



Universiteit
Leiden

MA Thesis

The Non-Latin Lexis in the
Cooking Terminology of
Anthimus' *De Observatione Ciborum*

Veerle Pauline Verhagen

*gertrudi adalbertoque
gratias immensas ago*

Table of contents

Preface.....	i
List of Abbreviations.....	v
1. The Text in Historical Context.....	1
1.1 Introduction.....	1
1.2 The Author himself: historical sources.....	2
1.3 What the text reveals.....	4
1.4 The Linguistic situation of Anthimus' days.....	8
2. The lemmata.....	13
<i>afratus</i>	13
<i>alfita</i>	14
<i>aloxinum</i>	15
<i>azimus</i>	16
<i>bradonis</i>	17
<i>bridos</i>	19
<i>cracatiu</i>	21
<i>fartalia</i>	22
<i>fenea</i>	25
<i>medus</i>	26

<i>nauprida</i>	28
<i>platensis</i>	29
<i>sitri</i>	30
<i>sodinga</i>	33
<i>tecunis</i>	35
<i>trucanti</i>	37
<i>truca</i>	39
3. Analysis and conclusions.....	43
Bibliography.....	49

Preface

The following research aims to discuss and explain some of the non-Latin lexis found in Anthimus' *de observatione ciborum epistula* (henceforth *DOC*). Literally translated, this title means 'Letter concerning the observance of food'. The text is a list, presented as a letter to a Frankish king, of foodstuffs and instructions for their preparation, compiled by Anthimus, a 5th–6th century physician of presumably Byzantine origins.¹ It dictates to the reader which types of food do and which do not fit a healthy lifestyle, and how these foodstuffs should be prepared in order to promote health and well-being. Most likely the work was written in the early sixth century, seemingly by a non-native speaker of the Latin language.^{2,3} The text offers us an interesting insight into the linguistic environment in which it was composed, which, as it seems, was one where interaction between languages was common. *DOC* contains a large number of non-Latin loanwords from Germanic, Celtic, and Greek.⁴ Many of these lemmata have already been discussed extensively in academic investigations.⁵ What this work aims to do, is to concentrate on the cooking terminology, that is, words denoting edibles, cooking techniques, kitchen equipment and any other terms that seem to have been used principally in a culinary context. Moreover, it aims to focus on the loanwords that were likely introduced into Latin in or just before Anthimus' time, and may still have been perceived as loanwords by native speakers of contemporary Latin. The purpose here is not to enumerate all the words from the text that were introduced into Latin from other language branches throughout the ages. Rather, it is meant to be a snapshot, as it were, of the linguistic environment wherein this text was written, and to give an image of the relationship of Late Latin with its neighbours.

This means that words of which we have attestations from Classical Latin have not been included in the following research, even if they are easily proven to be of non-Latin origin. An example of such words is *butyrum* (in *DOC* found in the form *butero*, "*similiter et de butero recente si acceperit pthisicus*", section 77, folio 254), a word of Greek origins⁶ which is attested

¹ For more biographical information on Anthimus, see Grant 1996, 9-36; Rose 1870, 43-56; Keyser & Irby-Massie 2010, 91-2.

² See Grant 1996, 27-8; Rose 1870, 45.

³ It might be worth specifying that in this work, with "Latin" is intended not only Classical Latin, but any stage or variation of the language before the emergence of Romance languages. Where necessary, I will specify that a distinction is being made, referring to 'Classical Latin' (largely referring to texts from before the 3rd century, approximately), 'late Latin' (for anything after Classical Latin), or 'Vulgar Latin' (referring to non-literary language). For an interesting view on the problem of classifying Latin and Vulgar Latin, see Herman 2000, 1-8 and 110-5

⁴ Caparrini 2009, 180.

⁵ See, for instance, the editions of *DOC* with commentaries and notes such as that of Grant 1996; the many articles that have been published on the text and some of its peculiar lemmata, such as Caparrini 2009, Deroux 1988 and 2002, Grant 1993, Klein 1953, Schwentner 1967. See also the bibliography of this work, which is far from exhaustive.

⁶ Walde-Hofmann 1938, LEW, 125; Ernout-Meillet, DLL, 1985, 79

as early as Pliny.⁷ Vice versa, because the focus of this research is on language contact, words which occur first or only in *DOC* but which can be shown to be of Italic origin, have been excluded, even if they appear to be new formations. An example of such words is *crudaster* (“[...] *in subtilis carbonis assent ita ut crudastro sint*[...]”, section 21, folio 231), which is made up of the adjective *crudus* and the suffix *-aster*. Whilst the composition of this adjective with this suffix is found only in Anthimus, the word is certainly of Latinate origin, and is therefore not of interest for the following examination of non-Latin lexis. Finally, words that are not culinary jargon have been excluded. An example of such a word is *catamodicum* (“*sic linguat catamodicum etsupinus se poneat*”, section 77, folio 255) of which the first attestation is found in *DOC*, but which is not relevant to the culinary jargon examined here.⁸

As is often a problem in the examination of very old texts, the extant manuscripts are more than likely not perfectly representative of what Anthimus wrote. Of *DOC*, there are various different manuscripts, and they often offer extremely varying readings. What follows is an overview of the nine manuscripts that are currently known:

Manuscript	Name	Age	Comments
Sangallensis 762	G	9 th century	The earliest extant manuscript, G is blindly faithful to the example from which it was copied. Corrections in two hands, G ^c and G ² . ⁹ Uniquely contains headings - probably a later addition ¹⁰ .
Londiniensis Ayscough	A	17 th century	Much more recent than most others, but a careful copy of 9 th c original and thus often considered equally reliable ¹¹
Bamberg	B	9 th century	Truncated version - occasionally offers valid readings where G is corrupt, but also offers its own corrections of perceived incorrect usage ¹²
Sangallensis	g	ninth century, some time after 849 ¹³	Vulgarisms ‘corrected’ to customary usage, but g does preserve some interesting readings that correspond to the better mss ¹⁴
Parisinus	P	11 th century	Seems to share an ancestor with g, based on readings that only those two mss contain or omit ¹⁵

⁷ Albeit in a different spelling, *butyrum* – Pliny the Elder, Nat. Hist., various occurrences, for instance book 11, chapter 96, and book 28, chapter 35.

⁸ For an overview of hapax legomena unique to *DOC*, see Groen 1926, 11.

⁹ Rose 1870, 56-7; Liechtenhan 1928, VIII; Grant 1996, 43.

¹⁰ Liechtenhan, op cit, VIII.

¹¹ Rose 1870, 58.

¹² Liechtenhan 1928, XI.

¹³ Ibidem.

¹⁴ Ibidem, XI-XII.

¹⁵ Ibidem, XIII.

Londinensis Harleianus	I	11 th century ¹⁶	Has been changed to what was considered 'correct' Latin by its scribe, and often differs needlessly from better mss ¹⁷
Pragensis	P	14 th or 15 th century	Probably the furthest from the original text and of all other extant mss, P is of little value
Parisinus 6842	H	10 th century	Occasionally useful in confirming the other mss ¹⁸
Parisinus New Acquisition	N	11 th or 12 th century	Contains only introduction and first chapter, usually reads like H ¹⁹

For the sake of consistency, I have preferred to cite the words as they occur in one single manuscript. **G** is widely considered to be the most reliable in the sense that its scribes have made no changes to the text in order to produce what they considered to be more correct Latin,²⁰ thus potentially preserving the original text better than the other manuscripts do. (As Weber explains,²¹ our improved understanding of Vulgar Latin has revealed that some expressions and forms which were previously thought to be errors, were actually phenomena inherent to popular speech.)

Conveniently, **G** is available for consultation online on the Swiss digitization site of e-codices, in the manuscript known as Codex Sangallensis 762, with *DOC* starting on page 217.²² For these two reasons, **G** is the manuscript that has been used for the present compilation. For the variant readings, which can be found under each lemma in this work, I have used the critical apparatus from Liechtenhan's 1928 edition of *DOC*, as his edition starts with an extensive comparison of the different manuscripts and includes two that Rose (who also provides an excellent critical apparatus) had apparently never been able to consult. The lemmata occur in this work spelled exactly as they appear in **G**, even when such a reading might not be the most probable one in terms of conventional correctness. As mentioned, **G** seems to be blindly loyal to whatever original it was copied from, and therefore sometimes offers surprising readings – any corrections from other manuscripts or alternative suggestions by contemporary translators will be discussed under their related heading if relevant.

The presentation of the lemmata will be as follows: the lemmata which have been included in the selection are listed in alphabetical order, followed by the number of the section of *DOC* in which they can be found as listed in **G**, and the folio number. Each lemma is listed in the

¹⁶ Rose 1870, 60 (footnote).

¹⁷ Liechtenhan 1928, IX.

¹⁸ Liechtenhan 1928, XIV.

