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 6th 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 gastronomical literature (Ἡδυπάθεια 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.
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* 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 Lanckoronski Foundation in 2018.
Little is known about Anthimus’ life⁴. We do learn that he was a physician⁵ from the account by Malchus of Philadelphia (⁵th/⁶th cent. AD)⁶, despite Anthimus not mentioning his medical profession in the introduction to De observatione ciborum. Instead, he describes himself as vir ilustris, comes et legatarius ad gloriosissimum Theudoricum regem Francorum⁷, 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 Latin⁸, and such phrases as afratus Graece quod Latine dicitur spumeo⁹; oxygala vero Graece, quod Latine vocant melca¹⁰ show that Anthimus knew Greek. Indeed, by writing: nos Graeci dicimus¹¹, he clearly reveals that it was his mother tongue¹².


⁴ Anthimi De observatione ciborum ad Theodoricum regem Francorum epistula (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.


⁶ Anthimus, De observatione ciborum, 34 (CML VIII 1: 16, 3).

⁷ Anthimus, De observatione ciborum, 78 (CML VIII 1: 29, 4).

⁸ Anthimus, De observatione ciborum, 64 (CML VIII 1: 24, 1).

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\(^{10}\). Today, researchers believe that Anthimus most likely joined the Ostrogoths\(^{11}\), 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\(^{12}\) leads us to the conclusion that he also took a keen interest in dietetics during his Constantinopolitan years\(^{13}\).

\(^{10}\) *Malchus Philadelphiensis, Exc. de Leg. Gent.*, 15, 30–39, p. 422.


\(^{12}\) From the analysed treatise we learn that Anthimus treated foods as ἁπλὰ 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 diversae (De observatione 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.

\(^{13}\) 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]).
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*\(^{14}\). Some modern scholars maintain that Anthimus held high offices in Ravenna\(^{15}\), where – as a token of the king’s trust – he was sent as an emissary


\(^{14}\) Cf. Anthimus, *De observatione ciborum*, 64 (CML VIII 1: 24, 1–2) ([…] *nos Graeci dicimus alfta, Latine vero polenta, Gothi vero barbarice fenea […])*.

\(^{15}\) 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 Helfidius (*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 Helfidus 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 Helfidus).
to the Frankish ruler, Theuderic\textsuperscript{16}, to whom he dedicated his work entitled \textit{De observatione ciborum}\textsuperscript{17}, 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\textsuperscript{18}. These included dishes made from such rare and expensive ingredients as, for instance, rice\textsuperscript{19} and peacock meat\textsuperscript{20}. 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\textsuperscript{21}. As for peacocks, ever since Antiquity they had been exotic birds eagerly bred and kept by eastern rulers in private menageries\textsuperscript{22}, which allowed the beauty of their colourful plumage to be enjoyed and to have uninterrupted access to a meat that

\textsuperscript{16} 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, \textit{Food…}, p. 102–103. Hen’s supposition has been recently supported by Maciej Kokoszko (\textit{Anthimus and his Work}, p. 83–84).

\textsuperscript{17} According to Bonnie Effros, Anthimus’ treatise was a gift from Theodoric the Great to the Frankish king, cf. B. Effros, \textit{Creating…}, p. 65–66. This view is disputed by Hen, who indicates that, inter alia, \textit{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, \textit{Food…}, p. 102.

\textsuperscript{18} Cf. Y. Hen, \textit{Food…}, p. 105–106.

\textsuperscript{19} Anthimus, \textit{De observatione ciborum}, 70 (CML VIII 1: 26, 1–6).

\textsuperscript{20} Anthimus, \textit{De observatione ciborum}, 24 (CML VIII 1: 12, 17 – 13, 5).


was prized for its rarity value\textsuperscript{23}. In all probability, this same practice took place in the court of the Frankish king\textsuperscript{24}.

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


\textsuperscript{25} \textit{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, \textit{Roman Cookery. Ancient Recipes for Modern Kitchens}, London 2002, p. 123. In fact, rabbits were fairly common in the West (cf. M.W. Adamson, \textit{Food…}, p. 36). As it was shown by Henriette Kroll (\textit{Tiere im Byzantinischen Reich. Archäozoologische Forschungen im Überblick}, Mainz 2010 [= MRGZ, 87], p. 176), in the period between the 4\textsuperscript{th} and the 6\textsuperscript{th} cent. AD, we can observe rabbit domestication in the monastiries 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, \textit{Food…}, p. 36; H. Kroll, \textit{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 Northen 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, \textit{Livestock…}, p. 738–751. Neither do the researchers mention rabbits as game hunted by the Franks, cf. J.-H. Yvinec, M. Barme, \textit{Livestock…}, p. 751–755. Therefore, it is highly likely that rabbit meat was rather not served (or served only sporadically) at Theuderic’s court.

