anthimi de observatione ciborum: bridum/spis, sodinga/prue*, “Linguistica e Filologia” 29, 2009, p. 179–196.
- CASEAU B., *Dogs, Vultures, Horses and Black Pudding: Unclean Meats in the Eyes of the Byzantines*, [in:] *Multidisciplinary Approaches to Food and Foodways in the Medieval Eastern Mediterranean*, ed. S.Y. WAKSMAN, Lyon 2020, p. 229–237, <https://doi.org/10.4000/books.momeditions.10194>
- CASEAU B., *Nourritures terrestres, nourritures célestes. La culture alimentaire à Byzance*, Paris 2015.
- CASEAU B., *Quelques réflexions sur les interdits alimentaires dans le christianisme byzantin*, [in:] *Religion et interdits alimentaires. Archeozoologie et sources littéraire*, ed. B. CASEAU, H. MONCHOT [= Orient & Mediterranée, 38], p. 99–110 (forthcoming).
- DALBY A., *Food in the Ancient World from A to Z*, London–New York 2003.

- DALBY A., *Tastes of Byzantium. The Cuisine of a Legendary Empire*, London–New York 2010.
- DALBY A., GRAINGER S., *The Classical Cookbook*, London 2000.
- DECKER M., *Garum and Salsamenta*, [in:] *The Oxford Dictionary of Late Antiquity*, ed. O. NICHOLSON, Oxford 2018, p. 642.
- DECKER M., *Olives and Olive Oil*, [in:] *The Oxford Dictionary of Late Antiquity*, ed. O. NICHOLSON, Oxford 2018, p. 1098–1099.
- DECKER M., *Wine and Wine Trade*, [in:] *The Oxford Dictionary of Late Antiquity*, ed. O. NICHOLSON, Oxford 2018, p. 1591–1592.
- DELACENSERIE E., *Le traité de diététique de Hiérophile: Analyse interne*, “Byzantion” 84, 2014, p. 81–103.
- DEROUX C., *Anthime et les tourterelles: un cas d’intoxication alimentaire au très haut moyen âge*, [in:] *Maladie et maladies dans les textes latins antiques et médiévaux. Actes du V<sup>e</sup> Colloque international «Textes médicaux latins» (Bruxelles, 4–6 septembre 1995)*, ed. C. DEROUX, Bruxelles 1998 [= Collection Latomus, 242], p. 366–381.
- DEROUX C., *Anthime, un médecin gourmet du début des temps mérovingiens*, “Revue Belge de Philologie et d’Histoire” 80.4, 2002, p. 1107–1124, <https://doi.org/10.3406/rbph.2002.4663>
- DEROUX C., *Anthimus, De obs. cib. 32 (p. 15, l. 10–11 Liechtenhan): un texte correctement établi, mais en apparence se*, “Latomus” 65.4, 2006, p. 1009–1011.
- DEROUX C., *Des traces inconnues de la “Diététique” d’Anthime dans un manuscrit du Vatican (“Reg. Lat. 1004”)*, “Latomus” 33.3, 1974, p. 680–687.
- DEROUX C., *Garlic, Dropsy, and Anthimus’s Aquae diuersae (De obseruatione ciborum, LXI)*, [in:] *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History*, vol. V, ed. C. DEROUX, Bruxelles 1989 [= Collection Latomus, 206], p. 508–515.
- DEROUX C., *La digestion dans la Diététique d’Anthimus: langage, mythe et réalités*, [in:] *Le latin médical. La constitution d’un langage scientifique. Réalités et langage de la médecine dans le monde romain. Actes du III<sup>e</sup> Colloque international «Textes médicaux latins antiques» (Saint-Étienne, 11–13 septembre 1989)*, ed. G. SABBAH, Saint-Étienne 1991, p. 407–416.