¹⁹ Ibidem.

²⁰ Weber 1924, 2; Grant 1996, 43.

²¹ Weber 1924, 3.

²² See bibliography for complete URL.

spelling, case, and number in which it is found in **G**. Below the header is the phrase from the text in which the word occurs, with a translation, to provide some context. Below that, all variant readings can be found. (Note that only forms are listed that are different from the reading in **G**.) If a word occurs in the text multiple times, all occurrences will be listed with their context and translation, and any variant readings. Meaning and origin are listed where they are known. Other attestations will only be listed if they are from before Anthimus' time, or contemporary to him, with a slight margin for later attestations. Then there will be two sets of reflexes the word may have yielded, one representing reflexes in Romance and one representing those found in other language branches. Reflexes in Romance languages are limited to the oldest attested forms, and the current form in the modern Romance daughter languages where applicable. Regional variations are listed only where other forms are lacking or where there is a divergence in meaning or form. Dictionary definitions of the reflexes are given only where these differ in meaning from the meaning in Anthimus. If the word is mentioned in the rubric, the rubric is included. (Note that the rubric was unique to **G**.) Below is an example lemma:

Aloxinum n. 15, f229

cervisa bibendo vel medus et aloxinum quam maxime omnibus congruum est– “Drinking beer or mead or absinthe is very good for everyone.”

aloxanum **B** *aloxmum* **g**

Meaning	wormwood, absinthe
Attestations	no other attestations known
Origin	Greek ἀλόη ὀξινῆς, ‘sour aloe’
In Romance	Fr. <i>aluine</i> , OFr. <i>aluisne</i> , (with variants <i>aloisne</i> , <i>aloesne</i> , <i>aluesne</i> , <i>alonge</i>), Lux. <i>batteralzem</i> Norm. <i>aliène</i> OIt. <i>alóscia</i> , Po. <i>losna</i> , Sp. <i>aloja</i> , OSp. <i>alosna</i>
Other reflexes	Ge. <i>Alsem</i> , OHG. <i>alahsan</i> , Lux. <i>alzem</i> , Du. <i>alsem</i> , MDu. <i>alsene</i>

Abbreviations of authors, works and manuscripts in which attestations have been found:

Alex. Trall.	Alexander Trallianus Medicus, c. 525 – c.605 CE
By this author:	
Alex. Trall. Febr.	de febris
Aelian	Claudius Aelianus, c. 175 – c. 235 CE
By this author:	
Aelian N.A.	de natura animalium
Aus.	Decimus Magnus Ausonis, c. 310 – c. 395 CE
By this author:	
Aus. Ep.	Epistulae
Aus. Mos.	Mosella
Cael. Aur.	Caelius Aurelianus, 5 th century CE (but argued by some to be earlier)
By this author:	
Cael. Aur. Acut.	Acutarum sive Celerum Passionum
Cael. Aur. Tard.	Tardarum sive Chronicarum Passionum
Cath. Angl.	Catholicon Anglicum, 1483 CE
Cod. Vind.	Codex Vindobonensis 804
Isid.	Isidore of Seville, c. 560–636
By this author:	
Isid. Etym.	Etymologiae
Nat. Hist.	Naturalis Historia, Pliny the Elder, 1 st century CE
Oppian	Oppian, 2 nd century CE
By this author:	
Oppian Hal.	Halieutica
Plin. Val.	C. Plinius Valerianus, physician, c. 400 CE
Pol. Sil	Polemios Silvius, 5 th century CE
By this author:	
Pol. Sil. Lat.	Polemios Silvius, Laterculus
Prud.	Aurelius Prudentius Clemens, Late-Latin poet, c. 348 – c. 413 CE
By this author:	
Prud. Apoth.	Apotheosis
Sinon. Barthol.	Sinonoma Bartholomei, 1380 CE, as published in “Sinonoma Bartholomei, a glossary from a fourteenth-century manuscript in the

Library of Pembroke college, Oxford by [Mirfeld, John, d. 1407]; Mowat, J.L.G. (John Lancaster Gough), 1846-1894

Ven. Fort. Venantius Fortunatis, Vita Radegundis (only work known) c. 536 – 610 CE
Vulg. Biblia Vulgatae Editionis - Hieronymus (St. Jerome), 383 - 392 CE
Vulg. Jud. Epistula Judae from the Biblia Vulgatae Editionis

Abbreviations of quoted works:

AAG Althochdeutscher und Altsächsischer Glossenwortschatz. Schützeichel, R. 2004.
DAHDG Die althochdeutschen Glossen. Steinmeyer und Sievers, 1879.
DELF Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue française. Bloch & Wartburg, 1968.
DELL Dictionnaire Étymologique de la langue latine. Ernout & Meillet, 1985.
EWDF Etymologisches Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache. Kluge, F. 2011.
EWN Etymologisch Woordenboek van het Nederlands. Philippa M. 2003-2009.
FEW Französisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch. von Wartburg, W, 1922-2003.
GLL Glossary of Later Latin. Souters, 1949.
LEW Lateinische Etymologisches Wörterbuch. Walde-Hofmann, 1938.
REW Romanisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch. Meyer-Lübke, 1935.
TLL Thesaurus Linguae Latinae, online edition.
VDADC Vocabolario degli Accademici della Crusca, 1863.
VWIS Vergleichendes Wörterbuch der Indogermanischen Sprache. Walde-Pokorny, 1927.

Abbreviations of languages and dialects:

Bas. Basque
BLim. Bas-Limousin
Bret. Breton

Celt.	Celtic
Da.	Danish
Du.	Dutch
En.	English
Fr.	French
Gal.	Galician
Gaul.	Gaulish
Ge.	German
Gmc.	Germanic
Gr.	Greek (Classical)
Ic.	Icelandic
Ir.	Irish
It.	Italian
Lang.	Languedocian
Lat.	Latin
Lux.	Luxembourgish
MHG	Middle High German
MBre.	Middle Breton
MDu.	Middle Dutch
MFr.	Middle French
ModGr.	modern Greek
MWe.	Middle Welsh
NFr.	New French (1600 onwards, excluding current usage)
NHG	New High German
No.	Norse
OCor.	Old Cornish

OE.	Old English
OFr.	Old French
OHG	Old High German
OIt.	Old Italian
ON.	Old Norse
OPr.	Old Provençal
OSp.	Old Spanish
Po.	Portuguese
Ro.	Romanian
Sp.	Spanish
Sw.	Swedish
Umb.	Umbrian

Other abbreviations

adj.	adjective
dial.	dialect
<i>DOC</i>	<i>de observatione ciborum</i>
gen.	genitive
mss.	manuscripts
n.	noun
nt.	neuter
neg. part.	negating particle
om.	omitted
pl.	plural
rubr.	rubric
sg.	singular

1. The historical context

1.1 Introduction

De observatione ciborum, the Latin letter that makes recommendations to the Frankish king regarding his dietary régime, has drawn the attention of scholars and linguists because of the large amount of non-Latin lexis it contains, some of which are unique to the work.²³

Additionally, *DOC* contains a number of hapax legomena, some of non-Latin appearance, some clearly Latin forms that are unattested elsewhere. The question is posed here, is what the reason for this high frequency of non-Latin words in the text is. The words that we find in *DOC* are of Germanic, Celtic, and Greek origin.²⁴ How is the distribution of these words and their respective language branch of origin? Do words from any one of them occur more frequently than of the others or is the distribution a relatively clean three-way split? What can the distribution tell us about the text and the environment that it was written in?

The historical context of the work is a vital element in establishing an image of the linguistic environment of the Latin of the late fifth and early sixth centuries. However, historical evidence as provided by accounts concerning the author's life alone is insufficient, because it simply does not offer enough information, either about the author or the text, to draw a conclusion one way or the other concerning the creation of the work. Therefore, the text itself must be examined in order to find out what it can tell us. The two aspects that must be considered in examining the historical context, to wit, history and linguistics, might then be shown to support each other in offering a final conclusion.

As regards the first question posed above, namely what the reason is for the relatively high density of foreign lexis in this text, there are two possibilities. One is that Anthimus wrote his *epistula* when he was already living at the Frankish court in Gaul. Having lived at the Ostrogothic court, he would have been in a contact situation with perhaps his first Germanic language: Gothic. Living at the Frankish court after that, he would have been in contact with native speakers of Frankish, and possibly of Celtic languages, which would have provided him with an opportunity to take in new vocabulary in a relatively natural manner. As a non-native speaker of Latin, he may have found it difficult to tell which words were Latin and which ones weren't, leading to the introduction of Germanic and Celtic vocabulary in his text. Alternatively, he may have considered it appropriate or convenient to include non-Latin vocabulary, as his intended audience would have been Germanic-speaking, although this

²³ Caparrini 2009, 179.

