ANTHIMUS AND HIS WORK, OR ON AROMATICS AND WILDFOWL IN _DE OBSERVATIONE CIBORUM_

**Abstract.** Kokoszko Maciej, Anthimus and His Work, or on Aromatics and Wildfowl in _De observatione ciborum_ (Antimus i jego dzieło, czyli o aromatach i dzikim ptactwie w “De observatione ciborum”).

The present study focuses on select fragments of _De observatione ciborum_ only. It starts with Chapter 13 (describing preparation of hare), analysing exclusively the recipe for a sauce included therein as it illustrates accurately Anthimus’ world of knowledge, and gives an opportunity to supplement the list of ingredients of the delicacy. Subsequently, the analysis moves on to Chapters 25, and 26 of _De observatione ciborum_, which have some information on Anthimus’ medical practice and his creativity as a physician. The research is concluded with the contents of Chapter 33, which provide data on the place, where the work was composed.
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**INTRODUCTION**

_De observatione ciborum_, which was penned by an author whose name reads in Latin Anthimus and in Greek Ἄνθιμος, is a collection of culinary recipes (incorporating ample dietetic advice) addressed to Theuderich, ruler of the Franks (511–534 AD). It is likely to have been composed at the beginning of the 6th c. AD. The author of _De observatione ciborum_ is commonly agreed to have been a physician, mentioned by Malchus of Philadelphia (6th c. AD) in his “Byzantine history” (Βυζαντιακά). According to the historian, Anthimus, on a charge of plotting against emperor Zeno (474–491 AD), was exiled from Constantinople in 478 AD. The doctor’s later fate is dubious, though it is often maintained that Anthimus spent the rest (or at least a substantial fraction) of his life among the

---

1 The work was composed thanks to a scholarship granted by the The De Brzezie Lanckoronski Foundation to Maciej Kokoszko in 2017.

2 Circa 516 or 523 AD. – Grant 2007: 9–42, esp. 23–24. Grant considers the former date to be more likely. Cf. Scarborough 2008: 91.

barbaric Goths. During that period, he was dispatched by Theodoric the Great (471–526) on a diplomatic mission to Theuderic’s court, carrying his work as a gift to the Frankish ruler.\(^4\) In the year 2006, however, Yitzhak Hen undermined those conjectures, suggesting that the author of *De observatione ciborum*, after a short period of his stay with the Goths, returned from his exile between 491 and 497 AD to Constantinople, and was sent as an envoy to the Franks (at least twice) by Byzantine emperor Anastasius (491–518 AD). Last but not least, his work was said by Hen to have been commissioned by Theuderic himself.\(^5\)

*De observatione ciborum* is a compelling piece of medical literature as it can be researched into at different angles. For historians of medicine, the text shows the evolution of dietetics and *materia medica*.\(^6\) Food historians analyse the treatise as evidence testifying to the condition of Mediterranean cuisine in the 6\(^{th}\) c. AD,\(^7\) while philologists find it fascinating because it allows to explore the lexical richness and evolution of Latin.\(^8\) This paper delves into the data provided by Anthimus through the prism of a researcher in the field of medical thought, approaching *De observatione ciborum* as a collection of advice on nutrition principles, i.e., as a regimen based on the rules of dietetics.\(^9\) When Anthimus was compiling his treatise, this branch of medicine was already nearly 1000 years old, which explains why the rules of dietetics deeply permeate the text. The foundations of Greek dietetics are mentioned, for instance, in a sentence within the *proemium*, which explicitly attributes good health to an appropriate diet (“prima sanitas hominum in cibis congruis constat,”\(^10\)) and in an extract that describes the consequences of eating unsuitable foodstuffs, identifying them as the main reason behind disturbances of the process of digestion and absorption of food.\(^11\) These

---


\(^8\) The treatise is most commonly studied through the prism of its lexis, which often causes numerous interpretative difficulties. For instance, cf. Messing 1942: 150–158; Grant 1993: 377–379; Deroux 2015: 491–493 etc. Some researchers classify the lexis by its ethnic origin. Cf. Caparrini 2009: 179–196. Another interesting aspect of *De observatione ciborum* is the fact that the author was bilingual. Cf. Adams 2003: 496–497.

\(^9\) Thus, I share Plouvier’s (2002: 1358–1360) line of reasoning.

\(^10\) Anth., *Proemium*, 1, 8–9.

\(^11\) Anth., *Proemium*, 1, 9 – 2, 2.
statements are supplemented with the remark “si autem bene praeparati fuerint cibi, digestio bona et dulcis fiet, et humoris boni nutriuntur (...),”\textsuperscript{12} which explains the author’s interest in food preparation, i.e., culinary art. Anthimus’ dietetics (as well as dietetics in general) was connected with \textit{materia medica}, i.e. with a branch of medicine which focused on a corpus of knowledge on therapeutic substances, a large fraction of which were also foodstuffs. This is visible on almost every page of Anthimus’ text, e.g., in the extract where the author refers to dried figs,\textsuperscript{13} explicitly attributing them to a therapeutic effect in clearly specified treatments, e.g., early stages of rhinitis, sore throats, and dysphonia.

Nevertheless, \textit{De observatione ciborum} is not just an ordinary collection of practical advice on food preparation based on knowledge of the properties of various foodstuffs. The treatise also reveals a tendency to summarise the output of previous generations of physicians which is akin to that we can find in medical encyclopaedias by Oribasius (\textsuperscript{4th} c. AD),\textsuperscript{14} Aëtius of Amida (\textsuperscript{6th} c. AD), and Paul of Aegina (\textsuperscript{7th} c. AD).\textsuperscript{15} Simple though it is, the text by Anthimus is based on the acquisition of knowledge mastered by medical experts. Two statements that refer to this corpus of expertise – and thus, emphasise the competences of the author himself – can be already found in the introduction to \textit{De observatione ciborum}. First of all, Anthimus assures the reader that the substantive part of the treatise is a body of knowledge based on “praecpta auctorum medicinalium,”\textsuperscript{16} and next he reveals that the content was compiled “secundum praecepta diversorum auctorum.”\textsuperscript{17} Finally, we have references to this substantial theoretical base in the numerous chapters that provide more detailed information, including sections 23, 25, 26, 36, and 57.

As a consequence, the method of approach towards Anthimus’ output employed in the present article involves a close reading of ancient medical theories and is supposed to analyse his writing with an eye to re-constructing the physician’s professional competence. Subsequently, the article attempts to make use of purely medical data for the purpose of adding to the picture of Anthimus as a doctor, and at the same time it demonstrates how information included in his treatise can be profitably used to comment on a possible moment in time when the physician compiled his letter to Theuderic. For spatial and temporal constraints, the study focuses only on select fragments of \textit{De observatione ciborum}. It starts with Chapter 13 (describing preparation of hare), focusing exclusively on the

\textsuperscript{12} Anth., \textit{Proemium}, 2, 3–4.
\textsuperscript{13} Anth., 93, 33, 1–3.
\textsuperscript{16} Anth., \textit{Proemium}, 1, 6–7.
\textsuperscript{17} Anth., \textit{Proemium}, 4, 4–5.
sauce included therein. Short as it might seem, the recipe illustrates accurately Anthimus’ world of knowledge. Subsequently, the analysis moves on to Chapters 25 and 26 of De observatione ciborum, which have some information on Anthimus’ medical practice and his creativity as a practitioner. The research is concluded with the contents of Chapter 33, which provide data on the place, where the work was composed.

A SAUCE FOR HARE

We shall now examine an extract from Chapter 13 within De observatione ciborum, which discusses the preparation of a sauce for hare meat, and is worded as follows: “in dulci piper habentem, parum cariofilum et gingiber, costo et spicanardi vel folio.”¹⁸ Anthimus claims that hare should be consumed in dulci..., which – being slightly imprecise – suggests that the prepared meat of lepores novelli ought to be served with a sweet sauce aromatised with spices, to which Anthimus refers using the term iuscellum.¹⁹ What is more, the preposition in with the ablative case may imply that the served meat was either steeped in the sauce or meant to be dipped in it.²⁰ Whether the meat was also stewed in it, we do not know.

Since the recipe itself does not specify how the said dulce iuscellum was prepared, we may conclude that Anthimus chose not to provide any details in the recipe within Chapter 13 as the general principles of making meat sauces had been laid out previously – in Chapter 3 on serving beef.²¹ Presumably, the physician assumed that Theuderic’s cooks were familiar with the technicalities of the matter, and thus, he focused on key issues concerning the health of the Frankish king.