\textsuperscript{26} M.W. Adamson, \textit{Food…}, p. 36.

wealthy landowners would customarily erect special pens for hares and other wild animals. According to Varro, such places were referred to as leporaria, 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 and boars. Such facilities remained popular also in the Byzantine period.

Since hare meat (just like other types of game) was most likely consumed by the nobility and the rich, we may assume that it never became an important...
 constituent of the Frankish everyday diet. The same conclusion can also be drawn for other species of wild animals, which may explain why Anthimius devoted only four chapters to game in his treatise. 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.

The recipe is worded as follows: leporis vero si novellae fuerint, et ipsi sumendi in dulci piper habentem, parum cariofilum et gingiber, costo et spicanard vel folio (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 and Liechtenhan in the discussed chapter one can also find a medical annotation. 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, 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

34 Anthimius, 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 (Anthimius, 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 of domesticated animals more commonly than game.


37 Anthimius, De observatione ciborum, 13, 1–2, p. 73 (Rose 1870).

38 Anthimius, De observatione ciborum, 13 (CML VIII 1: 8, 7–8).

39 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.

can be found in *De diaeta*, a treatise dating back to the late 5th and early 4th cent. BC and constituting part of the so-called *Corpus Hippocraticum*[^1]. 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[^2]. Slightly more information is provided by Galen of Pergamon (2nd/3rd cent. AD)[^3]. 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[^4]. 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[^5]. Furthermore, in *De victu attenuante*, the author also claims that the discussed food is as dry as dog and fox meat[^6]. 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 (4th cent. AD)[^7], Aetius of Amida (6th cent. AD)[^8], and Paul of Aegina (7th cent. AD)[^9] 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


black bile\textsuperscript{50}, i.e., a dry and cold humour\textsuperscript{51} which was believed to be particularly thick\textsuperscript{52} and sticky\textsuperscript{53}. 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\textsuperscript{54}. 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\textsuperscript{55}.

This theory is reflected in the Byzantine dietary calendar compiled by Hierophilus\textsuperscript{56}, who states that hare meat should be avoided in September as it is a month that favours the formation of black bile. Hare meat was dry and 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, \textit{Galen’s Theory of Black Bile}. Hippocratic Tradition, Manipulation, Innovation, Leiden–Boston 2019 (= SAM, 51), p. 12, 125–127, 144–145.

\textsuperscript{50} Oribasius, \textit{Collectiones medicae}, III, 9, 1 (CMG VI 1, 1: 73, 17); Aetius Amidenus, \textit{Libri medicinales}, II, 246 (CMG VIII 1: 242, 19).

\textsuperscript{51} Galen, \textit{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, \textit{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, \textit{Galen’s Theory of Black Bile}. Hippocratic Tradition, Manipulation, Innovation, Leiden–Boston 2019 (= SAM, 51), p. 12, 125–127, 144–145.

\textsuperscript{52} Galenus, \textit{In Hippocratis De natura hominis}, I, 26 (CMG V 9, 1: 36, 3–5 = Kühn XV: 66).

\textsuperscript{53} Galenus, \textit{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 (\textit{Galen’s Theory…}, passim [especially p. 60–74]).

\textsuperscript{54} For instance, adverse effects from meat consumption that triggers the production of melancholic juices are discussed by Galen in the passage on beef within \textit{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, \textit{De alimentorum facultatibus}, III, 1, 3 (CMG V 4, 2: 333, 1–7 = Kühn VI: 661). The passage is quoted by Aetius of Amida (\textit{Libri medicinales}, II, 121 [CMG VIII 1: 1–8]).

\textsuperscript{55} 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, \textit{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. Jouanna, \textit{Dietetics…}, p. 149–151.