- DEROUX C., *Tradition et innovation dans la Diététique d’Anthime*, [in:] *Tradición e innovación de la medicina latina de la antigüedad y de la alta edad media. Actas del IV Coloquio Internacional sobre los «textos médicos latinos antiguos»*, ed. M.E. VÁZQUEZ BUJÁN, Santiago de Compostela 1994, p. 171–182.
- DONNELLY A.J., *Cooking Pots in Ancient and Late Antique Cookbooks*, [in:] *Ceramics, Cuisine and Culture. The Archaeology and Science of Kitchen Pottery in the Ancient Mediterranean World*, ed. M. SPATARO, A. VILLING, Oxford–Philadelphia 2015, p. 141–147.
- EFFROS B., *Creating Community with Food and Drink in Merovingian Gaul*, New York–Basingstoke 2002 [= *The New Middle Ages*], <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-349-62577-2>
- GRAINGER S., *The Myth of Apicius*, “Gastronomica” 7.2, 2007, p. 71–77, <https://doi.org/10.1525/gfc.2007.7.2.71>
- GRANT M., *Commentary on Book 4 of Oribasius’ Medical Compilations*, [in:] *Dieting for an Emperor. A Translation of Books 1 and 4 of Orinasius’ Medical Compilations*, ed., praef., comm. M. GRANT, Leiden–New York–Köln 1997 [= *Studies in Ancient Medicine*, 15], p. 255–325, [https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004377424\\_006](https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004377424_006)
- GRANT M., *Introduction*, [in:] ANTHIMUS, *On the Observance of Foods. De obseruatione ciborum*, ed., trans. M. GRANT, Blackawton–Totnes 2007, p. 9–44.

- GRANT M., *Introduction*, [in:] *Dieting for an Emperor. A Translation of Books 1 and 4 of Orinasius' Medical Compilations*, ed., peaeaf., comm. M. GRANT, Leiden–New York–Köln 1997 [= *Studies in Ancient Medicine*, 15], p. 1–22, <https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004377424>
- GRANT M., *Roman Cookery. Ancient Recipes for Modern Kitchens*, London 2002.
- GROCOCK C., GRAINGER S., *Introduction*, [in:] *Apicius. A Critical Edition with an Introduction and an English Translation of the Latin Recipe text Apicius*, ed. C. GROCOCK, S. GRAINGER, Blackawton–Totnes 2006, p. 13–123.
- HANKINSON R.J., *Galen of Pergamon (155–215 CE)*, [in:] *The Encyclopedia of Ancient Natural Scientists. The Greek Tradition and its Many Heirs*, ed. P.T. KEYSER, G. IRBY-MASSIE, London–New York 2008, p. 335–399.
- HEN Y., *Food and Drink in Merovingian Gaul*, [in:] *Tätigkeitsfelder und Erfahrungshorizonte des ländlichen Menschen in der frühmittelalterlichen Grundherrschaft (bis ca. 1000). Festschrift für Dieter Hägermann zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. B. KASTEN, München 2006, p. 99–110.
- JOUANNA J., *Dietetics in Hippocratic Medicine: Definition, Main Problems, Discussion*, [in:] *Greek Medicine from Hippocrates to Galen. Selected Papers by Jacques Jouanna*, trans. N. ALLIES, ed. Ph. VAN DER EIJK, Leiden–Boston 2012 [= *Studies in Ancient Medicine*, 40], p. 137–153, [https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004232549\\_009](https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004232549_009)
- KARPOZILOS A., NESBITT J.W., CUTLER A., *Hunting*, [in:] *The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, vol. II, ed. A.P. KAZHDAN, New York–Oxford 1991, p. 958.
- KISLINGER E., *Anthimus*, [in:] *Antike Medizin. Ein Lexikon*, ed. K.-H. LEVEN, München 2005, col. 56.
- KODER J., *Cuisine and Dining in Byzantium*, [in:] *Byzantine Culture, Papers from the Conference 'Byzantine Days of Istanbul' Held on the Occasion of Istanbul being European Cultural Capital 2010, Istanbul, May 21–23 2010*, ed. D. SAKEL, Ankara 2014, p. 423–438.