In the treatise, Anthimus lists three sweetening substances that could possibly have been used in the recipe, referring to them as dulcedines.²² These are “mel aut sapa vel carenum.”²³ As the author does not specify the type of honey as such, we may conclude that it was not necessary to select one type from among numerous kinds described in medical and agronomic literature by the properties imbued by its origins²⁴ (for instance, it did not have to be exclusively Attic honey, which is, preferably, made from thyme flowers that

---

¹⁸ Anth., 13, 5–6, p. 8.
¹⁹ Anth., 3, 5, 1; 4, 6, 1; 5, 6, 7; 10, 7, 8; 23, 12, 14; 24, 13, 2; 34, 16, 7.
²⁰ The second option was described in the chapter on serving piglets (lactantis/lactantes), namely ...intingendo in oximelli simplici... Cf. Anth., 10, 7, 10.
²¹ Anth., 3, 4, 16 – 5, 15. For the first time, Anthimus reveals that it is his tried and tested way of writing about things in the recipe for boar meat, where he refers to the data he had already included in the recipe for mutton: ...quomodo de uerbicinas indicauimus, cf. Anth., 8, 6, 15.
²² Anth., 3, 5, 6 (...dulcedinem...).
blossomed on Hymettus). While it is safe to say that *sapa* and *carenum* (or *caroenum*) were liquids in which food could be boiled or stewed, honey is either fluid or solid in consistency (when it crystallises). Although reversible, once honey has been exposed to a higher temperature, the process of re-liquefaction is not easy to control since the substance tends to caramelise rather quickly. Therefore, it is advisable to mix it with another liquid so that it can dissolve when heated up. The problem, however, did not bother ancient cooks, since – as we learn from Galen in the chapter on honey\(^{25}\) in *De alimentorum facultatibus* (2\(^{nd}/3\(^{rd}\) c. AD)\(^{26}\) – prior to use, honey was customarily dissolved in water and then boiled. The main purpose of the procedure was to eliminate its impurities, which – according to the contemporaneous theory of *materia medica* – changed the overall dietetic nature of honey by removing the characteristic sharpness, provoking the viscera to excrete (which, in turn, would impede the appropriate absorption of food).\(^{27}\) Accordingly, as a result of being processed in this way, honey always had an admixture of water, and thereby remained fluid.

The term *sapa* refers to reduced grape must,\(^{28}\) produced – according to Columella (1\(^{st}\) c. AD) – when it was heat-reduced to three quarters, two thirds, or even half of its initial volume.\(^{29}\) On the other hand, Pliny (1\(^{st}\) c. AD)\(^{30}\) and Palladius (4\(^{th}\) c. AD)\(^{31}\) accounted that must was customarily boiled down to one third of its original volume.\(^{32}\) Pliny added that such a product was called *siraeum* and *hepsema*\(^{33}\) (in Greek σίραιον\(^{34}\) or ἑψημα\(^{35}\) ). As for *carenum/caroenum*, Palladius maintained that the noun referred to must that had been reduced to two thirds of its initial volume,\(^{36}\) meaning it contained less sugar and more water than *sapa*. However, it is possible that it was not grape must, but reduced sweet wine, whose taste resembled οἶνος Καρύϊνος (dark, thick, and very sweet) produced in Lydia, often mentioned by Galen, and compared to σίραιον.\(^{37}\) Even though these terms are not precisely defined in the ancient

---


\(^{32}\) Pallad., XI, 18.


\(^{34}\) The term is used in numerous medical writings, cf. Dsc. *Eup.*, V, 6, 4, 4; Gal. *Vict.At.*, 88, 1 – 89, 1; Gal. *Alim.Fac.*, 503, 8, vol. 6 etc.

\(^{35}\) The term was used in the medical literature, cf. Dsc. *Eup.*, V, 6, 4, 4; Gal. *Alim.Fac.*, 503, 8, vol. 6; Gal. *Alim.Fac.*, 667, 10, vol. 6 etc.


literature, they undoubtedly referred to distinct syrups characterised by varied, but invariably high, concentrations of sugars, which made them all suitable for Anthimus’ recipe. Since we can conclude that both sapa and carenum/caroenum were commonly available for cooking, the physician must have known how they differed. Therefore, it was unnecessary for him to elaborate on something that was clearly obvious.

In addition, Anthimus’ recipe contained certain exotic spices: pepper (piper), cloves (cariofilum), ginger (gingiber), costus, also known as putchuk (costus), and, as Anthimus puts it, spicanardi vel folio.\(^\text{38}\) If we take into account analogical data in the recipe for beef, these ingredients were pounded in an earthenware mortar with the addition of small amounts of wine.\(^\text{39}\) Next, the ingredients were mixed with honey or sapa or carenum/caroenum.

Even though Anthimus never mentioned whether the sauce was to be prepared cold or heated, the technique – described in his recipe for oxymel\(^\text{40}\) within Chapter 10 (devoted to serving young pork),\(^\text{41}\) and Chapter 24 (on peacock meat)\(^\text{42}\) of De observatione ciborum – allows us to conclude that the meat sauces were usually made by boiling their ingredients. This cooking method is also implied by the fact that the heat treatment of sauces was remarked in the vast majority of the recipes for hare meat to be found in De re coquinaria (4\(^\text{th}\) c. AD),\(^\text{43}\) and specifically in recipes 1,\(^\text{44}\) 3,\(^\text{45}\) 4,\(^\text{46}\) 5,\(^\text{47}\) 6,\(^\text{48}\) 7,\(^\text{49}\) 9,\(^\text{50}\) 11,\(^\text{51}\) 12,\(^\text{52}\) and 13.\(^\text{53}\) Heating

\(^{38}\) Mark Grant stresses the fact that spices used to make the sauce were expensive rarities in 6\(^\text{th}\) century Gaul, cf. Grant 2007: 28.

\(^{39}\) ista omnia simul trita bene in mortario fictile addito vino modico... – Anth., 3, 5, 10–11.

\(^{40}\) Medical sources indicate that oxymel was obtained through boiling water, honey and vinegar until the decoction gained the appropriate consistency. Anthimus (10, 7, 11–12) describes the process as follows: “… duas partis de melle et una pars de aceto… coquat in vas fictile…” and yet, he never mentions water among its ingredients. Despite medical texts reporting numerous variants of the recipe, they all confirm Anthimus’ information that oxymel was prepared by heating its ingredients. Cf. Dsc. Eup., V, 14, 1, 1–4; Gal. San. Tu., 273, 11 – 274, 7, vol. 6; Orib. Coll. Med., V, 24, 9, 1 – 15, 3; Orib. Lib. Eunap., IV, 144, 4, 1 – 6, 2; Aët., IX, 24, 101–113. On oxymel, cf. Xpóvñ 2012: 272–278.

\(^{41}\) Anth., 10, 7, 8–13.

\(^{42}\) Anth., 24, 12, 17 – 13, 5.


\(^{44}\) Apic., VIII, 8, 1.

\(^{45}\) Apic., VIII, 8, 3.

\(^{46}\) Apic., VIII, 8, 4.

\(^{47}\) Apic., VIII, 8, 5.

\(^{48}\) Apic., VIII, 8, 6.

\(^{49}\) Apic., VIII, 8, 7.

\(^{50}\) Apic., VIII, 8, 9.

\(^{51}\) Apic., VIII, 8, 11.

\(^{52}\) Apic., VIII, 8, 12.

\(^{53}\) Apic., VIII, 8, 13.
was particularly important whenever the dish contained aromatic ingredients, since – as stated by Anthimus in his recipe for beef – cooks of that time were aware that higher temperatures brought out the aroma of spices added to the sauce.\(^{54}\)

Hare sauce contained pepper, which from the 6th/5th centuries BC was one of the most favoured spices in antiquity.\(^{55}\) Immensely popular, it had to be imported from distant lands (at that time called India), which translated into its high price. Pliny accounts that the most expensive long pepper was sold for 10–15 denarii per pound,\(^{56}\) while its white and black variants cost 7–10 and 4–10 denarii respectively.\(^{57}\) Just like other aromatic substances, pepper was listed in the edict De pretiis rerum venalium issued by emperor Diocletian, where a pound of pepper is said to have cost 800 denarii.\(^{58}\) Although we have no detailed data on the pricing of pepper in Anthimus’ times, the information provided in the history by Theophylact Simocatta\(^{59}\) (and later also in the chronicle by Theophanes the Confessor\(^{60}\)) which gives an account of the failed campaigns conducted by emperor Maurice against the Avars (when the Romans had to pay a tribute to the victorious barbarians in kind, including pepper, φυλλον Ἰνδικόν,\(^{61}\) cinnamon κασία, and costus [κόστος]\(^{62}\)), together with the inventory of the treasury of the Persian ruler Khosrow II (which was captured by emperor Heraclius’ troops in 627, and where the Romans found pepper and ginger\(^{63}\)), preserved by Theophanes the Confessor,\(^{64}\) clearly prove that the spice was still highly valued in the late 6th and the early 7th centuries AD. Undoubtedly, the barbarian Avars would never have accepted a tribute made up of agricultural produce if they had not regarded it at least as highly as precious metals. Analogically, the Persians would not have hoarded pepper and ginger if they had not considered them luxury goods. In addition, the two pieces of information would not be preserved in the works by Byzantine historians if Theophylact (6th/7th c. AD) and Theophanes (early 9th c. AD) had not recognised them as noteworthy and prestigious commodities. Therefore, both the history written by Theophylact and

\(^{54}\) ista omnia trita ...mittis in ollam... ut antequam tollatur de foco, modicum sentiam et remittat in ius virtutem suam – Anth., 3, 5, 10–13.


\(^{56}\) One pound = 327 g.


\(^{58}\) Edict. Dioclet., 36, 114 (Lauffer); 34, 67 (Reynolds).

\(^{59}\) Theophyl. Sim., VII, 13, 6, 1–4.

\(^{60}\) Theoph., 278, 22–24.

\(^{61}\) Cf. deliberations on the term folio/folium herein.

\(^{62}\) Cf. deliberations on the term costus herein.

\(^{63}\) Cf. deliberations on the term gingiber herein.