²⁴ *Ibidem*; see also the discussion of the individual lemmata below.

only accounts for Germanic vocabulary, and not for Celtic. As for the Greek loanwords, Anthimus was a native speaker of Greek himself, and may have introduced words for certain dishes or foodstuffs from his own mother tongue.

Another possibility is that the linguistic relationship between Latin and its various neighbouring languages was one of close contact and thus of frequent interchange. In this scenario, the words that Anthimus uses were not at all unfamiliar to native Latin speakers of the author's own time. There are two arguments that can be made against this hypothesis. One is that Anthimus' *epistula* seems to be unusually high in loanwords.²⁵ Why do we not find more texts with such a high density of non-Latin words? Moreover, it is troubling that many of the words concerned occur exclusively in *DOC*. If these words were familiar to most Latin speakers, why do we not find them more often, and more importantly, why do some of them seem to have disappeared from Romance altogether? Of course it is possible that the words were of too specialistic a nature to occur in other texts. However, other texts on food and cooking have been found. Apicius is the most famous example, but other texts exist, with Pliny's *Naturalis historia* being a source of many plants and vegetables fit for human consumption.²⁶ Is it possible that some of the words denoted equipment or edibles that are no longer used, leading to the disappearance of the terminology that used to describe them?

1.2 The author himself: historical sources

Concerning the author, many aspects of Anthimus' history, and thus of that of *de observatione ciborum*, remain unclear to us. Most of what is known to a relative degree of certainty concerning the author himself, a rather scarce amount of information, comes from a single source. Malchus of Philadelphia, a fifth century Byzantine historian,²⁷ describes a political plot against emperor Zeno in which Anthimus was involved, and for which he was sent into exile along with the other conspirators.²⁸ The source makes no more mention of Anthimus, but as Grant points out,²⁹ his most likely movements afterwards can be deduced with relative ease. Anthimus had sought to conspire against Zeno with Theodoric the Amal, king of the

²⁵ Ibidem.

²⁶ Particularly books XIV and XV on fruit trees, XVIII on grains, XIX on garden plants, XXII on plants and fruits, and all chapters on remedies extracted from plants or animals, XX and XXVI - XXXII contain many words denoting both edible plants or techniques to extract food or medicine from them. See also Dalby (2003) for an extensive list of food from the ancient world with their attestations.

²⁷ See Baldwin 1977 for an excellent examination of the historian's life.

²⁸ Malchus *Historia*, page 238 in the 1829 edition (ed.s Bekker & Niebuhr): "Interea apprehensi sunt qui ea, quae in urbe facta erant, ad Theuderichum scripserant, Anthimus medicus, Marcellinus et Stephanus [...] Tres ex senatu praesente magistro de his quaestionem habuerant, quos multis illatis plagis perpetuo exilio condemnarunt." - "Meanwhile those who had written to Theodoric what had been done in the city, Anthimus the physician, Marcellinus and Stephanus were arrested. [...] Three men from the senate, in the presence of the *magister*, had instituted a trial for these deeds, and the men were sent in permanent exile, with many wounds inflicted upon them."

²⁹ Grant 1996 16.

Ostrogoths, who later sent him as a legate to Theuderic, king of the Franks³⁰ (see also the preface to his own *epistula*, where he describes himself as “*anthimus, vir inluster comes et legatarius ad gloriosissimum theudericum regem francorum*” - “Anthimus, distinguished associate and legate to the glorious Theuderic, king of the Franks”). It is more than likely that in the meantime, too, he associated with Theodoric, and thus found himself in the North of Italy, specifically at Ravenna, which is where the Ostrogothic court was located. However, any more detail than that, even if based on careful examination of other, indirect historical evidence, is speculation.³¹

Unfortunately, it is precisely the details that elude which are important in the historical context of the question posed here. This text could shed light on the linguistic interchange between Latin on the one hand, and Celtic, Germanic and Greek on the other, but at the same time it does not give us the entire picture, because it is uncertain how representative the text is of the Latin spoken and written in Anthimus’ days. A useful examination would be to compare the extent to which Latin and its neighbouring languages interacted with one another, and to what degree Latin adopted words from other language branches on the one hand, and the extent to which this is reflected in *DOC* on the other. In order to establish to what extent the work can be considered representative of the linguistic situation of Anthimus’ days, it will prove vital to know more about the work and its author. In order to understand the linguistic context of the work, for instance, it would be helpful to know where Anthimus had learned his Latin - a scholarly Latin in Constantinople, where he had presumably studied, or a more vulgar speech in Italy upon his arrival there? Was Anthimus himself particularly prone to introducing foreign lexicon into his Latin text because of where he was when he wrote the work, or were these words in common use throughout larger Latin speaking areas? Did his Grecophone background influence his texts, or were his readers familiar with the Greek terms he used? And did Anthimus write his *epistula* in Ravenna, at the court of Theodoric, or in Gaul, at the court of Theuderic?

The relevant literature offers some interesting hypotheses about Anthimus’ linguistic background. Rose,³² for instance, argues that Anthimus’ Latin is not of a scholarly character, and he must therefore have learned it not in a formal, academic setting, but by associating with native speakers and learning from them, acquiring the language in an entirely informal manner. Undoubtedly Rose draws this conclusion from the colloquial nature of the *DOC*.³³ This colloquial style is reflected, to name but one example, in the extensive use of prepositions followed by an accusative, where a more literary style would have demanded an appropriate case without preposition.³⁴ However, this informal style is not entirely

³⁰ Ibidem, 15-6.

³¹ Grant 1996 does give an incredibly useful timeline of other important players on the political stage of Anthimus’ time, carefully placing Anthimus in a narrower context of time and place than I can afford to do here, see 15-28.

³² Rose 1870, 46.

³³ Grant 1996, 16; for an elaborate discussion of vulgar Latin and the presence of colloquialisms in *DOC*, see Weber 1924, introduction and commentary.

³⁴ For instance, in the title of the work: *ad gloriosissimum theudericum* instead of *gloriosissimo theudorico*.

conclusive evidence - there is always the possibility that Anthimus was able to write a more scholarly Latin, but deemed it unnecessary for the *letter*, which, as will be discussed below, may have been presented to the Frankish king as a gift upon arrival - a friendly peace offering, rather than a piece of high art. But at any rate, Rose is not alone in his conviction – Adams³⁵ shares his belief and similarly bases himself upon the text. Adams focuses on the interference he sees of Greek in the written Latin, which, he argues, shows the characteristics of someone not formally trained in the language. In addition to the previously mentioned argument, Rose asserts that Anthimus' use of *nam non* instead of the expected *sed non* irrefutably demonstrates that Anthimus learned his Latin in Italy, as *nam non* occurs exclusively in Lombardic legal documents (though not annals).³⁶ However, Liechtenhan, in his 1963 edition of *DOC*, argues that *nam non* was not in fact a typically Italian expression,³⁷ whilst Weber sees in it a Graecism.³⁸ Grant argues that Rose's linguistic arguments are consistent with the known geographical movements of the Ostrogothic king with whom Anthimus associated. We know that Theodoric had his court in Ravenna in Northern Italy, and it is imaginable that Anthimus was present there between their first chronicled contact (the letter that resulted in his exile from Constantinople) and Anthimus' ambassadorship at the Frankish court. However, as mentioned above, none of the discussed hypotheses can offer conclusive evidence, and everything we might conjecture about Anthimus is informed guesswork. The question cannot be settled without further evidence, which, for lack of historical sources, must be deduced from the contents of the work itself.

1.3 What the text reveals

Regarding the question where the *epistula* was written, Rose³⁹ offers an interesting piece of evidence from *DOC*. Anthimus, he argues, cannot have been a resident of Frankish territory at the time when he composed the *epistula*, as evidenced by the phrase "*de crudo vero larido quod solent ut audio domni franci comedere, [...]*". *ut audio* clearly suggests hearsay, rather than personal experience, and it would certainly be unlikely that, if Anthimus were present at the Frankish court, he had heard of the Franks eating raw bacon, without having once seen them enjoying this delicacy. If Rose is right, this could mean that the *epistula* was written by Anthimus before his departure for the Frankish court to present as a gift upon arrival. Grant⁴⁰ argues against this, stating that some of the knowledge and acceptance of Frankish eating habits would have had to be learned from experience, an opinion shared by Flobert.⁴¹ Moreover, Grant argues that there is no reason for Anthimus to call himself a legate to the

³⁵ Adams 2003, 449.

³⁶ Rose 1870, 46.

³⁷ See Grant 1996, 16; unfortunately, the 1963 Liechtenhan edition of *DOC* itself is unavailable to me.

³⁸ Weber 1924.

³⁹ Rose 1870, 45-6.

⁴⁰ Grant 1996, 27-8.

⁴¹ Flobert 1997, 20.