- KODER J., *Die Byzantiner. Kultur und Alltag im Mittelalter*, Wien–Köln–Weimar 2016, <https://doi.org/10.7767/9783205204527>
- KODER J., *Stew and Salted Meat – Opulent Normality in the Diet of Every Day?*, [in:] *Eat, Drink, and Be Merry (Luke 12:19) – Food and Wine in Byzantium Papers of the 37<sup>th</sup> Annual Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, in Honour of Professor A.A.M. Bryer*, ed. L. BRUBAKER, K. LINARDOU, Aldershot–Burlington VT 2007, p. 59–72.
- KOKOSZKO M., *Anthimus and his Work, or On Aromatics and Wildfowl in De observatione ciborum*, “*Symbolae Philologorum Posnaniensium*” 31.2, 2021, p. 59–95, <https://doi.org/10.14746/sppgl.2021.XXXI.2.7>
- KOKOSZKO M., *Anthimus the Dietician*, “*Almanach Historyczny*” 23.1, 2021, p. 11–37.
- KOKOSZKO M., *On Anthimus and his Work*, “*Vox Patrum*” 81, 2022, p. 65–90, <https://doi.org/10.31743/vp.12625>
- KOKOSZKO M., JAGUSIAK K., RZEŹNICKA Z., *Dietetyka i sztuka kulinarna antyku i wczesnego Bizancjum (II–VII w.)*, część I, *Zboża i produkty zbożowe w źródłach medycznych antyku i wczesnego Bizancjum (II–VII w.)*, Łódź 2014 [= *Byzantina Lodziensia*, 16].
- KOKOSZKO M., JAGUSIAK K., RZEŹNICKA Z., *Rice as Food and Medication in Ancient and Byzantine Medical Literature*, “*Byzantinische Zeitschrift*” 108.1, 2015, p. 129–156, <https://doi.org/10.1515/bz-2015-0007>
- KROLL H., *Animals in the Byzantine Empire: An Overview of the Archaeozoological Evidence*, “*Archeologia Medievale*” 39, 2012, p. 93–121.



- KROLL H., *Tiere im Byzantinischen Reich. Archäozoologische Forschungen im Überblick*, Mainz 2010 [= Monographien des Römisch-Germanischen Zentralmuseums, 87].
- LEONTSINĒ M., *Diatrofikés synétheies kai ygeía: Parateréseis gia te diatrofé me dzoiká lípe stis byzantinés diaitetikés pragmateíes (7<sup>os</sup>–12<sup>os</sup> ai.)*, [in:] *Iatriké therapeía ésti mén pou kai sómatos, ésti d'ára kai psychés: Ópseis tes Iatrikés sto Byzántio (14 Dekembriou 2018, Istorikó Archeío tou Panepistemiou Athenón)* PRAKTIKA, ed. K. NIKOLAOU, K. GARDIKA, Athens 2021, p. 41–68.
- LEONTSINI M., *Hens, Cockerels and other Choice Fowl. Everyday Food and Gastronomic Pretensions in Byzantium*, [in:] *Flavours and Delights. Tastes and Pleasures of Ancient and Byzantine Cuisine*, ed. I. ANAGNOSTAKIS, Athens 2013, p. 113–131.
- LIECHTENHAN E., *Ad lectorem praefatio*, [in:] *Anthimi De observatione ciborum ad Theodoricum regem Francorum epistula*, ed., trans. E. LIECHTENHAN, Berlin 1963 [= Corpus Medicorum Latinorum, 8.1], p. IX–XX.
- LINDSAY H., *Who was Apicius?*, “Symbolae Osloenses” 72.1, 1997, p. 144–154, <https://doi.org/10.1080/00397679708590926>
- LONIE I.M., *A Structural Pattern in Greek Dietetics and the Early History of Greek Medicine*, “Medical History” 21, 1977, p. 235–260, <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0025727300038242>
- MARTINDALE J.R., *The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire*, vol. II, 395–527, Cambridge–London–New York–New Rochelle–Melbourne–Sydney 1980.