\(^{64}\) Theoph., 322, 5.
the chronicle compiled by Theophanes prove that pepper was still a valuable merchandise long after Anthimus composed *De observatione ciborum*. Physicians also took interest in pepper, and its first comprehensive description is known as part of the pharmacopoeia compiled by Dioscorides (1st c. AD). He listed three types of foodstuff (i.e., long, black, and white pepper), attributing them with sharpness, a pleasant taste, and culinary applicability. Moreover, the author described all variants of the spice as substances that facilitate digestion, with warming, diuretic, astringent, and diaphoretic effects. Pepper was also a subject of interest among posteriori physicians, who treated it invariably as a foodstuff and a medicament.

Clove were imported from as far as the Maluku Islands. Pliny maintained that they originated from India. Their regular presence in the Greek pharmacopoeia is proven by the fact that in the 6th c. AD they are mentioned (as an ingredient of aromatic preparations and medicines) by Aëtius of Amida and Alexander of Tralles (6th/7th c. AD). However, the first fully comprehensive description dates back to as late as the 7th c. AD, and is preserved in the medical encyclopaedia by Paul of Aegina. The author stated that their smell was pleasant, and assessed

---


66 Dsc. *Eup.*, II, 159, 1, 1 – 4, 8 (description of individual types – II, 159, 1, 6 – 2, 7; shared effects of all types of pepper – II, 159, 3, 1–2).

67 Galen discussed pepper as a foodstuff in *De alimentorum facultatibus*. Even though no separate chapter was devoted to the spice, its properties were listed within descriptions of other foods. For instance, the author attributed pepper with warming qualities (when expounding on the properties of various parts of plants and animals), cf. Gal. *Alim.Fac.*, 477, 5–9, vol. 6. In the chapter on figs (Gal. *Alim.Fac.*, 570, 11 – 573, 9, vol. 6), Galen lists pepper among substances that have cutting (τέμνοντα), diluting (λεπτύνοντα; both terms referred to the impact pepper had on thick humours within the body) as well as purifying (ῥύπτοντα) properties, cf. Gal. *Alim.Fac.*, 572, 6–12, vol. 6. In another passage within the same treatise (Gal. *Alim.Fac.*, 703, 12 – 705, 14, vol. 6), he argues that pepper facilitates digestion (i.e., is πεπτικός), cf. Gal. *Alim.Fac.*, 705, 9–13, vol. 6. Galen also includes an analysis of the plant’s qualities in his theory of *materia medica*, emphasising its sharpness and warming properties (as a result of which pepper was told to have a siccative effect on tissues), cf. Gal. *SMT*, 97, 7 – 16, vol. 12. Other effects and properties of pepper are scattered throughout the first five theoretical books of his work. The findings by Dioscorides and Galen later formed the basis for the theory applied by Byzantine physicians, reflected in the works of Oribasius (*Coll.Med.*, XII, π, 7, 1–12; XV, 1:16, 12, 1 – 15, 1 etc.), Aëtius of Amida (I, 316, 1–5 etc.), and Paul of Aegina (VII, 3, 16, 27–31 etc.).


the spice as sharp, slightly bitter, and having a warming and strongly siccative effect. He also added that cloves could be used for multiple purposes in cooking and pharmacology.\textsuperscript{71}

Ginger was a popular spice and medicament. In the 1\textsuperscript{st} c. AD, it cost between 5 and 10 denarii per pound,\textsuperscript{72} while in the early 4\textsuperscript{th} c. AD, a libra\textsuperscript{73} of dried ginger\textsuperscript{74} was sold for as much as 250 denarii.\textsuperscript{75} The high price and its reputation of being an aromatic must have lasted for centuries, since ginger was listed, by Theophanes the Confessor, among the war booty found in Khosrow II’s palace of Dastargerd.\textsuperscript{76} Dioscorides’ \textit{De materia medica} proves that the properties of the plant were described in detail as early as in the 1\textsuperscript{st} century AD, as the author writes that ginger has a warming effect, delicately softens the gastrointestinal tract (i.e., stimulates the excretion of faeces), is beneficial for the stomach, and affects the body in a similar manner to pepper.\textsuperscript{77} Interest in ginger as a medical substance was keenly held by subsequent generations of physicians.\textsuperscript{78}

Costus was yet another aromatic commodity imported from distant lands.\textsuperscript{79} Pliny accounted that its roots were sold for 5,5 denarii per pound,\textsuperscript{80} while \textit{De pretiis rerum venalium} contained information that a libra of costus was priced at 250 denarii.\textsuperscript{81} The reputation it enjoyed and, in consequence, its high prices at the turn of the 6\textsuperscript{th} and 7\textsuperscript{th} centuries AD, is evidenced by the spice being among

\textsuperscript{73} Libra = 0.327 l.
\textsuperscript{74} The term most likely referred to dried ginger rhizomes. As fresh rhizomes were prone to go off quickly in transport, they had to be either pre-dried or stored in brine within earthenware vessels. In the latter case, both ginger and the liquid were to be consumed. Cf. Dsc. \textit{Eup.}, II, 160, 1, 6–8.
\textsuperscript{75} \textit{Edict.Dioclet.}, 36, 102 (Lauffer); 34, 56 (Crawford, Reynolds).
\textsuperscript{76} Theop., 322, 6.
\textsuperscript{78} Galen discusses ginger as a spice in \textit{De alimentorum facultatibus}. These extracts confirm that the physician of Pergamon shared Dioscorides’ belief on the similarity of properties between ginger and pepper, cf. Gal. \textit{Alim.Fac.}, 572, 6–12, vol. 6; 703, 12 – 705, 14, vol. 6. In the same treatise, we can also read that ginger (together with white pepper and vinegar) was added to a medicament based on honey and apple juice and served to anorexics (Gal. \textit{Alim.Fac.}, 603, 6–8, vol. 6), which implies that ginger was thought to increase appetite. A description of ginger from the perspective of \textit{materia medica} can be found in \textit{De simplicium medicamentorum temperamentis ac facultatibus} (880, 9 – 882, 4, vol. 11). Physicians of early Byzantium continued to rely on the findings by Dioscorides and Galen, for instance cf. Orb. \textit{Coll.Med.}, XI, ζ, 2, 1–7; XV, 1:6, 1, 1–6, 1; Aët., I, 153, 1–4; Paul.Aeg., VII, 3, 6, 5–8.
\textsuperscript{81} \textit{Edict.Dioclet.}, 36, 47 (Lauffer); 34, 1 (Crawford, Reynolds).
Ἰνδικαί καρυκείαι\textsuperscript{82} to be given as a form of tribute to the Avars by the Roman general Priscus.\textsuperscript{83} Costus was analysed in detail by Dioscorides, who described its flavour as δηκτικὸς καὶ πυρώδης, i.e., sharp and burning. The scholar of Anazarbus claimed that the spice had a warming and diuretic effect.\textsuperscript{84} Writings by Galen and early Byzantine physicians show that the plant was also used in medicine in later times.\textsuperscript{85}

The list of sauce ingredients culminates in the phrase worded ...\textit{spicanardi vel folio}. The first noun refers indubitably to the spikenard.\textsuperscript{86} Growing in the Himalayas and the Hindu Kush, spikenard had to travel a long and dangerous route before it was delivered to the centres of the Greco-Roman civilisation. Pliny accounted that the price for one pound of the so-called ears (\textit{spicae}) of nard could reach 100 denarii, while its most valued type of leaves – 90 denarii.\textsuperscript{87} Although no information about its prices is contained in Diocletian’s \textit{De pretiis rerum venalium}, we can assume that nard was still an expensive commodity in the early 4\textsuperscript{th} c. AD, because the source reports that a libra of essential oil made from the plant cost 75 denarii.\textsuperscript{88} We owe a detailed description of nard’s properties to Dioscorides,\textsuperscript{89} who stressed that the spice had a warming, desiccant, and diuretic effect.\textsuperscript{90} For that reason, when drunk,\textsuperscript{91} it slowed down the gastrointestinal processes and counteracted diarrhoea.\textsuperscript{92} Served in cold water,\textsuperscript{93} nard helped patients suffering from nausea, heartburn, bloating, jaundice, and liver as well as kidney diseases.\textsuperscript{94} It could also be an ingredient of antidotes.\textsuperscript{95} Remarks by

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{82} On the term καρυκεία, cf. Kokoszko 2008: 269–283.
\item \textsuperscript{83} Theophyl.Sim., VII, 13, 5, 3 – 6, 5. Cf. Dalby 2003: 43; Dalby 2010: 43.
\item \textsuperscript{84} \textit{Dsc. Eup.}, I, 16, 1, 1 – 2, 11 (note on the properties of costus – I, 16, 1, 6–7).
\item \textsuperscript{85} The lack of information on costus within \textit{De alimentorum facultatibus} implies that it was not commonly used as a spice. On the other hand, numerous remarks on its therapeutic applications in Galen’s pharmacological treatises indicate that the plant was far more frequently made use of by physicians. Galen’s most comprehensive description of costus (concordant with Dioscorides’ account) can be found in \textit{De simplicium medicamentorum temperamentis ac facultatibus} (40, 10 – 41, 6, vol. 12). The two authors’ teachings became part of the canon of early Byzantium, for instance cf. Orib. \textit{Coll.Med.}, XI, κ, 31, 1–9; XV, 1:10, 65, 1–3; Aët., I, 219, 1–12; Paul.Aeg., VII, 3, 10, 306–315.
\item \textsuperscript{87} \textit{Plin. Hist.Nat.}, XII, 43, 6 – 44, 4.
\item \textsuperscript{88} \textit{Edict.Dioclet.}, 36, 98 (Lauffer); 34, 52 (Crawford, Reynolds).
\item \textsuperscript{89} \textit{Dsc. Eup.}, I, 7, 1, 1 – 4, 9.
\item \textsuperscript{90} \textit{Dsc. Eup.}, I, 7, 3, 9.
\item \textsuperscript{91} As a brew, or an infusion.
\item \textsuperscript{92} \textit{Dsc. Eup.}, I, 7, 3, 9–10.
\item \textsuperscript{93} Presumably, what the author has in mind is a nard infusion diluted with cold water.
\item \textsuperscript{94} \textit{Dsc. Eup.}, I, 7, 4, 1–3.
\item \textsuperscript{95} \textit{Dsc. Eup.}, I, 7, 4, 7.
\end{itemize}
Galen and early Byzantine physicians show that nard was used in therapeutic procedures.96