Frankish king if he were not at the Frankish court. Grant ignores the possibility that Anthimus had been appointed as legate, but had not yet taken on the journey for the court he was to be a legate at, and that the work was written in preparation for his arrival in Gaul, rather than after it. As for the eating habits Anthimus discusses and, consequently, apparently knew of, these may have been learned in the same way as the Frankish predilection for raw bacon: word of mouth. Theodoric was married to Audofleda, the sister of Clovis, the king of the Franks and father of Theuderic, the latter one of Clovis' four successors.⁴² Clearly there was ample diplomatic interaction between the two peoples, and it is therefore unimaginable that the Ostrogothic court never saw Frankish visitors. It follows that Anthimus would have had sufficient opportunity to learn about Frankish eating habits before his departure for Northern Gaul.

Slightly troublesome for Rose's hypothesis that the work was composed before Anthimus' departure for Gaul, I would argue, is that Anthimus sometimes refers to places as if he were there. For instance, in section 39 we find "*de piscium ratione que in his partibus sunt*". We read *his partibus* or "these parts", rather than *illis partibus* which you might have expected to find if Anthimus were writing about a region which was far away from him, as opposed to a region in which he found himself at the time of writing. *hic*, of course, was not employed exclusively to refer to something near in the physical world, but also to things that were recently mentioned. Yet this does not seem a sufficient explanation for the use of *hic* in this section, as neither Gaul nor the Franks have been mentioned in the preceding sections. G, the manuscript that I have relied on heavily for this research, is not infallible, and it is possible that the original order of the sections was changed, thus moving a reference to the Franks further away from *his*. The text, precisely at this point, seems to be corrupted: g and P include a section on fungi that the other manuscripts do not have. However, these two are not counted among the more reliable manuscripts.⁴³ Moreover, they seem to have been copied from the same original, based on omissions and additions that only these two manuscripts contain. Surely, then, it is more likely that g and P have included this part where it should not have been. Additionally, direct references to the Franks or Gaul are infrequent in the text.

An alternative explanation might be that Anthimus thought the region of Gaul an implied subject, considering the letter was addressed to and intended for the use of the Frankish king, to be presented to him upon Anthimus' arrival at the Frankish court in Gaul. However, in such a construction, a form of *is* would be expected,⁴⁴ rather than a form of *hic*. Arguably there were some dramatic changes in the use of the Latin demonstrative pronouns, leading, amongst other results, to the definite article as it is known in Romance.⁴⁵ However, these did not occur until much later, with *hic* persisting even in the eighth century,⁴⁶ and therefore

⁴² See also Burns, 1984, 94.

⁴³ Liechtenhan 1928, XI-XIV; Weber 1924, 2-3.

⁴⁴ Panhuis 1998, 42.

⁴⁵ Alkire & Roosen 2010, 301.

⁴⁶ Meader 1901, 149.

cannot be argued to have played a role in any potential confusion over which pronoun to use in this text. Moreover, *hic*, which had previously been used to indicate something nearby, was lost completely. *Ille* on the other hand, which had previously been used to indicate something further away, became the definite article in Romance.⁴⁷ Anthimus' use of *hic* would suggest the opposite semantic changes had taken place, and is therefore clearly not related to this phenomenon. Without giving an explanation as to why, however, we can establish at the very least that Anthimus' use of pronouns seems to have been somewhat inconsistent, with various different pronouns being used synonymously throughout the work.⁴⁸ Admittedly the confusion centers around *ille*, *iste*, and *ipse*,⁴⁹ which seem in Anthimus to be at times completely interchangeable. Be that as it may, the confusion of these three particular pronouns might point to a somewhat careless use of pronouns in general, granting some credibility to the idea that Anthimus used *his* in referral to a distant location.

A completely different possibility is that *his* is actually meant to read *is*, but was misspelled, the initial *h* having dropped. Initial *h* was lost early on in spoken Latin.⁵⁰ Additionally, as discussed above, it seems that Anthimus did not use pronouns in an entirely consistent manner. It is not impossible that in the confusion surrounding the pronouns, the author, or more likely, a later scribe, simply chose a spelling that was incorrect in this instance, but that did not lead to a radically different reading. Spelling in **G** and in other manuscripts varies wildly. We find a reasonable extent of interchange between voiced and voiceless stops (e.g. *expromatas* **G** *exbrumatas* **A**) and vowels, too, are often mixed up, even within single manuscripts.⁵¹ It is therefore not unimaginable that an *h* was mistakenly inserted where it should not have been. In this scenario, *his* has actually replaced *is*, in which case it might be used as a demonstrative pronoun referring to the previously mentioned or implied regions of Gaul.

Rose, in his discussion of these pronouns, does mention *his*, and seems to take it for granted that the location of the Frankish court is intended. When Anthimus mentions "*de piscium ratione que in his partibus sunt*", it is followed by a list of fish that have, as Rose puts it, "sonderbare provinciale Namen",⁵² meaning that the names for these fish are remarkably local. They point, according to him, to France, a sentiment which is shared by Adams.⁵³ In contrast to *his partibus* as referring to Gaul, Rose takes 'apud nos', found in section 34 ("*[...]de pectenis marinis, quia et ipsi optimi sunt et satis apud nos abundant*", 34, folio 238) to signal the place where Anthimus was staying at the time when he composed the *epistula*, i.e. Northern Italy. Whilst I must point out that it is by no means indisputable that he did, it is entirely possible that Anthimus intended to signal a contrast by using these two different terms, as

⁴⁷ Ibidem 302.

⁴⁸ Flobert 1997, 19, 22; Weber 1924, 119.

⁴⁹ Weber 1924, 119.

⁵⁰ Alkire & Roosen 2010, 34.

⁵¹ for example, in section 1, *pane nitedum* (rubr.) and *pane nitidum*. See also Flobert 1997, 21.

⁵² Rose 1870, 46.

⁵³ Adams 2007, 330.

Rose seems to assume. This would indicate that he was indeed discussing two different regions. However, it would confirm nor disprove that the work was indeed written before Anthimus' departure for the Frankish court. Assuming that *apud nos* always refers to Ravenna, where Anthimus had resided for a long time before his departure for Gaul, *his* is still ambiguous. It could, as mentioned before, be interpreted either to refer to something that is near the speaker, or to something that is near in the text (i.e., mentioned just before or otherwise implied). If Anthimus was already in Gaul at the time of the composition of *DOC*, *his* would have the former function. If he was still in Ravenna, it would have the latter. Because the pronoun is ambiguous, it does not help in establishing a location for the creation of the work. The same logic applies to the comparison that Rose makes between the occurrences *apud nos* and a deictic pronoun in 56 and 57.⁵⁴ In section 56 concerning gourds, we read: "*tamen apud nos et febricitantibus iugiter sine frigore offerimus*" ("nevertheless, among us, we always offer it to the feverish, too, without [them causing] chilliness"). This is followed by section 57 on cucumbers, where we read: "*cucumeris enim etsi hic non sunt [...]*" ("cucumbers, even though they are not [available] here..."). Rose does not make any explicit point with this comparison except that the information is useless when one does not know which places are intended by *apud nos* and *hic*. However, what is implicit in his statement, is that the two constructions are used to refer to two different places, that is, the place where Anthimus wrote his work, and the place where his intended readers resided. The question then remains which place should be assigned to which term.

Another interesting hypothesis is found in Hen.⁵⁵ He poses the possibility that Anthimus returned to Constantinople after emperor Zeno, who had sent him into exile, had died⁵⁶. In this scenario, Anthimus was sent as a legate by emperor Anastasius (Zeno's successor), not by Theuderic, and to Clovis, not to Theuderic. Moreover, he argues that the *epistula* was written by request of Theuderic himself, rather than at the behest of Theuderic. Whilst this is certainly possible, there does not seem to be any particularly compelling evidence in favour of the hypothesis. The idea seems to be founded mostly on the notion that it must have been Theuderic who instructed Anthimus to write *DOC*, which is far from proven. Hen argues that it was Theuderic himself who, after meeting the physician through his father, took an interest in Anthimus, not because of his Ostrogothic connections, but because of his acquaintance with the Byzantine court.⁵⁷ He cites the absence of any references to Theuderic as proof that it cannot have been written at his instigation to be sent as a diplomatic gift.⁵⁸ However, if Anthimus were a legate sent to Theuderic by Theuderic, the ambassadorship in the king's name would have been enough to establish him as the person who was ultimately responsible for the gift, rendering a written reference somewhat superfluous. Hen sees supporting evidence for Theuderic's interest in Anthimus' knowledge of Roman *mores* in the

⁵⁴ Rose 1870, 46 - Rose mistakenly lists sections 57 and 58.