\textsuperscript{56} 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 (\textit{Botany…}, p. 346, note 159) it may have been the period between 7\textsuperscript{th} and 9\textsuperscript{th} cent. On other possible dates, cf. E. Delacenserie, \textit{Le traité de diététique de Hiérophile: Analyse interne}, B 84, 2014, p. 102–103; B. Caseau, \textit{Nourritures terrestres, nourritures célestes. La culture alimentaire à Byzance}, Paris 2015, p. 149–150; M. Leontsini, Διατρητικές συνήθειες και νυχήα: Παρατηρήσεις για τη διατροφή με ζωικά λίπη στις βυζαντινές διαιτητικές πραγματείες (7\textsuperscript{α}-12\textsuperscript{α} αι.), [in:] \textit{Ιατρική θεραπεία ἐστὶ μὲν πον καὶ σώματος, ἐστί δ’ ἀρα καὶ ψυχῆς: Ὄψεις της Ιατρικής στο Βυζάντιο (14 Δεκεμβρίου 2018, Ἰστορικό Αρχείο του Πανεπιστημίου Αθηνών) ΠΡΑΚΤΙΚΑ}, ed. K. Νικολάου, Κ. Γαραϊκα, Athens 2021, p. 46; B. Caseau, Quelques réflexions sur les interdits alimentaires dans le christianisme byzantin, [in:] \textit{Religion et interdits alimentaires. Archeozooologie et sources litteraire}, ed. eadem, H. Monchot (= O&M, 38), p. 100 (forthcoming). On Byzantine dietetic calendars, cf. A. Touwaide, \textit{Botany…}, p. 346; idem, \textit{Medicine and Pharmacy}, [in:] \textit{A Companion to Byzant-
that contributes to the generation of black bile\textsuperscript{57}. 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\textsuperscript{58} and November\textsuperscript{59} (when the human body is dominated by [moist and cold] phlegm\textsuperscript{60}) nor in May\textsuperscript{61} (when it tends to produce mainly [moist and hot] blood\textsuperscript{62}). On the other hand, the author finds the food acceptable (provided that it is combined with some vinegar\textsuperscript{63} or ὀξύμελι\textsuperscript{64}) in July\textsuperscript{65} and August (until the 15\textsuperscript{th} day of the month)\textsuperscript{66}, i.e. in the period which was believed to generate (dry and hot) bile\textsuperscript{67}. 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 of tine…, p. 379. In the present study I refer to Hieropilus’ calendar edited by Roberto Romano, which combines three texts, two of which were originally edited by Jean François Boissoneade in 1827 (col. I) and 1831 (col. II) and one edited by Armand Delatte in 1939 (col. III), cf. below.


\textsuperscript{58} 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 λεπτὸν […] ) 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.


\textsuperscript{60} Winter (χειμών, 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).


\textsuperscript{62} 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).

\textsuperscript{63} 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]).

\textsuperscript{64} For an explanation when the food ought to be consumed with ὀξύμελι, cf. above.


\textsuperscript{66} 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\textsuperscript{th} 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.

\textsuperscript{67} Summer (θέρος, 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)\(^{68}\), stating that it is better than that of older animals (Chapters 6–7)\(^{69}\). It is important for our deliberations that these observations concern not only novellae hares\(^{70}\) but also agnelinae carnes\(^{71}\) (lamb meat), edi\(^{72}\) (goat kids), teneriores oxen\(^{73}\), enulei\(^{74}\) (fawns) and carnes novellae of young wild goats\(^{75}\), 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\(^{76}\) 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\(^{77}\). It comes as no surprise therefore that Anthimus recommends the use of the meat of young hares in the discussed recipe.

\(^{68}\) 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).

\(^{69}\) Anthimus, De observatione ciborum, 6 (CML VIII 1: 6, 9–10); 7 (CML VIII 1: 6, 11–12).

\(^{70}\) Anthimus, De observatione ciborum, 13 (CML VIII 1: 8, 5).

\(^{71}\) Anthimus, De observatione ciborum, 5 (CML VIII 1: 6, 6).

\(^{72}\) Anthimus, De observatione ciborum, 5 (CML VIII 1: 6, 6).

\(^{73}\) 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.

\(^{74}\) Anthimus, De observatione ciborum, 7 (CML VIII 1: 6, 11–12).

\(^{75}\) Anthimus, De observatione ciborum, 7 (CML VIII 1: 6, 11).

\(^{76}\) Hence, it can facilitate the production of black bile.