Anthimus ends his recipe for sauce with ...vel folio. Mark Grant, who translated De observatione ciborum into English, believes that folio refers to nard, suggesting that the recipe required the use of its ears or leaves.97 In doing so he relies on a version of the Latin original proposed by Valentin Rose (and reading, ...spicam nardi vel folium)98, and on Rose’s understanding of the noun folium printed in his glossary to the second edition of Anthimus’ work.99 Accordingly, the two scholars imply that the genitival qualifier nardi refers to both nouns, i.e. spica and folium. Interestingly, the same interpretation of the text is found in Edward Liechtenhan’s German translation,100 even though the Latin version of the original postulated by him101 does not include any genitival qualifier relating to the form folio. There is virtually no explanation to the mode of translation he adopted except for a short mention of the term spicanardi in his Index Grammaticus, where Liechtenhan suggests that it is a compound noun, and stands for the accusative spicam.102 All in all, in this respect Liechtenhan represents the same tradition as Rose and Grant.

There is, however, another possible interpretation of the passage – folio (i.e. folium in classical Latin, and in Greek φύλλον) should be interpreted as a designate separate from nardus, i.e. a phytonym, which is, in fact, pars pro toto, since it was derived from this part of the plant it referred to. In preserved Greek and Latin sources, we can find convincing evidence that such a plant existed. A couple of examples will suffice.103 The first is included in Galen’s teachings and in an anonymous work entitled Eclogae medicamentorum.104 Galen quoted
a recipe for Polyarchus’ medicament, which included φύλλα μαλαβάθρου, i.e. tejpat. A similar therapeutic substance named πολυάρχειον can also be found in Eclogae medicamentorum, but the author of the work mentions in the formula no φύλλα μαλαβάθρου but only the term φύλλον. Since the ingredients and the intended use of the two medicines are analagical, there is no doubt that both authors had in mind the same plant, and thus in the first formula tejpat is termed φύλλα μαλαβάθρου (which means ‘leaves of μαλάβαθρον’), while in the second, it is simply called φύλλον, i.e., ‘leaf’. The second example comes from the works by Aëtius of Amida. Among the essential oils he describes there is one called φύλλινον or μαλαβάθρινον (φύλλινον ἤτοι μαλαβάθρινον). Since the title of the recipe implies that the terms φύλλινον and μαλαβάθρινον mean the same perfume (μύρον), we may conclude that the name of the oil was derived from the word φύλλον (listed in the formula), which, in this case, doubtlessly meant the leaves of μαλάβαθρον, as such meaning is reflected in the alternative name (i.e., μαλαβάθρινον) of the oil.

It is equally noteworthy that the term folium appears in De re coquinaria. In three recipes, the nouns folium and malabathrum, however, are used one next to another, which may imply that each has a separate designatum. Notwithstanding, there is evidence indicating that all the recipes within De re coquinaria that contain the word folium refer to the application of malabathrum, i.e., tejpat. A significant class among alcoholic beverages described in ancient and of debates on the authorship of Eclogae medicamentorum, cf. Buzzi 2016: 195, footnote 8; Buzzi 2017: 965, footnote 17; Buzzi, Calà 2017: 126, footnote 12.

---

108 Eclog.Med., 51, 8, 1–9, 1 (φύλλον – 51, 8, 4).
109 Aët., I, 133,1–7 (μαλάβαθρον – I, 133, 2). Admittedly, Diocletian’s De pretiis rerum venaliurn contains no information on φύλλινον, but the chapter on prices of aromatic substances lists a similar fragrant ointment called φολιᾶτον, which was made with an addition of tejpat leaves, as proved by Eclogae medicamentorum (73, 31, 1–7), and Aëtius of Amida (XVI, 131, 4–17). On the other hand, it must be stated that source texts also speak of another perfume under the same name that had no tejpat among its ingredients. Galen mentions it as a luxurious commodity on numerous occasions (San.Tu., 427, 3–5, vol. 6 etc.), providing proof of its alternative name of σπικᾶτον, which implies that it was derived from spikes of nard. A recipe for the product was preserved, inter alia, by Pliny (Hist.Nat., XIII, 15, 4 – 16, 1), who accounts that yet another name of the perfume was nardinum. A series of similar recipes were incorporated by Aëtius of Amida into Book 16 of his treatise – Aët., XVI, 130, 22 – 132, 4. A libra of φολιᾶτον cost 1,000 denarii (Edict.Dioclet., 36, 88 [Lauffer]; 34, 42 [Crawford, Reynolds]), while the same amount of unwashed leaves of tejpat – 60 denarii (Edict.Dioclet., 36, 49 [Lauffer]; 34, 3 [Crawford, Reynolds]).

110 The term μαλάβαθρον is not listed in the recipe.
111 Apic., I, 1; I, 3; I, 27; I, 29; VI, 5, 4; VII, 6, 8; VIII, 2, 6; IX, 1, 3; IX 7; IX, 8, 2; IX, 8, 3.
112 Apic., I, 29; IX, 1, 3; IX 7.
Byzantine literature were κονδῖτα (Latin: *condita* or *piperata*), i.e., therapeutic drinks that contained pepper, honey, and a long list of other ingredients. One of them, namely κονδῖτον νεφριτικόν, can be found among recipes within *Eclogae medicamentorum*, and has its equivalent in *conditum paradoxum*, whose recipe is quoted in Book 1 of *De re coquinaria*. Both contain terms that mean ‘leaf’, i.e., *folium* in Latin and φύλλον in Greek. We have already established that the author of *Eclogae medicamentorum* used the term to refer to μαλάβαθρον, so there is every likelihood that *folium* included in the Latin formula was used to designate the same plant. What is more, this interpretation is reinforced by Pliny’s remark when he explicitly expounds on the excellent results obtained by adding malobathrum to wine. The second example is *apsintium Romanum*, whose recipe can also be found in Book 1 of *De re coquinaria*, and which has its counterpart in ἀψινθάτα used by Oribasius and Aëtius of Amida. In this case, the Latin term *folium* is also expressly used as the synonym to the Greek φύλλον. In conclusion, we can formulate a hypothesis that since the term *folium* meant a leaf of μαλάβαθρον in wine recipes, it must have had the same meaning in other recipes in *De re coquinaria*, and that the appearance of the words *folium* and malabathrum in Books 1 and 9 within the collection is nothing more than a mistake of the copyist. As a result, if the noun *folium* within *De re coquinaria* and the term φύλλον in Greek medical treatises are used to refer to leaves of tejpat, there is no reason why it would have a different meaning in the short text by Anthimus, whose theory of materia medica mirrored that of the medical tradition of the period. What must be emphasised is that this interpretation is concordant with the view of Andrew Dalby, who consistently translates the Latin term *folium* and the Greek word φύλλον as malabathrum despite not providing formal proof of this interpretation.

What is more, medical sources clarify why Anthimus used the conjunction *vel* in his account. In order to comprehend it, let us refer to some preserved descriptions of tejpat’s properties. Remarks on the affinity between nard and *Cinnamomum tamala* can already be found in Dioscorides’ work, who argues that the latter possesses properties identical to Indian spikenard, when it comes to intensifying the effects of other therapeutic substances. He also adds that both

115 Apic., I, 1.
116 Cf. the aforenoted passage from *Historia naturalis*.
117 Apic., I, 3.
120 Which is not repeated by the author of *Excerpta Vinidarii*. Cf. Grocock, Grainger 2006: 347.
121 Dalby 1996: 192, 306; Dalby 2003: 206; Dalby 2010: 175, 182 etc.
are diuretic and good for the stomach (although tejpat is more effective in respect of both qualities). Galen, in turn, directly lists leaves of tejpat as a substitute to nard in *De simplicium medicamentorum temperamentis ac facultatibus*, stating that the plant has a similar effect to that customarily attributed to nard. Later descriptions of tejpat do not differ from accounts compiled in the 1st/2nd centuries AD, as evidenced by data provided by Oribasius, Aëtius of Amida, and Paul of Aegina. In conclusion, it seems justified to state that Anthimus recommended nard or its replacement, i.e. leaves of *Cinnamomum tamala*, to be used for the sauce served with hare. He did so because both spices offered similar properties.