⁵⁵ Hen 2006, 99-110

⁵⁶ *Ibidem*, 102

⁵⁷ *Ibidem*, 103

⁵⁸ *Ibidem*, 102

fact that Gothic cuisine is negligible throughout the work, whilst Anthimus frequently references the Roman authors Apicius, Galen, and Oribasius.⁵⁹ However, as will be discussed below, evidence points to the royalty at the Ostrogothic court having been highly educated according to the Roman tradition, and that there were, as Vitiello describes it, “persons of culture among Theodoric’s relatives and descendants”.⁶⁰ Apparently Roman virtues were embraced, and cuisine may well have been included in this acceptance. Hen also seems to assume that if Theodoric had commissioned the work, the *epistula* was intended to show the superiority of the Ostrogothic court over the Frankish. Since a careful reading of *DOC*, Hen shows, clarifies that the objective of the work was not to offend, but to flatter the king⁶¹ (Hen does not elaborate this point immediately, but see the section on raw bacon, *DOC* 14, folio 227ff, and Hen’s later remarks concerning this passage⁶²). However, there is absolutely no reason to believe that if Theodoric was to send a legate bearing gifts to Theuderic, his intention was to offend the other king – one would expect quite the opposite to be true, as Anthimus was on a diplomatic mission. There does not seem to be any historical evidence to prefer Hen’s scenario over the hypothesis that Anthimus resided with, and represented the Ostrogothic king. Considering the linguistic evidence points more towards Italy or Gaul than towards Constantinople, with references made in *DOC* to Gothic culinary facts (see, for instance, the section on legumes, *DOC* 64, folio 247ff) and Frankish eating habits (for instance previously mentioned *DOC* 14, folio 227ff), I see no reason to assume Anthimus returned to Constantinople before his journey to Gaul.

A final complicating factor in determining where the work was written, is the difficulty in establishing from which particular language within the Germanic branch a word has been borrowed. As Rohlf’s points out, both Franks and Goths were responsible for the introduction of loanwords into Latin.⁶³ This means that it is not always easy, or indeed possible, to determine the precise origin of a loanword. Statistical evidence, therefore, that might otherwise be used to understand which of the languages has a higher contribution to the non-Latin lexis in *DOC*, is unreliable, and thus insufficient as proof.

1.4 The linguistic situation of Anthimus’ days

An examination of the historical context of the work necessarily requires a closer look into the linguistic situation of the time. Which languages were generally spoken in the area, or

⁵⁹ Ibidem, 103

⁶⁰ Vitiello 2006, 399

⁶¹ Hen 2006, 103

⁶² Ibidem, 108

⁶³ Rohlf’s 1947, 9

areas, where Anthimus resided? Was bilingualism⁶⁴ prevalent there? And how intense was language contact between Latin and its various neighbouring languages?

Starting, necessarily, with a more general overview of Latin in relation to other languages, we can observe that language contact was certainly not rare throughout the ages. According to Adams,⁶⁵ language contact was a natural and unavoidable phenomenon for groups such as the military, administrative personnel, traders, and slaves, among whom geographical mobility within the Roman Empire was high. Greek and Latin have a long history of linguistic exchange, with many Romans opting to learn Greek and vice versa, whilst some people simply found themselves in circumstances where the acquisition of a second language was a necessity.⁶⁶ But Greek is certainly not the only language that was in contact with Latin. As early as Ennius, we find *ambactus*, a word that seems to have been taken from Gaulish and that apparently means 'slave'.⁶⁷ Admittedly, whilst the inclusion of a foreign word at such an early stage is certainly interesting, it does not point to widespread linguistic exchange between Latin and Celtic: the curiosity for a Gaulish word may have been based upon an interest in ethnology, more than language.⁶⁸ But at any rate, it shows that language contact can be traced back to the time of the earliest extant Latin writings and was not confined to the later centuries. The language contact at that point, however, must have been of a different nature entirely to that of Anthimus' days. Green, in his discussion of Germanic loanwords in Latin⁶⁹ establishes a useful dividing line at approximately 400CE, at which point, he reasons, "the Germanic invasions and occupations of the different areas of the Empire began in earnest".⁷⁰ Before this time, when a word was introduced into Latin, its spread was facilitated by the relative linguistic unity of the Empire. This type of loanword stands in contrast with words which were introduced after this unity had come to an end, where, for instance, Frankish words might enter in what later became French, without ever exerting any influence upon the other areas of Latin and thus never appearing in other Romance languages. Green⁷¹ also makes the distinction between directly and indirectly attested loanwords, where those found in Latin texts are directly attested. Indirectly attested means that a word is present in all or most Romance language, pointing to a diffusion throughout the whole empire, and thus probably during the times that this was still possible. Directly attested words are relatively scarce (Green suggests about a dozen exist), and usually concern trade and warfare, in other words, technical terminology.⁷² This higher

⁶⁴ It might be worth to clarify that with bilingualism is intended proficiency, rather than native-level fluency, in two languages.

⁶⁵ Adams 2003, 1.

⁶⁶ Adams 2003, 9; 14.

⁶⁷ Adams 2013, 185; Festus S. Pompeius, edition Wallace 1913, 4: "ambactus apud Ennium (Ann. 605) lingua gallica servus appellatur".

⁶⁸ Adams 2003, 185.

⁶⁹ Green 1998, chapter 10, 182-200.

⁷⁰ Ibidem, 183; after Bruch 1913, 3-4.

⁷¹ Green 1998, 184.

⁷² See also Gamillscheg 1970, 22ff.

presence of foreign lexis in more specialised language might be explained by Latin authors' desire to keep their texts purely Roman, avoiding what they would have considered barbarisms, unless there was simply no other way to express the concept they were describing. Indirectly attested loanwords are more numerous (possibly counting almost a hundred),⁷³ indicating a higher level of language contact than the written Latin sources would suggest.

As discussed above, the situation changes after approximately 400CE, and the situation in Anthimus' time must have been different from the one previously discussed, due to the new peoples and ruling classes that were by then present in what used to be a single empire. Assuming, as discussed above, that Anthimus spent a considerable amount of time at the court of the Ostrogothic king, this seems a good place to start an examination of the linguistic environment of Anthimus' days. As Burton⁷⁴ points out, the first bilingual speaker of Gothic and Latin known to us is Wulfila, the translator of the Gothic bible. He was apparently not a rarity: Moorhead describes an environment in which the Goths were increasingly proficient in Latin and started employing their own language less.⁷⁵ For instance, we know that Amalasuintha, the daughter of Theodoric and for some time queen regent, was a learned woman who spoke three languages (Gothic, Latin, and Greek),⁷⁶ and that she was apparently not an exception among Gothic royalty.⁷⁷ By contrast, however, we also know that Amalasuintha's efforts to have her son Athalaric educated in the Roman tradition were thwarted by the Gothic aristocracy, who wanted to see the boy raised as a worthy successor to his grandfather Theodoric, meaning that he was to be brought up in the barbarian tradition⁷⁸. Clearly, although the lifestyle and education of the Roman élite was apparently something to strive towards for many Ostrogothic royals, it was not a unanimous preference that permeated all layers of the Gothic upper classes.

What can be said about bilingualism in native speakers of Latin? This seems to have been much less prevalent than bilingualism among the non-Latin speakers. Romans in Ostrogothic Italy seem to have been virtually non-existent. A single example that can be found is the family of Cyprianus, the *referendarius* (a type of official) at Theodoric's court.⁷⁹ Considering the position he held at the Ostrogothic court, he was probably, as Moorhead⁸⁰ describes it, "of strong pro-Gothic leanings", and thus truly an exception to the rule. Flobert⁸¹ too, in his discussion of Frankish-Latin bilingualism, describes a very one-sided linguistic exchange, where Franks were able to speak Latin, but the indigenous Gallo-Roman

⁷³ Green 1998, 189; Brück 1913, 87-8.

⁷⁴ Burton 2002, 393.

⁷⁵ Moorhead 1992, 86-7.

⁷⁶ Vitiello 2006, 400; Moorhead 1992, 87.

⁷⁷ Vitiello 2006, 402; Moorhead 1992, 88.

⁷⁸ Vitiello 2006, 402.

⁷⁹ Burns 1982, 111.

⁸⁰ Moorhead 1992, 86-7.