\(^{77}\) 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 (1st/2nd cent. AD)78 – wild game ought not to be cooked immediately after slaughter, we can conclude then that wild game would undergo a process of tenderisation79. 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 (4th cent. AD) known as *De re coquinaria*80, but it is mentioned only twice81, 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 treatment82. The exact method was not specified in the recipe, so in order to gain greater insight, we must turn to
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 (4th cent. BC)\(^83\). In his poem entitled *Ἡδυπάθεια*, preserved by Athenaeus of Naucratis (2nd/3rd 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\(^84\). 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\(^85\). 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\(^86\). 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 […]*)\(^87\). 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\(^88\), we may assume that hare meat should

---

**Note:**


\(^85\) Anthimus, *De observatione ciborum*, 21 (CML VIII 1: 11, 5–9).

\(^86\) 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 ἀντικριστό, 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.

\(^87\) Anthimus, *De observatione ciborum*, 4 (CML VIII 1: 6, 1–2).

\(^88\) 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 Ἡδυ-πάθεια, there were numerous methods and advice on cooking hare meat (τοῦ δὲ λαγῶ πολλοί τε τρόποι πολλαί τε θέσεις σκευασίας εἰσίν)⁸⁹.

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 dates⁹⁰, raisins⁹¹, boiled wine must (caroenum)⁹², honey⁹³, straw wine (passum)⁹⁴, and Damascene plums⁹⁵, 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 sauces⁹⁶. Intriguingly, besides hare, Anthimus also recommended sweet sauce for beef⁹⁷ and peacock meat⁹⁸, i.e., foodstuffs whose dietetic properties were similar to those attributed to hare⁹⁹. Additionally, a comparative analysis of both

---


⁸⁹ Archestratus Gelous, Ἡδυπάθεια, 57, 1–2 (57 Brandt, SH 188), p. 207; Athenaeus Naucratita, Deipnosophistae, IX, 399d (= Kaibel IX, 61), p. 360.
⁹⁰ Apicius, De re coquinaria, VIII, 8, 2; VIII, 8, 3; VIII, 8, 12; VIII, 8, 13, p. 278, 280, 282.
⁹¹ Apicius, De re coquinaria, VIII, 8, 2, p. 278; VIII, 8, 12, p. 282.
⁹² 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.
⁹³ Apicius, De re coquinaria, VIII, 8, 6, p. 280.
⁹⁴ Apicius, De re coquinaria, VIII, 8, 10, p. 282.
⁹⁵ Apicius, De re coquinaria, VIII, 8, 13, p. 282.
⁹⁶ 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.
⁹⁷ 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.
⁹⁸ 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.
texts shows that beef and peacock meat were exposed to similar heat treatment, which may suggest that hare meat was prepared likewise\textsuperscript{100}.

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\textsuperscript{101}. 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\textsuperscript{102}. 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\textsuperscript{103}.

The ingredients mentioned above (especially wine, fish sauce, and olive oil) were commonly used in the cuisine of the Mediterranean since Antiquity\textsuperscript{104}, 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\textsuperscript{105}, 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

\textsuperscript{100} 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.

\textsuperscript{101} 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.

\textsuperscript{102} Apicius, De re coquinaria, VIII, 8, 6, p. 280.

\textsuperscript{103} Apicius, De re coquinaria, VIII, 8, 13, p. 282.


\textsuperscript{105} Cf. further parts of the article.
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preparation\textsuperscript{106}, while the other three concern therapeutics\textsuperscript{107}. At the same time, Anthimus frequently recommends the use of vinegar\textsuperscript{108} in  	extit{ars coquinaria} – an ingredient that had long been a staple in Mediterranean cuisine\textsuperscript{109}. For our deliberations, it is worth remembering that vinegar is the base of the  	extit{iusscellum} 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  	extit{De re coquinaria}, he would also opt for the  	extit{iusscellum} 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\textsuperscript{110}, which allows us to presume that it was also listed by Anthimus in his recipe. After all, he recommends its application\textsuperscript{111} 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  	extit{laredum}, i.e. lard, is an additive which can replace olive oil if the latter is not at hand\textsuperscript{112}.