There is one more point to make. The sauce for hare appears to be compiled in accordance with the rules which governed dietetics. As the meat in Anthimus’ recipe was classified as tough by nature, and thus, heavy and contributing to the production of thick and sticky humours in the body, especially, to the generation of black bile (considered cooling), it was advisable that it be served with a sauce that contained honey, *sapa* or *caroenum*, because these

---

122 Dsc. Eup., I, 12, 1, 1 – 2, 11 (origins, cultivation, appearance – I, 12, 1, 1 – 2, 2; dietetic characteristics – I, 12, 2, 2–5; pharmacological characteristics and general applications – I, 12, 2, 6–11).


124 There were only minor inaccuracies regarding details. There was no doubt that μαλάβαθρον had warming properties of the first (cf. Orib. Coll.Med., XIV, 15, 1, 1–5 [μαλάβαθρον – XIV, 15, 1, 3]; Orib. Syn., II, 3, 1, 1–3 [μαλάβαθρον – II, 3, 1, 2]; Orib. Lib.Eunap., II, 3, 1, 1–4 [μαλάβαθρον – II, 3, 1, 5–6]; Aët., II, 199,1–3 [μαλάβαθρον – II, 199, 2]), or third degree (Aët., II, 201,1–10 [μαλάβαθρον – II, 201, 7]). On the other hand, all physicians who discussed the issue agreed that it had siccative properties of the second degree – Orib. Coll.Med., XIV, 26, 1, 1–16 (μαλάβαθρον – XIV, 26, 1, 6); Orib. Lib.Eunap., II, 5, 1, 1–4, 6 (μαλάβαθρον – II, 5, 2, 6); Aët., II, 211, 1–7 (μαλάβαθρον – II, 211, 7).


126 Aët., I, 266, 1; II, 196, 64–68.


128 The dietetic properties of hare meat were discussed by numerous ancient and Early Byzantine physicians, cf. Diaet., II, 46, 25–26; Gal. Alim.Fac., 664, 4–6, vol. 6 ; Orib. Coll.Med., II, 28, 10, 1 – 12, 1; III, 16, 4, 1 – 6, 1; Aët., II, 121, 25–18; II, 253, 8–10; Paul.Aeg., I, 84, 1, 7–9 etc. An excess of black bile that could stem from the consumption of hare meat was a health risk, which was explicitly stressed by Galen, e.g., in the treatise *De atra bile* (112, 3–5, vol. 5). His catalogue of diseases induced by black bile (Gal. At.Bil., 114, 9 – 119, 12, vol. 5) included the infamous plague in the times of Mark Aurelius that spread after 165 AD, an illness known as ἐλέφας (elephantiasis), ἄνθραξ-type ulcerations, neoplasms, haemorrhoids, κιρσός (varicose veins), melancholy (Galen, Loc.Aff., 179, 18 – 193, 6, vol. 8), and quartan fever (Galen, Diff.Feb., 336, 11–12;
foodstuffs were said to have warming properties. Not only did they ensure an appropriate temperature within the stomach (required for food to be digested), but they also prevented the rest of the body from being chilled. Among the listed sweeteners, it was honey that best served the purpose, as it was thought to have a warming, diaphoretic, and also – through its sharpness – purging effect. Even though it tended to lose some degree of the two latter properties when boiled, it would still remain effective. Anyway, Galen considered it beneficial for the stomach, which meant that – just like other sweet ingredients – it facilitated the functioning of the digestive tract. He explained the action, maintaining that sweet ingredients were made of tiny particles (and thus they were termed λεπτομερῆ), which meant that they effectively counterbalanced substances that had opposite properties (termed, in turn, παχυμερῆ), i.e. they were able to attenuate thick and sticky humours, and black bile in particular. The effect of such ingredients was reinforced with spices which, though different as far as their flavour is concerned, had a similar impact on digestion, because all of them were characterised by pungency or bitterness and pungency (denoting their warming effect and λεπτομέρεια).

One more aspect of the recipe seems noteworthy. All spices used for making the sauce were redolent. It means that apart from their therapeutic effect, they also had a pleasant fragrance which, in dietetics, was a desired, though not an indispensable, feature. Since they were all imported and expensive, the use of just one of them was enough to consider a dish exquisite (the fact which

129 Gal. SMT, 646, 2–5; 785, 6–7, vol. 11.
131 Gal. SMT, 646, 2–5; 785, 6–7, vol. 11.
132 Such conclusions can be drawn, for instance, from Galen’s lecture on the properties of individual substances that create sweet and bitter tastes. The physician writes that bitterness and sweetness are connected, since the humours he calls bitter are formed when sweet juices are diluted through exposure to heat. Therefore, both tastes are evidence that substances with such properties are small-particled and warming. However, bitter ones have smaller particles than their sweet equivalents, and they also offer more intense warming effects – Gal. SMT, 698, 4–10, vol. 11.
136 Gal. SMT, 653, 1 – 656, 2, vol. 11.
 Anthimus might also have wanted to emphasise when he decided to use the conjunction *vel*, thus offering the cook a choice between pricier nard and slightly cheaper tejpat). All in all, it seems logical to assume that if a single recipe required the use of pepper, cloves, costus, and nard, or pepper, cloves, costus, nard, and tejpat, only Frankish elites could afford such a dish. Last but not least, the recipe for hare in *De observatione ciborum* appears to testify to the fact that the Franks were already refined enough to stop thinking about merely satisfying their hunger, but they also sought pleasant culinary and olfactory sensations.

**ANTHIMUS ON TURTLEDOVES, QUAILS, STARLINGS, AND BUSTARDS**

*De observatione ciborum* contains three entries, namely Chapters 25, 26, and 33, which has been unsatisfactorily interpreted so far in terms of what they say about Anthimus’ practice and fate. A starting point in the present analysis should be Chapter 25, where Anthimus appears to make a reference to his medical practice when describing wildfowl. This is how we should probably interpret the words: “*istud et ego in tempore meo probavi in provincia mea,*” which are followed by a story of two peasants (*duo rustici*) who consumed the meat of a turtledove (*turtur*) that fed, *inter alia*, on hellebore (*elleborus*). It made one of the men so sick that he suffered from internal haemorrhage and died. Anthimus adds that in such cases aged wine (*vinum vetus*) and warm

---

137 With the exception of Deroux’s (1998: 366–381) study. His conclusions have been included in the hypothesis presented in the present research.

138 We are not able to fully understand what Anthimus meant. The words *…in provincia mea* were for Rose (1870: 49) the basis for a hypothesis that Anthimus was a governor of a province under Theodoric the Great’s rule. The suggestion was subsequently questioned by Liechtenhan (1963: X; cf. Liechtenhan 1963c: 74), Deroux (1998: 366, note 2), and Hen (2006: 102–103). I share Liechtenhan’ and Deroux’ opinion that in the passage *istud et ego…probavi…* the verb *probavi* suggests that the case of poisoning was Anthimus’ first-hand experience. Cf. the German translation by Liechtenhan (1963a: 39), reading “Das habe ich…beobachtet”; and the French translation by Deroux (1998: 370) worded “De cela j’ai été temoin…”.

139 There were two plants which could be considered to have been meant by Anthimus. One was the white hellebore (*Veratrum album* L.) and the other the black hellebore (*Helleborus niger* L.). They were commonly used in a variety of cures (cf. do Sameiro Barroso 2015: 30–37), including the treatment of mental illnesses (cf. Maieron 2018: 5–18). Deroux (1976: 875–878, esp. 877) maintains that it was the black hellebore that was mentioned by Anthimus.

140 Let us resort to some examples only. When Galen delves into the issue of treating poisoned patients, he illustrates his account with cases of opium (*μηκώνειον*) and cowbane (*κώνειον*) poisonings, for which he advises liberal amounts of aged, warming, wine of good quality (*εὐγενής*) to be the best cure. Subsequently, he enumerates a wide range of superior wines as antidotes, including wine from Lesbos (which he successfully applied in his own practice), and *…Φαλερῖνος καὶ Σουῤῥενῖνος, Ἀριούσιος τε καὶ Τμωλίτης ὁ αὐστηρὸς…, i.e., prestigious and expensive types*
olive oil\textsuperscript{141} were the antidotes to be served to the patient,\textsuperscript{142} which is definitely in agreement with the medical theory of Antiquity.