⁸¹ Flobert 2002, 419ff.

population barely knew Frankish at all. Flobert makes the distinction between active and passive bilingualism, and argues that the native Latin speakers were passively bilingual, able to understand Frankish but rarely inclined to speak it. At most, they would have used it for brief interaction and to refer to general everyday terms⁸². Gaulish, at the time, was already in steep decline, and was spoken only in rural areas. In the extant written sources, even the ones concerning language, there is no mention of Western Frankish, which was the language of the Frankish invaders and therefore of political importance⁸³. This omission, Flobert argues, points to a complete lack of linguistic curiosity on the part of the indigenous population, as well as to an aversion to what they considered barbarism, which can be summarised by the term *barbarolexis*, the error of using a non-Latin word in a Latin context. Frankish was restricted to the ruling classes, and, inevitably, to their servants, who would need the language as a professional necessity. Frankish bilingualism, on the other hand, was active, with the Franks taking an interest in religious and literary texts⁸⁴. As Grant⁸⁵ mentions, with the political offices that had always been inherent to the empire no longer available as a sign of nobility, writing became the new mode of expressing one's status, and writing occurred almost exclusively in Latin.⁸⁶ Despite all of the above, however, the presence of loanwords in both Latin and Germanic indicate that the two languages and their speakers were in prolonged contact.⁸⁷

Burton raises a very interesting point in his conclusion,⁸⁸ although he confuses some of the protagonists of his argument, assigning the linguistic abilities of Cyprianus' family to the two sons of Athalaric. The point he makes, however, remains valid, namely that bilingualism might have been experienced as humiliating by the Roman élite, whilst this was not the case for the barbarian newcomers. The Romans would have likely been averse to learning the language of what they might well have considered the usurpers of their place in society. A passage from Sidonius Apollinaris⁸⁹ gives us an insight into what learned Romans thought of their peers learning a barbarian language. He describes a certain Syagrius, who has apparently mastered a Germanic language to a high level.⁹⁰ Sidonius apparently seems to think it somewhat inappropriate for a learned Roman to be proficient in barbarian languages, expressing his surprise at Syagrius being schooled in classical Latin literature on one hand, and being able to converse with Germans on the other, apparently considering the two barely compatible qualities.⁹¹ The story may have been quite different for, on the other side, for ordinary peasants. For them, there might not have been any humiliation in learning the

⁸² Ibidem, 422

⁸³ Ibidem, 420

⁸⁴ Ibidem.

⁸⁵ Grant 1996, 11.

⁸⁶ Flobert 2002, 419-20.

⁸⁷ Ibidem, 422-3.

⁸⁸ Burton 2002, 417-8.

⁸⁹ Sidonius in Loeb, 1965, 180-3.

⁹⁰ Ibidem, 180: "quantum stupeam sermonis te Germanici notitiam tanta facilitate rapuisse".

⁹¹ Ibidem, 180; Adams 2003, 277.

language of their new overlords as opposed to that of their previous rulers, as their position had never changed from one of power to one of submission. However, whilst Frankish seems to have been integrated slightly more (see above), for Gothic it is uncertain if there would have been such intensive contact between the two peoples as to make a linguistic exchange possible or profitable.

A final note on hapax legomena is in order. As mentioned above, some of the words in Anthimus stand out simply because *DOC* is the only source in which they are found. This raises the question of how extraordinary it is for a word to occur only once. Does this absence of widespread attestations indicate that a word was rare or only regionally used? It does not appear so. The *Dictionnaire fréquentiel indexé inverse de la langue latine* (1981) lists all the words that occur in selected works of 16 Classical Latin authors, totalling 794.662 occurrences of 13.077 different lemmata.⁹² Out of these, 3155 words occur only once.⁹³ That means that on average, slightly over 24% of all the words attested in the most well-known Latin literature consists of hapax legomena. These numbers show that even if a word is uniquely found in a single text or author, this does not necessarily imply that a word was unusual. The words listed as occurring only once are often perfectly normal words (to name but a few examples, *excellentia*, *grammatica*, *litoralis*, *pomus*). The various cases of single words are all included in the same lema, so this does not account for any of the hapax legomena either. It must simply be the case that, in a language that relied on the fortuitous preservation of texts for its lexical legacy to be passed down through the centuries, that certain words occur infrequently. From this, however, we must not draw the conclusion that these words were somehow rare or unusual for the native speakers and writers of the Latin language.

⁹² Delatte et al. 1981, I.

⁹³ *Ibidem*, 195-219.

2. The Lemmata

Afratus n. 34, f238

de afratu (rubr.) – “concerning *afratus*”

afratus grece quod latine dicitur spumeo – “Afratus, in Greek, which in Latin is called ‘spumeo’...”

affatus **B** *afrato* **g** *afra* **P**

Meaning	soufflé, dish made of foamed up egg whites
Attestations	no other attestations known
Origin	Greek (τό ἀφράτων?)
In Romance	no reflexes known
Other reflexes	no reflexes known

Afratus is one of the interesting lemmata where Anthimus includes a gloss, seemingly intended to help his Latin readers with a foreign name of a type of dish. Anthimus tells the reader that what the in Latins is known as *spumeo* (or likely *spumeum*), the Greeks call *afratus*. Nevertheless, *afratus* is a rather difficult lemma, without any straightforward etymological explanation beyond its obvious Greek character as explicitly stated by Anthimus.

Afratus and its variant spellings are not found in any other sources, as far as is currently known. The one other source from after Anthimus that mentions the word at all, namely Isidore of Seville⁹⁴ (which spells *aphratum*, with *ph*), like Anthimus, describes *aphratum* as being the Greek word for the Latin *spumeum* (“*Aphratum, quod Latine spumeum vocatur; ἀφρόδες enim Graece spuma dicitur*”). It is arguably likely that Isidore actually got his information directly from Anthimus, rather than that the word was in common use in Latin. The phrasing in Isidore is almost identical to that of Anthimus (“*Aphratum, quod Latine spumeum vocatur*”), and he does not offer any further information, apart from a brief etymological note (“*ἀφρόδες enim Graece spuma dicitur*”).

According to Liddell and Scott⁹⁵, there are only two Greek sources that mention τό ἀφράτων (Alexander Trallianus Medicus, 6th-7th c. and Stephanus Medicus (or Stephanus Atheniensis), uncertain but likely 7th c.⁹⁶), and as in the case of Isidore of Seville, these are both from well after Anthimus’ days. None of this, of course, proves that *afratus* (or any of its variant readings) were not existent words at the time, at least in Greek. In principle the same applies

⁹⁴ Isid.Etym.20.2.29. This is not listed as an attestation because it occurs in the lexicographical context of the *Etymologia*, a work of the same nature (though not the same form) as a modern etymological dictionary or encyclopedia.

⁹⁵ Liddell & Scott 1940, entry ἀφράτων.

⁹⁶ See also Dietz 1934, xvi-xvii and Gerabek et al. 2004, 1360.

to Latin - it might simply be the case that attestations of *afratus* are lacking, especially considering that food and cookery are not extensively covered topics in Latin writing. However, this word is a gloss, and Anthimus actually explains the meaning of the word. It seems, therefore, more likely that Anthimus, being grecophone, simply introduced this term into a Latin tractate, fully aware of its foreignness, and using it to give the dish an exotic element, as was not unheard of in Latin writing.⁹⁷ This would explain the gloss: Anthimus would have known that his readers were unfamiliar with the word, which was precisely his reason for using it in the first place. The unfamiliarity of the scribes with the word, then, might be reflected in the variant spellings.

We find several different variants in the different manuscripts and in the later text editions. Leaving aside the ending (which may have been corrected by the scribe to fit what they believed to be more grammatical), we find variation in the second vowel (*afratus* vs. *afrutus*), in the omission or inclusion of *r* (*afratus*, *afrutus*, *afra* vs *affatus*), and **g** leaves out the ending completely, reading instead *afra*.

It is interesting to note that various translators have changed *afratus* to *afrutum*, despite there being no evidence for this reading as more correct in any of the manuscripts. However, the reason must be that *afrutum* recalls Greek ἀφρός, ‘foam’ and ἀφροτόκος, -ον, ‘foaming’. A dish made of foamed up egg whites, I suppose, is not unlikely to find its origins in a word that means ‘foam’, and yet the manuscripts do not suggest that this form is correct. Liddell & Scott do list the term τὸ ἀφρᾶτον as Greek – if the *a* in *afratus* in all the extant manuscripts is a scribal error, this word would have been listed erroneously.

Alfita n. 64, f248

fit etiam de ordeo opus bonum quod nos greci dicimus alfita – “A good dish, which we Greeks call ‘alfita’, is made with barley...”

alfitas **l** *alfila* **g** *alfeta* **P**

Meaning	a dish made of barley, probably barley soup ⁹⁸
Attestations	none in Latin, but frequently found in Greek, ἄλφιτα (n., nt. pl.)
Origin	Greek
In Romance	no reflexes known
Other reflexes	no reflexes known

In *alfita* we find another explicit gloss (see *afratus* above). Anthimus tells his reader, seemingly just as a curiosity, that what they might know as *polenta* is called *alfita* in Greek (and *fenea* in Gothic). There do not seem to be any reflexes in Romance or in Germanic, and

⁹⁷ Adams 2003, 403.