- ONAR V., *Animals in Food Consumption during the Byzantine Period in Light of the Yenikapı Metro and Marmaray Excavations, Istanbul*, [in:] *Multidisciplinary Approaches to Food and Foodways in the Medieval Eastern Mediterranean*, ed. S.Y. WAKSMAN, Lyon 2020, p. 331–342, <https://doi.org/10.4000/books.momeditions.10229>
- ONAR V., PAZVANT G., ALPAK H., GEZER İNCE N., ARMUTAK A., KIZILTAN Z.S., *Animal Skeletal Remains of the Theodosius Harbor: General Overview*, “Turkish Journal of Veterinary and Animal Sciences” 37, 2013, p. 81–85, <https://doi.org/10.3906/vet-1111-7>
- PÉRIN P., *Landscape and Material Culture of Gaul in the Times of Gregory of Tours According to Archaeology*, [in:] *A Companion to Gregory of Tours*, ed. A.C. MURRAY, Leiden–Boston 2015 [= Brill's Companions to the Christian Tradition, 63], p. 256–277, [https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004307001\\_010](https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004307001_010)
- PLOUVIER L., *L'alimentation carnée au Haut Moyen Âge d'après le De observatione ciborum d'Anthime et les Excerpta de Vinidarius*, “Revue Belge de Philologie et d'Histoire” 80.4, 2002, p. 1357–1369, <https://doi.org/10.3406/rbph.2002.4672>
- PORMANN P.E., *Paulos of Aigina (ca 630–670 CE?)*, [in:] *The Encyclopedia of Ancient Natural Scientists. The Greek Tradition and its Many Heirs*, ed. P.T. KEYSER, G. IRBY-MASSIE, London–New York 2008, p. 629.
- ROSE V., *Die Diätetik des Anthimus an Theuderich König der Franken*, [in:] *Anecdota graeca et graecolatina. Mitteilungen aus Handschriften zur Geschichte der griechischen Wissenschaft*, vol. II, ed. V. ROSE, Berlin 1870, p. 43–62.
- ROSE V., *Praefatio*, [in:] *Anthimi De observatione ciborum epistula ad Theodoricum regem Francorum*, ed. V. ROSE, Leipzig 1877, p. 3.
- ROTELLI F., *Trade and Exploration*, [in:] *A Cultural History of Plants in the Post-Classical Era*, vol. II, ed. A. TOUWAIDE, London–New York–Oxford–New Delhi–Sydney 2022, p. 59–77.

- RZEŹNICKA Z., *Rola mięsa w okresie pomiędzy II a VII w. w świetle źródeł medycznych*, [in:] *Dietetyka i sztuka kulinarna antyku i wczesnego Bizancjum (II–VII w.)*, część II, *Pokarm dla ciała i ducha*, ed. M. KOKOSZKO, Łódź 2014 [= *Byzantina Lodziensia*, 19], p. 213–447.
- SCARBOROUGH J., *Aëtios of Amida (500–550 CE)*, [in:] *The Encyclopedia of Ancient Natural Scientists. The Greek Tradition and its Many Heirs*, ed. P.T. KEYSER, G. IRBY-MASSIE, London–New York 2008, p. 38–39.
- SCARBOROUGH J., *Anthimus (of Constantinople?) (ca 475–525 CE)*, [in:] *The Encyclopedia of Ancient Natural Scientists. The Greek Tradition and its Many Heirs*, ed. P.T. KEYSER, G. IRBY-MASSIE, London–New York 2008, p. 91–92.
- SCARBOROUGH J., *Oreibasios of Pergamon (ca 350 – ca 400 CE)*, [in:] *The Encyclopedia of Ancient Natural Scientists. The Greek Tradition and its Many Heirs*, ed. P.T. KEYSER, G. IRBY-MASSIE, London–New York 2008, p. 595–596.