Let us commence the analysis with information on the birds which eat hellebore. In the literature that Anthimus may have been familiar with, we come across a thread, but it refers to quails, not turtledoves. In this context, quails are mentioned not only in \textit{De plantis}, a treatise ascribed to either Aristotle (4\textsuperscript{th} c. BC) or Nicolaus of Damascus (1\textsuperscript{st} c. BC),\textsuperscript{143} but also in Pliny's \textit{Historia naturalis},\textsuperscript{144} \textit{De alimentorum facultatibus},\textsuperscript{145} \textit{De simplicium medicamentorum temperamentis ac facultatibus},\textsuperscript{146} \textit{De theriaca ad Pisonem},\textsuperscript{147} \textit{In Hippocratis librum VI epidemiarum commentarii}\textsuperscript{148} by Galen, \textit{Problemata} by Alexander of Aphrodisias (2\textsuperscript{nd}/3\textsuperscript{rd} c. AD),\textsuperscript{149} \textit{Collectiones medicae} by Oribasius (in extracts derived from Galen),\textsuperscript{150} in the compilation of magic-medical texts entitled \textit{Cyranides} (dated of wine. Cf. Gal. \textit{SMT}, 603, 11–605, 9, vol. 11. On the gradation of quality wines mentioned by Galen cf. Thurmond 2017: 219–222, 224 (Italian); Komar 2020: 87–94, 102, 120 (eastern). It seems justified to add that the list of wines that Romans valued most began to crystallise at the turn of the 2\textsuperscript{nd} and 1\textsuperscript{st} c. BC, most probably under Lucius Licinius Crassus’ influence – cf. Tchernia 1997: 1247–1259. In Italia, mature Greek wines maintained a strong market position, which translated into their high prices – Cf. Komar 2014: 99–131; Komar 2014a: 227–244; Komar 2018: 95–116; Komar 2019: 3–16. The list of prestigious wines from Italia and other locations in the Mediterranean is provided by Pliny (\textit{His.Nat.}, XIV, 59, 1–76, 8), and referred to by Thurmond (2017: 219–231) in his in-depth study of ancient wine production. In Merovingian Gaul quality vintages were imported and expensive – Bonifay, Pieri 2020: 864. They also reached Metz – Bonifay, Pieri 2020: 863. In any case, we should expect that to be an effective antidote, the \textit{vinum vetus} recommended by Anthimus must have been a high-grade wine, i.e., it was more likely imported than local, and expensive, not cheap. What is more, Galen recommended large amounts of it to be served to the patient, which additionally raised the total cost of the treatment.

\textsuperscript{141}Because of abundant information, let us rely on select examples. Olive oil is depicted as an antidote in Dioscorides’ \textit{De materia medica}. It was served heated and in several doses until the patient was induced to vomit. Cf. Dsc. \textit{Eup.}, I, 30, 2, 3–4. Galen refers to the same method in the treatise \textit{De antidotis}. For instance, after Asclepiades of Bithynia (2\textsuperscript{nd}/1\textsuperscript{st} c. BC, cf. Scarborough 2008a: 170–171), he recommends warm ὑδρέλαιον, i.e., a mixture of water and olive oil, to be served repeatedly to the patient until emesis occurs – cf. Gal. \textit{Ant.}, 138, 6–10, vol. 14. Galen restates similar advice when he writes about treating people poisoned with cantharidin – Gal. \textit{Ant.}, 141, 10–12, vol. 14. However, this time he mentions olive oil mixed with grape syrup (γλυκύ). Warm olive oil with no additions, in turn, is recommended by the author for cases of white lead (ψιμύθιον) poisonings. Cf. Gal. \textit{Ant.}, 144, 3–4, vol. 14.

\textsuperscript{142}Anth., 25, 14, 6–8.


\textsuperscript{145}Gal. \textit{Alim.Fac.}, 567, 12, vol. 6.

\textsuperscript{146}Gal. \textit{SMT}, 382, 5–6; 612, 14–15, vol. 11.

\textsuperscript{147}Gal., \textit{Ther.Pis.}, 227, 14, vol. 14.


4–8th c. AD), in Homily 5 within commentaries to Hexaemeron by Basil of Caesarea (4th c. AD), in Procopius of Gaza’s teachings (5th–6th c. AD), in commentaries to Aristotle’s Metaphysica written by Asclepius of Tralles (6th c. AD), in Hesychius’ lexicon (6th c. AD), in Pseudo-Caesarius’ questions and answers (6th c. AD), and in an extract within Geoponica (10th c. AD), which – according to Cassianus Bassus – originated from Georgica by Didymos of Alexandria, i.e., from a text that is dated to the late 4th or the early 5th c. AD.

Interestingly, the story on quails eating hellebore is often followed by accounts claiming that starlings eat hemlock, a fact which is also mentioned by Anthimus (with data no different to what can be read elsewhere) in Chapter 26. Before the 6th century AD, it can be found in De temperamentis, De alimentorum facultatibus, De simplicium medicamentorum temperamentis ac facultatibus, in Galen’s De theriaca ad Pisonem, Problemata by Alexander of Aphrodisias, in Cyranides, in Homily No. 5 within commentaries to Hexaemeron by Basil of Caesarea, in Procopius of Gaza’s writings (5th–6th c. AD), in Pseudo-Caesarius’ work, etc.

We cannot trace the journey these two pieces of information travelled to reach Anthimus’ treatise, but what we can do is, especially when we consider his educational background, assume that he may have derived them from the repertory of medical texts. Anyway, it was Galen who, statistically, most often

157 Ps-Caes., 85, 19.
158 Rodgers 2008a: 245.
160 Anth., 26, 14, 9–11.
163 Gal. SMT, 382, 3–4, vol. 11; 551, 18 vol. 11; 600, 7–16 vol. 11; 601, 4–5, vol. 11.
165 Alex.Aphrod., I, proemium, 49, 4, 26.
166 Cyranid., 3, 53, 2–3.
169 Ps-Caes., 85, 18–19.
referred to the two facts in his treatises, and since he did so on the grounds of medical knowledge which Anthimus also studied, there is every likelihood that his works, and particularly *De alimentorum facultatibus* and *De simplicium medicamentorum temperamentis ac facultatibus* were the foundations of the system of knowledge presented in Chapters 25 and 26 of *De observatione ciborum*.

The reasons for Anthimus’ substituting turtledoves for quails is unclear and usually put down to the author’s error,170 perhaps an effect of an inaccurate reconstruction of data that he read in his studies in Constantinople,171 which he could not verify when compiling his treatise, as he may not have had access to well-equipped libraries, e.g., in the region of Ravenna under the reign of

---

170 An error was suggested by Rose (1870: 56) and later by Deroux (1998: 377). Both do not know how to explain the fact.

171 ‘During Anthimus’ lifetime, Constantinople was not only the imperial capital but also a growing centre for medical education. We can surmise that the city created opportunities for many physicians of different status – Nutton 1997: 191–226, esp. 210–212; Nutton 1984: 11–13; Ceran 1993: 6–11. As for Anthimus, we can conjecture that he received his medical training in Constantinople. Had he studied in Alexandria, the fact would have been mentioned by Malchus or by the author of *De observatione ciborum* himself – Evert-Kappesowa 1979: 139–164, esp. 140; Duffy 1984: 21–27, esp. 21. As far as medical studies are concerned, the city on Bosporus did not enjoy the fame which could equal that of Alexandria, and the majority of doctors working there were likely to learn their profession by apprenticeship to a practicing physician and reading medical books. At the end of the 5th c. AD Galen was definitely a medical classic, and thus there is nothing to suggest that Galen’s works were not known in Constantinople – Boudon-Millot 2007: CXXXVII. It is true that by 500, except for his glossary to Hippocrates, all his philological works had vanished. The same fate met his philosophical treatises, whose Greek originals had fallen out of use before the early sixth century – Nutton 2007: 171–176, esp. 174. However, the vast majority of his works survived, and were reworked by eminent medical authors into multiple writings, including those which are certain to have been composed and circulated in the Constantinopolitan milieu. A good example is Aëtius of Amida, who is said to have practised in the capital and possibly served as an imperial physician at Justinian’s court – van der Eijk 2010: 532; Scarborough 2013: 742–762; Gowling 2017: 99; Bouras-Vallianatos 2019: 41. During the period chronologically hardly distant from Anthimus’ times, he, *inter alia*, used *De simplicium medicamentorum temperamentis ac facultatibus*. He also consulted Galen’s *De alimentorum facultatibus* at first hand (cf. Gowling 2017: 83, 96–97; Bouras-Vallianatos 2019: 42) or indirectly (in the past, it was claimed that Aetius of Amida did not profit from *De alimentorum facultatibus* but made use of the lost synopsis of Galen’s works penned by Oribasius or possibly of another source – Sideras 1974: 110–130; van der Eijk 2010: 544–545). Even if the latter option is true, *De alimentorum facultatibus* and *De simplicium alimentorum temperamentis ac facultatibus* must have been in circulation. They were read by, for instance, Alexander of Tralles, who also lived during Justinian’s reign – Bouras-Vallianatos 2019: 45. As for Galen’s commentary on Book 6 of *Epidemiae* it must have been less popular because parts of it are left only in Arabic translation – Boudon-Millot 2007: CLXI–II. However, there is no evidence that the treatise was absent from the capital’s readership at the end of the 5th and at the beginning of the 6th c. AD either. Anyway, Constantinople is likely to have provided Arab translators with Greek originals of the work – Boudon-Millot 2007: CLVIII. To recapitulate, the city of Constantinople had satisfactory resources to provide Anthimus with vast medical knowledge, including those pieces of information which Anthimus discusses in his Chapters 25 and 26.
Theodoric the Great,\textsuperscript{172} or in Metz, the capital of the Frankish ruler Theuderic.\textsuperscript{173} Either way, such an interpretation could lead us to the conclusion that