⁹⁸ Grant 1996, 112-3. Note that out of the Anthimian context, ἄλφιτα as attested in Greek usually means simply ‘barley’, see Liddell & Scott 1940, entry ‘ἄλφιτον, τό’.

the word is not attested in any other Latin sources. The word is very unlikely to have been in common parlance in Latin. Had it been so in Gaul, Anthimus would not have needed to explain the word. Had it been in use in other regions of the Latin-speaking area where Greek was not the default second language, there would presumably be some Romance reflexes. Everything points to Anthimus having introduced this term not because he deemed it useful, but because he deemed it interesting. Throughout the Empire, large parts of the Italian peninsula had been hellenised, and Greek was spoken in many more areas than just the Eastern part of the Empire.⁹⁹ While this could play a role in the insertion of Greek words throughout the text, I find it more plausible that Anthimus added this particular word from his mother tongue as a personal touch.

Concerning the etymology of ἄλφιτα, Beekes¹⁰⁰ gives the form ἄλφι (pl. ἄλφιτα, from which the back-formed Homeric sg. ἄλφιτον) and suggests a possible connection to Albanian *elb*, ‘barley’, with a possible PIE etymon **h₂elb^{hi}*, ‘barley’.

Aloxinum n. 15, f229

cervisa bibendo vel medus et aloxinum quam maxime omnibus congruum est– “Drinking beer or mead or absinthe is very good for everyone.”

aloxanum **B** *aloximum* **g**

Meaning	wormwood, absinthe
Attestations	no other attestations known
Origin	Greek ἀλόη ὀξινηζ, ‘sour aloe’ ¹⁰¹
In Romance	Fr. <i>aluine</i> , OFr. <i>aluisne</i> , (with variants <i>aloisne</i> , <i>aloesne</i> , <i>aluesne</i> , <i>alonge</i> ¹⁰²), Lux. <i>batteralzem</i> ¹⁰³ Norm. <i>aliène</i> ¹⁰⁴ OIt. <i>alóscia</i> , Po. <i>losna</i> , Sp. <i>aloja</i> , OSp. <i>alosna</i> ¹⁰⁵
Other reflexes	Ge. <i>Alsem</i> , OHG. <i>alahsan</i> , Lux. <i>alzem</i> , Du. <i>alsem</i> , MDu. <i>alsene</i> ¹⁰⁶

The etymology of *aloxinum* is relatively straightforward, with a clear Greek origin. The word’s appearance in Latin, however, is somewhat more complicated. It appears only in northern Gallo-Romance and on the Iberian peninsula¹⁰⁷, whilst the reflex that is found in

⁹⁹ Darling Buck 1906, 103.

¹⁰⁰ Beekes 2010, 77.

¹⁰¹ Walde-Hofmann 1938, vol1, 32.

¹⁰² Hunt 1994, 110-11.

¹⁰³ FEW I, 75.

¹⁰⁴ Bloch and von Wartburg 1968, 4.

¹⁰⁵ FEW XXIV, 346; VDADC vol1 393; Adams 2007 333-4.

¹⁰⁶ FEW XXIV, 346.

¹⁰⁷ Adams 2007, 333.

Italy (OIt. *alóscia*) is a later loan from Old Spanish. The word was later largely replaced by the more erudite *absinthium* and its derivatives¹⁰⁸.

One theory is that Anthimus, being a native speaker of Greek, introduced *aloxinum* to northern Gaul himself. This theory is mentioned and granted some credibility by Bloch and von Wartburg in the DELF (1968, 4), and by von Wartburg in the FEW I, 75¹⁰⁹. However, in a later volume of the FEW¹¹⁰, the possibility is rejected on the basis of the observation that Anthimus does not explain the term to his readers, whilst he explains and translates other words he evidently supposes to be unknown in the region (see *afrutus*, *alfita* above, and *fenea*, *sitri* below). As to how the word made its way to the Iberian peninsula, this is equally uncertain. Since a connection between Northern Gallo-Romance areas and the Iberian peninsula cannot be proven, it has been suggested that it might be most likely that the word arrived there independently, through trade with the eastern Mediterranean¹¹¹ (in which case some of the reflexes listed above, i.e. Po. *losna*, Sp. *aloja*, OSp. *alosna* and OIt. *alóscia* - do not, strictly speaking, belong there). There is, however, no concrete evidence for this scenario.

The spelling variation *aloxmum* from **g** is interesting. Taking a closer look at the manuscript, in **G** the word is split in two by the scribe for lack of space, and it reads *aloxi-num*. However, looking at other instances of *i* followed by *n* (for instance in the word *putridinem* on the same folio, “*lardum crassum adpositum adsidue et purgat putritudinem vulneris illius*”), it can be observed that these two letters put together look very similar to *m*. It may be the case that in whatever manuscript **g** was copied from, the word was not split but written all attached, and that **g**'s scribe simply copied *-in-* as *-m-*.

Azimus adj. 1, f222

panem nitidum bene fermentatum non azimum – “White bread, well leavened, not unleavened...”

agimum **g**

Meaning	unleavened
Attestations	very frequent in Vulgate, St. Jerome (383 - 392 CE.) (spelled <i>azym-</i>); Prud. Apoth. (353) “ <i>stultum est sic credere sacrum (...) similaginis azymon esse</i> ”
Origin	Greek ἡ ζύμη, ‘the leaven’ (‘yeast’) with neg. part. ἀ - ἀζύμη
In Romance	It. <i>azzimo</i> , Sp. <i>ácimo</i> , Fr. <i>azyme</i> , Ro. <i>azima</i> (n., unleavened bread), Po. <i>ázimo</i>
Other reflexes	ModGr. ἀζυμος,

¹⁰⁸ FEW XXIV 346.

¹⁰⁹ According to von Wartburg, the theory was proposed by Rose (1870), but he does not give a page number and I have been unable to find the passage that he refers to.

¹¹⁰ FEW XXIV 346.

¹¹¹ FEW I.75; Adams 2007, 334.

The word *azimum* ‘unleavened’ constitutes a departure from Classical Latin, since there the terms for leavening were connected to the words *fermentum* (n.) and *fermentare* (v.), as found in Pliny¹¹² and Celsus.¹¹³ According to the FEW,¹¹⁴ the word is used not to refer to any unleavened bread, but is often found when referring to Passover, or the Feast of unleavened bread, and specifically to the *matzo* that is eaten on that day. This does seem to indicate that the context in which the word is found is overwhelmingly biblical. Aside from Anthimus, the word is only found in Latin works that were religious in character. The biblical connotations of the word’s reflexes in Romance suggest the possibility that the word was spread throughout Latin-speaking areas through ecclesiastical language. However, this association is unlikely in the Anthimian context, which is not religious of character. Anthimus may have chosen this particular word over the Latin option simply because he was a native speaker of Greek and had the word more ready at mind, or just preferred it over the alternative.

Bradonis n. 14, f227

si assatum fuerit ad horam quomodo brad(r)onis – “If it is freshly grilled, like you would do with a roast...”

bradones **BpH** *bradonis* **A** *prado* **I** *pradonos* **g** *pradones* **g^c** *brado* **P**

Meaning	probably a type of roast, a joint of meat, a ham
Attestations	no other attestations known
Origin	Germanic, likely Frankish, <i>brādo</i> , from pgm. <i>*brāda</i> or <i>*brēda</i> ¹¹⁵
In Romance	OFr./MFr. <i>braon</i> (‘piece of meat for roasting’) ¹¹⁶ , OIt. <i>bradone</i> (‘falda del vestito che pende dalla congiuntura della spalla – ‘piece of fabric of the clothes that hangs from the shoulder’) ¹¹⁷ , It. <i>brandello</i> (‘shred, scrap’) ¹¹⁸ , Sp. <i>brahon</i> (‘doblez que ceñia la parte superior del brazo’ – ‘fold that covers the upper arm’) ¹¹⁹ , Cat. <i>braó</i> (‘nom de la part alta del braç’ – ‘the upper part of the arm’) ¹²⁰
Other reflexes	E. <i>brawn</i> , from OE. <i>brahun</i> (‘fleshy part, muscle, particularly the most fleshy part of the hind leg, originally a part suitable for roasting’) ¹²¹ ,

¹¹² Plin. Nat. XVIII 26 “galliae et hispaniae frumento in potum resoluta quibus diximus generibus spuma ita concreta pro fermento utuntur, qua de causa levior illis quam ceteris panis”; “panis hordeaceus ervi aut cicerculae farina fermentabatur”.

¹¹³ Cels. Med. II 24, “*panis sine fermento*” page 204 of the Loeb edition.

¹¹⁴ FEW XXV 1310.

¹¹⁵ FEW XV.1, 234-5.

¹¹⁶ FEW XV.1 234.

¹¹⁷ Grant 1996, 91; Prati (Vocabolario etimologico italiano), 162.

¹¹⁸ Vocabolario etimologico italiano, 162-3.

¹¹⁹ Grant 1996, 91; Coromines i Vigneaux 1976, vol 1, 508.

¹²⁰ FEW XV/1, 235; Coromines i Vigneaux et al 1980, vol 2, 199-200.

¹²¹ FEW XV/1, 235; Simpson & Weiner 1989, OED vol 2, 499.