- SCARBOROUGH J., *Rufus of Ephesos (ca 70–100 CE)*, [in:] *The Encyclopedia of Ancient Natural Scientists. The Greek Tradition and its Many Heirs*, ed. P.T. KEYSER, G. IRBY-MASSIE, London–New York 2008, p. 720–721.
- SCHRODT B., *Sports of the Byzantine Empire*, “*Journal of Sport History*” 8.3, 1981, p. 40–59.
- ŠEVČENKO N.P., *Wild Animals in the Byzantine Park*, [in:] *Byzantine Garden Culture*, ed. A. LITTLEWOOD, H. MAGUIRE, J. WOLSCHKE-BULMAHN, Washington D.C. 2002, p. 69–86.
- SODINI J.-P., *Olives*, [in:] *Late Antiquity. A Guide to the Postclassical World*, ed. G.W. BOWERSOCK, P. BROWN, O. GRABAR, Cambridge Mass.–London 1999, p. 619–620.
- STEWART K.A., *Galen’s Theory of Black Bile. Hippocratic Tradition, Manipulation, Innovation*, Leiden–Boston 2019 [= *Studies in Ancient Medicine*, 51], <https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004382794>
- TOUWAIDE A., *Botany*, [in:] *A Companion to Byzantine Science*, ed. S. LAZARIS, Leiden–Boston 2020 [= *Brill’s Companions to the Byzantine World*, 6], p. 302–353, [https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004414617\\_011](https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004414617_011)
- TOUWAIDE A., *Medicine and Pharmacy*, [in:] *A Companion to Byzantine Science*, ed. S. LAZARIS, Leiden–Boston 2020 [= *Brill’s Companions to the Byzantine World*, 6], p. 354–403, [https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004414617\\_012](https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004414617_012)
- TOYNBEE J.M.C., *Animals in Roman Life and Art*, Barnsley 2013.
- VERA D., *Wine*, [in:] *Late Antiquity. A Guide to the Postclassical World*, ed. G.W. BOWERSOCK, P. BROWN, O. GRABAR, Cambridge Mass.–London 1999, p. 749.
- WHITE K.D., *Farm Equipment of the Roman World*, Cambridge–London–New York–Melbourne 2010.
- WILKINS J., *Dialogue and Comedy: The Structure of the Deipnosophistae*, [in:] *Athenaeus and his World. Reading Greek Culture in the Roman Empire*, ed. D. BRAUND, J. WILKINS, Exeter 2000, p. 23–37.
- WILKINS J.M., *Hippocratic Corpus, Regimen (ca 430–370 BCE)*, [in:] *The Encyclopedia of Ancient Natural Scientists. The Greek Tradition and its Many Heirs*, ed. P.T. KEYSER, G. IRBY-MASSIE, London–New York 2008, p. 416–417.
- YVINEC J.-H., BARME M., *Livestock and the Early Medieval Diet in Northern Gaul*, [in:] *The Oxford Handbook of the Merovingian World*, ed. B. EFFROS, I. MOREIRA, Oxford–New York 2020, p. 738–762, <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780190234188.013.42>
- ZUCKER A., *Zoology*, [in:] *A Companion to Byzantine Science*, ed. S. LAZARIS, Leiden–Boston 2020 [= *Brill’s Companions to the Byzantine World*, 6], p. 261–301, [https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004414617\\_010](https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004414617_010)

**Zofia Rzeźnicka**

Waldemar Ceran Research Centre for the History and Culture  
of the Mediterranean Area and South-East Europe  
ul. Matejki 32/38, sala 319  
90-237 Łódź, Polska/Poland  
zofia.rzeznicka@uni.lodz.pl



© by the author, licensee University of Lodz – Lodz University Press, Lodz, Poland. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license CC BY-NC-ND 4.0 (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>)

---