\textsuperscript{172} Ravenna was implied by Rose (1870: 56) as a place where \textit{De observatione ciborum} was composed, when he called Theodoric the Great “der Auftraggeber” of the \textit{opusculum} and set as \textit{terminus post quem} for the compilation of the work years after 511 AD (the beginning of Theuderic’s rule in Metz) and as \textit{terminus ante quem} Theodoric the Great’s death (526 AD). The same view can be deduced from Effros’ (2002: 65–66) discussion on Anthimus and his work. On the other hand, the option is frowned upon by Hen (2002: 102–103). At the time of Anthimus’ hypothetical stay in the city, Ravenna was not strange to medical studies, and the city’s students followed a course similar to that in Alexandria – Palmieri 1991: 294–310, esp. 295–302; Corcoran 2016: 181; Herrin 2020: 367. In the late 5\textsuperscript{th} or early 6\textsuperscript{th} c. AD, in north Italy, possibly in Ravenna itself, there appeared a number of Latin translations of works belonging to \textit{Corpus Hippocraticum}, and especially a Latin version of Book 2 of Hippocratic \textit{De diaeta} known by the title \textit{De observantia ciborum}, which clearly shows a contemporary keen interest in dietetics – Joly 1975: 3–22, esp. 3, 9, footnote 36, 22; Mazzini 1984: 11–12, 32–34; Totelin 2009: 278–279; Everett 2012: 23; Herrin 2020: 241. Fragments of the other translation are found to be interwoven with some manuscripts of Anthimus’ work – Deroux 1974: 680–687; Deroux 1978: 966–970. The same milieu is said to have given the oldest Latin translations of Oribasius’ treatises \textit{Synopsis ad Eustathium filium} and \textit{Libri ad Eunapium} – Baader 1984: 251–259, esp. 252; Mazzini 1991: 286–293, esp. 288–289; Everett 2012: 22–23. Sometime after Anthimus’ lifetime (in the second part of the 6\textsuperscript{th} or at the beginning of the 7\textsuperscript{th} c. AD), the city of Ravenna witnessed lectures given by the famous iatroso-phant Agnellus, which were written down by his student named Simplicius. Agnellus’ curriculum included Galen’s \textit{De sectis}, \textit{Ars medica} and \textit{De pulsibus}. At a very similar time, a commentary to Galen’s \textit{De medendi methodo} was also compiled in the same (or not distant) location – Palmieri 1991: 306–309; Everett 2012: 22; Herrin 2020: 239–241. Accordingly, during Anthimus’ hypothetical stay in the city, Ravenna was an environment inducive to medical studies, and promoting the interest in Greek medical heritage. Accordingly, one can surmise that, even if the city’s medical library did not possess adequate literature, Greek-speaking doctors practising and teaching there (Herrin 2020: 239), had Anthimus wanted to consult them on peculiarities of wild bird’s diet, he would have enough resources and knowledge to help him out on this problem.

\textsuperscript{173} Anthimus was a legate and the mission should entail a stay of some duration in Gaul. The fact does not appear an oddity because physicians were used as diplomats (cf. Blockley 1980: 89–100; Baldwin 1984: 15–19; Nutton 1984: 12–13, esp. note 114; Nutton 2005: 301). As for the author of \textit{De observatione ciborum}, Hen (2006: 103) suggests that he might have been sent to the Franks not once but at least on two diplomatic missions (the first, in 508, still during the reign of Clovis, when he met Theuderic for the first time, and the other after 511, when he was sent to his capital at Metz). Accordingly, in the light of Hen’s hypothesis Anthimus might have had an opportunity to familiarize himself with Frankish dietary habits, and subsequently he included his experience in his final work. Such an option appears to be corroborated by the fact that, on the one hand, Anthimus writes relatively little about the Goths’ diet (he mentions fleetingly only one Gothic dish, namely \textit{fenea} – Anth., 64, 24, 2; cf. Hen 2006: 103), while, on the other hand, he writes in detail about the appreciation (i.e. \textit{laredum} – Anth., 14, 8, 9 – 10, 5) raw bacon enjoyed among the Franks. The entry on \textit{laredum} is by far the most exhaustive in the entire \textit{opusculum}, which seems to suggest that Anthimus knew the Frankish delicacy well, and is the basis for Mark Grant’s premise that the entire work was compiled in north-eastern Gaul – Grant 2007: 27. Such a conclusion, however, appears to be weakened by that fact that Anthimus writes that he only heard that the Franks ate raw bacon (\textit{de crudo vero laredo, quod solent, ut audio, domni Franci comedere…} – Anth., 14, 9, 9–10) and never admits to having eaten it himself. As a result, his knowledge on bacon may be interpreted as indirect. For a dietetic interpretation of the passage cf.
Anthimus had erred with regard to accepted knowledge, a mistake which might lead us to question his overall competences. Such a way of reasoning seems, however, to have its weaknesses. As a dietician and gourmet Anthimus was knowledgeable about foodstuffs, including fowl. Carl Deroux, who studied his letter in detail, has demonstrated Anthimus’ competence in a number of his articles, never having been able to prove him wrong except for this one and only case.\textsuperscript{174} As far as turtledoves and quails are concerned, they were ubiquitous in the Mediterranean, and thus well-known. The former nested across the areas of Europe, North Africa, and West Asia, which is reflected both in literary sources as well as by results of archaeological research.\textsuperscript{175} The latter crossed the region twice a year and their bones have been excavated in Italy, the Balkans, and North Africa.\textsuperscript{176} Accordingly, it should be

\textsuperscript{174} On the contrary, he rather appears to have proved that Anthimus was precise in using his terminology. Cf. Deroux’ conclusions concerning terms referring to the fish salmon – Deroux 1976: 55–68, esp. 63–64.


\textsuperscript{176} Arnott 2007: 237 (migration); Kroll 2010: 122 (migration), 187 (osseous remains); Kroll 2012: 105 (migration and osseous remains), 116 (osseous remains).
assumed that the author of *De observatione ciborum* knew the creatures from his own experience, and thus was able to tell one from the other. His topical competence is corroborated by the fact that it is impossible to demonstrate that Anthimus blunders when he refers to *turtures* as a dietician. He was right that the birds, although they basically (together with other birds) live in the wild (*in campis vero qui nascentur*...), were also kept in captivity for fattening purposes (*...qui saginantur in domum*...). He was equally well-informed about their dietetic influence, and in his evaluation followed in Galen’s footsteps, who assessed them as hard-fleshed. The above-characteristic resulted in their contribution to the production of black bile, which was also alluded to rightly by Anthimus. It is of the utmost importance that Galen’s opinion was retained by later physicians who practiced up the time when Anthimus was compiling his treatise, and consequently is present in Oribasius’ works, and cited also in Aetius of Amida’s teachings.

One has, however, also to admit that dietetic assessment of quails was not far from that of turtledoves. A good example is the fact that Archigenes of Apamea (1st/2nd c. AD) prescribed turtledoves’ and quails’ meat to those suffering from dropsy because it was relatively dry. To be honest, quails did not attract Galen’s attention at all, except for his testimony saying that they were hunted for and consumed in Greece (in Doris, Boeotia, Thessaly, and Attica) and that their meat could pose a threat to those who ate it (giving them muscle cramps),

---

178 Deroux (1998: 371) recommended the reading *pascuntur* instead of *nascentur*.
179 The information has been preserved, for instance, by Varro (*R.Rust.*, III, 8, 1, 1 – 3, 8) and Columella (VIII, 9, 1, 1 – VIII, 9, 4, 7), and implied in *Geoponica* (XIV, 24, 1, 1–4).
181 The effect of consuming turtledove meat is discussed by Galen in *De victu attenuante*, where Galen’s readers are advised against eating the foodstuff in large quantities, especially if they live a sedentary lifestyle. In order to make the food less harmful, Galen recommends that it should be left to mature for a day after slaughter, which tenderizes the meat effectively and makes it fit to nourish the body safely – *Gal. Vict. At.*, 69, 1–71, 9.
182 I do not agree with Deroux’ conclusion that Galen spoke highly of turtledoves – Deroux 1998: 372–374. Since I share Deroux’s opinion that Anthimus was first and foremost a medical doctor (“...Anthime est avant tout médecin... – Deroux 1998: 372), I think that the primary goal of his work was to present general rules of materia medica (considering foodstuffs) from the point of view of dietetics. Therefore I am of the opinion that the culinary information referred to by Deroux is inconclusive because it says nothing about the principles of dietetics but about disobedience to dietetic rules. Such an interpretation of the data has been also proposed by Deroux (1998: 372), who writes that “...le point de vue du médecin n’est pas nécessairement celui de gourmet....”
186 *Archigen.*., *Fragment* 72, 5–11.
when the birds had a temporary fancy for hellebore. Galen’s silence about the quality of the birds’ meat is in fact its assessment, as, if it had been a foodstuff regarded as worth pondering on, he would not have refrained from writing about it. In fact, we can conjecture that other medical doctors who were active after Galen shared his low appreciation of the meat. By the by, his opinion had already had a long history when he was composing his works, and that is why Athenaeus of Attaleia’s (1st c. AD) teachings on the birds (preserved by Oribasius in his *Collectiones medicae*) are limited to a mere statement that quails were fattest (that is best to eat) in autumn. In fact, Rufus of Ephesus (1st/2nd c. AD), a fragment of whose work on diet appropriate for women has been preserved in writings attributed to Oribasius, is the other physician who, while classifying quails as the worst of all wildfowl, alluded to their dietetic characteristics, opining that the creatures’ meat moistens the body but is not easy to concoct. It is easy to notice that Rufus’ evaluation contradicts what Archigenes claimed, and is a clear sign of the double assessment of quails in ancient medicine. On the other hand, apart from corroborating the validity of the above assumptions as for a general quality of quails, Rufus’ remark on their moistening quality suggests that they were not assessed to contribute to the production of black bile (as the humour’s characteristics included dryness) but rather to phlegm (being watery and cold). In conclusion, the evidence presented above turns out to be important because it appears to prove that in Chapter 25 of *De observatione ciborum* Anthimus did not make a mistake in naming the bird he was writing about, but, as his description concerns a foodstuff which is melancholic and not phlegmatic, he made a choice in his teaching, and out of two pathways of medical tradition he embarked on the one which was also preferred by Rufus.