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

\textsuperscript{106} Anthimus,  	extit{De observatione ciborum}, 3 (CML VIII 1: 4, 16 – 5, 15); 4 (CML VIII 1: 5, 16 – 6, 5).
\textsuperscript{107} Anthimus,  	extit{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).
\textsuperscript{108} Anthimus,  	extit{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).
\textsuperscript{109} Cf. A. Dalby,  	extit{Food…}, p. 343.
\textsuperscript{110} Olive oil was not listed in only two out of thirteen recipes, cf. Apicius,  	extit{De re coquinaria}, VIII, 8, 3, p. 278; VIII, 8, 9, p. 282.
\textsuperscript{111} Anthimus,  	extit{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).
\textsuperscript{112} Anthimus,  	extit{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  	extit{oxygala/melca}, cf. Anthimus,  	extit{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,  	extit{Landscape and Material Culture of Gaul in the Times of Gregory of Tours According to Archaeology}, [in:]  	extit{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,  	extit{Olives…}, p. 1099.
against this ingredient, recommending salt instead\textsuperscript{113}. Therefore, it seems quite likely that he would use the latter to add flavour to the discussed \textit{iuscellum}.

In all probability, his \textit{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\textsuperscript{114}. 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 \textit{De re coquinaria}. However, we should not exclude the use of celery since it was mentioned among the ingredients of the \textit{iuscellum} described in \textit{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 \textit{olla}\textsuperscript{115}. This is mentioned, for instance, in a recipe for beef together with a pot named \textit{bucular}, which is significant for our deliberations, since

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{113} Anthimus, \textit{De observatione ciborum}, 9 (CML VIII 1: 7, 5–7). Anthimus (\textit{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 (\textit{egrogarium}). Cf. C. Deroux, \textit{La digestion…}, p. 409–410; idem, \textit{Tradition…}, p. 176–177; idem, Anthime, un médecin…, p. 1117–1119.
  \item \textsuperscript{114} Anthimus, \textit{De observatione ciborum}, 55 (CML VIII 1: 22, 4–5).
  \item \textsuperscript{115} Cf. Anthimus, \textit{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 \textit{vas}, cf. \textit{De observatione ciborum}, 10 (CML VIII 1: 7, 12); 76 (CML VIII 1: 28, 7); 83 (CML VIII 1: 30, 11). Kenneth Douglas White (\textit{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 (\textit{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 \textit{olla} and \textit{vas} interchangeably. In \textit{De observatione ciborum} we can find more terms referring to vessels: \textit{bucular} (Anthimus, \textit{De observatione ciborum}, 3 [CML VIII 1: 5, 14]), \textit{gavata} (Anthimus, \textit{De observatione ciborum}, 34 [CML VIII 1: 16, 6–7]). What is more, a recipe for beef (Anthimus, \textit{De observatione ciborum}, 3 [CML VIII 1: 4, 16]) also contains the word \textit{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, \textit{Per un approfondimento dei germanismi dell’Epistula Anthimi de observatione ciborum: bridum/spiss, sodinga/prue}, LFi 29, 2009, p. 187–188.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
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 buc- culare non coquat, sed in olla fictile […]*)\(^{116}\), 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*)\(^{117}\) enables us to presume that *ollae* may also have been made of bronze. The last passage, together with the recipe for beef\(^{118}\), 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\(^{119}\), quinces\(^{120}\) and sauces based on vinegar\(^{121}\). Importantly, the mentioned foodstuffs, with the exception of milk\(^{122}\), 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\(^{123}\). 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.

116 Anthimus, *De observatione ciborum*, 3 (CML VIII 1: 5, 14–15).
117 Anthimus, *De observatione ciborum*, 75 (CML VIII 1: 27, 8). Perhaps *bucular* was also made of bronze.
118 […] *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]).
119 Anthimus, *De observatione ciborum*, 75 (CML VIII 1: 27, 8).
120 Anthimus, *De observatione ciborum*, 83 (CML VIII 1: 30, 11).
121 Anthimus, *De observatione ciborum*, 3 (CML VIII 1: 5, 3–15); 10 (CML VIII 1: 7, 10–13).
122 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.
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 form 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 and pigs) and *tenerior* (used in reference to the meat of oxen and ducks) have a similar meaning as the word *novellus* in the entry on the hare. Namely, they do not relate directly to the freshness or tenderness 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

---

124 Anthimus, *De observatione ciborum*, 8 (CML VIII 1: 6, 13).
125 Anthimus, *De observatione ciborum*, 9 (CML VIII 1: 7, 1–2).
126 Cf. note 73.
127 Anthimus, *De observatione ciborum*, 32 (CML VIII 1: 15, 10).
128 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 Observation…*, 20, p. 57).
129 Anthimus, *On the Observance…*, 8, p. 53 (Grant); 9, p. 53 (Grant).
130 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.
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