Having said that, I would like to propose a solution to the riddle. First and foremost, one can venture a slightly different way of interpreting the meaning chapter 25 has. The beginning of the fragment (“de agrestibus vere avibus” suggests that its contents refer to wildfowl in general, and consequently the facts mentioned in the narrative consider all wild birds (including turtledoves). Accordingly, Anthimus’ statement worded “sicut auctoris nostri dicent” implies a mere fact that, known from medical literature, if wild birds have a fancy for hellebore, their meat can pose a threat to the health of those who would like to consume it. What follows is a story which exemplifies these general teachings Anthimus learned from his reading but on the basis of a case which proved

---

188 Touwaide 2008a: 176–177.
192 Anth., 25, 13, 3, 6.
193 Anth., 25, 13, 10–11.
the theory true. As a result, the story about treating the two *rustici* poisoned with turtledove meat may well be a description of an actual intervention which Anthimus made on the basis of correct therapeutic premises. Presumably, the fact that he knew medical sources that prevalingly reported food poisonings caused by quail meat entitled him to believe that he had encountered a similar case (in terms of aetiology) with much the same symptoms induced by another bird belonging to the class (i.e., wild fowl), namely turtledoves. Even though the case was not identical to the accounts he knew from the literature, he may still have come to the conclusion that the two poisoned peasants required the same, standardised, treatment with aged wine and olive oil.

If this interpretation is accurate, Chapter 25 should be recognised as evidence that Anthimus was not only an active but also a creative physician, who – just like Galen – related his own professional experience (ἐμπειρία) in his writings.\(^{194}\) In all probability, he decided to add this information to tell the reader about his small contribution, which not only remained in line with medical theory but parallely was able to authenticate the content of his treatise, differentiating *De observatione ciborum* from works of medical theoreticians and authors who were not professional medical practitioners, e.g., Diphilus of Siphnos (3\(^{rd}\) c. BC),\(^{195}\) Cato the Elder (3\(^{rd}/2^{nd}\) c. BC),\(^{196}\) iatrosophists of his times,\(^{197}\) and later Symeon Seth,\(^{198}\) and Michael Psellos (10\(^{th}/11^{th}\) c. AD).\(^{199}\) Accordingly, one can modify Deroux’ conclusions expressed in his study on Chapter 25 of *De observatione ciborum* that the case was a mere verification of “…un savoir figé et éminnemment livresque,” and add the described poisoning and its cure to other elements of Anthimus’ creativity rightly recognised in the researcher’s earlier article.\(^{200}\)

Although the story of the two poisoned *rustici* is not explicit enough for us to determine the exact time and place of the events, it still leaves leeway for speculation on the matter. First of all, there is *terminus post quem*, which relates to the general background of the story. Before his exile from Constantinople, as a city dweller, Anthimus mostly had contacts with residents of the capital (*urbani*), not *rustici*, while the fragment worded “turtures in campo vero qui nascuntur” and the profession of the poisoning victims allow us to conclude that

\(^{194}\) Nutton 2005: 1–14, esp. 4. Alexander of Tralles, who wrote in Constantinople sometime later (but still in the 5\(^{th}\) c. AD), was equally proud of his practical experience – Duffy 1984: 25; Bouras-Vallianatos 2019: 45–46, 56.

\(^{195}\) Cf. Scarborough 1870: 194–201.


\(^{200}\) As a result, the case should be included into Deroux’ article entitled *Tradition et innovation dans la Diététique d’Anthime*. 
Chapter 25 tells a story that is more likely to have happened in the countryside, i.e., in a setting very different from that typical of the Byzantine capital. If so, the story is not a report from Anthimus’ young years before the exile but would rather refer to the period of his life when he was absent from the city upon the Bosporus. As a result, it must have taken place after 478, i.e., the year when he was forced to leave Constantinople.

The words “in villa duo rustici” reveals that the author considers the two men poisoned with turtledove meat to be either peasants, or farm labourers who worked at a large mansion. They cannot have been better-off as, if they were, they would have purchased fattened fowl which was said to be better than the wild turtledove they happened to catch. Neither could they have owned their own estate each as the noun villa would then have been used in the plural, most likely with an additional possessive pronoun, e.g., in villis suis. If so, it seems reasonable to presume that the men could have afforded to pay neither for medical consultation nor for necessary medicaments, one of which – namely, vinum vetus – would have been more expensive than regular table wine because of its maturity, and also due to the fact that it should have belonged to the class of top-quality wines.

Anthimus writes that he encountered the case during his time in provincia mea. Here, we may consider two possibilities for the situation to have happened. If we follow Rose’s suggestion that Anthimus was a governor of one of the provinces in Theodoric’s Gothic state, the situation must have occurred most probably after 493, when the Gothic leader established his rule in Ravenna, as it was only after this date that the political situation in the kingdom of Theodoric the Great allowed farm labourers to lead a peaceful life and landowners to care about their staff. On the other hand, provided we accept Hen’s hypothesis that Anthimus returned to the city on Bosporus between 491 and 497, stayed there for good, and was sent on diplomatic missions, the medical intervention is likely have happened after the date, and provided Anthimus actually practiced as a medical doctor, being commissioned by landowners to treat either themselves or their staff.

There is one more piece of evidence worth considering in the context of Anthimus’ career. Notably, in Chapter 33 Anthimus recommends to Theuderich bustards, saying that they are absent from Gaul. Since this piece of information implies that the author, while he was writing De observatione ciborum lived in a place where bustards were hunted for, and therefore appreciated as food, and since, according to the data collected by D’Arcy W. Thompson, Lawrence Feinberg, and W. Geoffrey Arnott, bustards were in antiquity ubiquitous

---

202 Feinberg (1970: 129–136, esp. 129, footnote 2) disproves Capponi’s (1962: 572–615) conclusions that the bird τέτραξ, whose mention is made by Atheneus of Naucratis in in Book 9 of his Dipnosophistarum libri (IX, 398d – 399a [58, 28–50]), is the bustard.
203 Arnott 2007: 239–240. Though Arnott maintains that bustard’s remains were identified at Fishbourne Roman palace (which appeared to imply that they were also present in the northern
in the Balkans and to the east of the region but there is no evidence that they were hunted for in the west (with the exception of Spain) or in the middle of the Mediterranean (with the exception of North Africa), it could be argued that *De observatione ciborum* was not compiled in Gothic Italy but rather in the eastern part of the Empire. 205 Such a conclusion supports Hen’s hypothesis (which locates Anthimus for a longer period in the region of Constantinople) and disproves that of Rose and his followers (which implies that Anthimus stayed close to Theodoric the Great’s court). If so, it also becomes likelier that, in Chapter 25, Anthimus told us a story that happened somewhere in the countryside (but not that far from Constantinople as the city was in the region inhabited by bustards) during the period between the beginning of the nineties of the fifth century AD and his diplomatic mission to the Franks (during which he was carrying his final version of the work to Theuderic). Consequently, if we accept other results of Hen’s line of reasoning, *De observatione ciborum* was most probably completed also in a similar location after Anthimus’ first encounter with the Franks (and possibly with Theuderic himself, who, having been impressed by Anthimus’ competence in dietetics, commissioned the work) in 508, before the hypothetical second legation, which might have been despatched after Theuderic’s enthronement (i.e. after 511), and definitely prior to Theuderic’s death in 534. Such course of events appears to be more congruous with pieces of information extant in Anthimus’ work than that postulated by Rose, whose ideas, though modified, were shared by Grant, the translator of the text into English, suggesting that *De observatione ciborum* was compiled in north-eastern Gaul, and handed over to Theuderic by a Gothic legation sent by Theodoric the Great either in 516 or in 523. 207

**FINAL CONCLUSION**

The analysed information proves that Anthimus was a competent physician, and he was able to apply in his medical practice theories he learned. Accordingly, the author *De observatione ciborum* did not err when, in chapter 25, he mentioned

---

204 Where bustards were not hunted for.
205 Where bustards were common.
206 The three years between 508 and 511 were a time which allowed Anthimus to acquire knowledge on Frankish diet. By the by, Hen’s hypothesis also appears to put forward an explanation to the riddle of Anthimus’s use of vulgar Latin – it was actually learned by him when he was with the Goths. However, when he was allowed to return to the empire, he used to live in a Greek-speaking environment, and that is why he did not continue to master his command of the language.
turtledoves but his topical teachings were a creative application of knowledge he acquired through reading medical classics. His know-how included understanding achievements of ancient dietetics and was based on his fairly profound knowledge of materia medica. That is why he was able to use the theory he acquired as a result of his studies to give culinary advice which was in tandem with his doctrine. Moreover, Anthimus’ work and fate imply that his approach towards the medical knowledge and its application in food preparation techniques were growing more and more popular and thereby influential among Gothic and Frankish elites. Last but not least, the information included in Chapters 25, 26, and 33 of the treatise De observatione ciborum imply that Anthimus’ work was composed in the Constantinopolitan milieu after 508, possibly circa 511.
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