MDu. *brâde* 'kuit, vlezig deel van het been'¹²², from which likely Du. *gebraad* ('roast')¹²³.

The FEW gives, apart from two separate interpretations in Old French ("morceau de viande propre à être rôti" and "partie charnue du corps, muscles, lambeau du chair"), various cognates of *brādo* in ancient languages (Old Norse, Anglosaxon, Anglonorman, Old Provençal, Old Saxon), These all refer to a type of meat, generally either 'fleshy', or 'fit for human consumption', or both. The word is placed in the same category as OHG *brāt(o)*, "Fleisch ohne Speck und Knochen". According to von Wartburg¹²⁴, the fact that *bradones* [sic] occurs in *DOC* is no evidence for the presence of the word in Latin - rather, he says, the Franks would have introduced it into Gaul, but the word did not necessarily spread to other regions. This supposition seems to be based on the assumption that Anthimus composed his work after he had already been sent to the court of Theuderic, although it is of course possible he had somehow learned the word before. Either way, Anthimus must have assumed his target audience to be familiar with the term, as it has no further explanation or translation as some of the other lemmata do.

Caparrini (2009, 182) states that concerning *bradonis* there is very little debate in terms of translation, as most scholars seem to agree that the word refers to a ham or a roast. She regards the term in its context and concludes that "prosciutto cotto", or 'cooked ham', is the most probable and correct interpretation. As concerns the unanimity on the correct translation, Caparrini is right if we extend the meaning somewhat from just 'ham' to 'piece or cut of meat fit for human consumption that can be cooked' (which may or may not be a ham).

The meaning, then, appears to include a hint to the preparation method. The etymon, on the other hand, seems to relate more to the piece of meat itself. There seems to be a universal tendency towards a Proto-Germanic source **brēda* or **brēda*. The Etymologisch Woordenboek van het Nederlands (henceforth EWN, see footnote 28), links Dutch 'gebraad' with *brādo*, as mentioned above, and argues that etymologically it is distinct from the verb 'braden', which has a different origin. According to the EWN 'gebraad' used to mean 'a piece of meat', similar to the meaning generally proposed for *brādo*, and folk-etymologically it started to mean 'a roast', under influence of the similar-sounding verb 'braden'. For *brādo* the EWN proposes pgm. **brēda-/ōn/-ō*, meaning 'a piece of meat', whilst she links 'braden' with pgm. **brēdan-*, in turn derived from PIE **b^hreh₁-*¹²⁵. Kluge¹²⁶, too, states that the German noun 'Braten' is "ursprünglich von dem starken Verb *braten* ganz unabhängig(...)", proposing

¹²² Philippa et al 2005, EWN vol 2, 187.

¹²³ Ibidem. 'Gebraad' probably derived from 'brâde' mentioned above, meaning 'calf' or 'fleshy part', similar to OEn. *brahun*. It is possible that it was later incorrectly associated with the verb 'braden' ('to roast') after which it took on the meaning of 'a roast', but the verb and the noun are most likely etymologically unrelated.

¹²⁴ FEW XV/1, 235.

¹²⁵ Philippa et al 2003, EWN vol1, 369.

¹²⁶ Kluge & Seebold 2011, 147.

**brāda-/ōn/-ō* as etymon and “Fleischstück” as translation. The word’s etymon, it seems, refers more to the cut of meat than to whether or not it was roasted.

Concerning its spread to Latin, Brūch¹²⁷ suggests a connection to the Marsi people, based on what he says can be found in the historical authors. The Romans, he argues, are known to have obtained what is now known as ham from the Marsi. The Marsi preserved the *ē*, which was to become *ā* in Germanic, longer than other Germanic peoples, and evidence of a Marsi *ā* first arises in the year 499. The word *brādo* is not attested earlier in Latin than Anthimus, so, Brūch argues, it is likely that the word was introduced into Vulgar Latin in this form by the Marsi, suggesting that the word must have come from the Frankish realm.

Bridos n. 43, f241

asse ita, ut capellentur et sic in bridos assentur aptiores sunt – “they are good if roasted as follows, they should be cut into chunks and roasted on a skewer (?)”

bridos **G** *brido* **A I** *breto* **B p** *breto* **g** *bredu* **P** *brid* **H**

Meaning	unclear, likely a type of kitchen equipment, possibly a skewer
Attestations	no other attestations known
Origin	most likely Germanic
In Romance	no reflexes known
Other reflexes	no reflexes known

The word *bridos* is a hapax legomenon found exclusively in Anthimus. This makes it difficult to find a suitable translation for the word, and there is no universal agreement among scholars and translators concerning what the word might mean, or even what its correct form in the text should be. Many editions read ‘*in brido*’, rather than **G**’s ‘*in bridos*’, while most people seem to agree that the word is a neuter, *bridum*.¹²⁸ Translations exist in two broad categories. On the one hand, we find those who think of *bridos* as a type of food, either a sauce or a pastry.¹²⁹ On the other, we find those who see in *bridos* a type of kitchen utensil.

The hypotheses that suggest *bridos* is a type of food can be rejected based on the context. A sauce or gravy is simply out of the question, as Anthimus suggests that the fish is roasted (*asse, assentur*). As Grant and Caparrini point out,¹³⁰ there are other occurrences in *DOC* where Anthimus describes sauces or gravies, and these words are invariably followed by a

¹²⁷ Brūch 1913 (*Der Einfluss der germanischen Sprachen auf das Vulgärlatein*), 32ff.

¹²⁸ Except for the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*, which posits a masculine *bridus* might be possible: TLL 2, 2191, entry *bridum* (-us?).

¹²⁹ Weber 1923, 33; Rose 1877, 49; Diefenbach 1857, 81. See also Grant 1993, 378.

¹³⁰ Grant 1993, 378; Caparrini 2009, 191-2.

verb that conveys the idea of boiling or stewing.¹³¹ In this case, *bridos* is found with a verb that means ‘to roast’, which is simply not possible to do in a liquid. Additionally, *bridos* as reflecting a type of sauce is apparently based on the idea that *bridos* is somehow related to Germanic *brod*¹³² or ‘broth’. As Klein points out,¹³³ however, the change in the stem vowel is problematic (see also It. *brodo*, Po. *brodio*, Fr. *brouet*, ‘broth’, which all preserve *o*), and another solution must be found.

The other suggestion concerning edibles, namely that *brido* represents a type of pastry or bread, is unlikely to be true, again based on the context of Anthimus’ suggested preparation. The recipe calls for the fish to be basted with *salemoria*, or brine, which the author suggests will toughen the flesh. As Grant¹³⁴ points out, brine is unlikely to do anything to the flesh if it is already coated in pastry. Phonologically the idea is based on a connection with German *brod*, Danish *brød*, Gothic *braud*, and especially Anglosaxon *breád*, all meaning ‘bread’, which Grant¹³⁵ argues could be supported by the variant readings *breo*, *breto*, and *bredu* of **B p, g, and P** respectively. I must disagree, as the spelling variants are, in my opinion, more likely to reflect a confusion as regards the correct spelling of contemporary pronunciation. If the *i* in *bridos* was a short *ĩ*, its pronunciation may well have been closer to *e* by Anthimus’ time,¹³⁶ leading to scribal spelling errors. Additionally, Grant cites Diefenbach’s *Glossarium latino-germanicum mediae et infimae aetatis*, in which the word *brida* refers the reader back to *bria*, which, among other meanings, seems to signify *farina* or flour. However, the word as listed in Diefenbach is *brida*, and I see no obvious reason to assume it is the same or, in fact, related at all, to Anthimus’ term *bridus*. This hypothesis, then, must be rejected as well.

The other option which has been suggested and discussed in scholarly examinations of the word, then, is a type of cooking utensil. Walde-Hofmann suggest “eine Art Kochgeschirr”¹³⁷ (‘a type of pot’), without being more specific, and suggest an etymological connection to OHG *brañtan* ‘to roast’, arguing that the *i* is a Gothic closed *ē*. Grant¹³⁸ rejects this possibility on the grounds that various different cooking utensils have already been mentioned by Anthimus. The insertion of yet another term for a pot or pan, Grant explains, would suggest that Anthimus was referring to something highly specialised, which seems a rather unlikely requirement for the recipe described in *DOC*.

Grant once more finds what he assumes to be a related word in *brida*, as listed in the *Dictionary of Medieval Latin from British Sources*.¹³⁹ He states it is related to French *bride* (‘bridle’), and that it is derived from a Frankish root, and he considers the possibility that the

¹³¹ *DOC* 3, 5, 10, 23, 34, 64 (see Grant 1993, 378, after Groen, 1926, 53) Grant 1993, 378 and 1996, 102; Caparrini 2009, 191-2.

¹³² Rose 1877, 49.

¹³³ Klein 1953, 126.

¹³⁴ Grant 1993, 378.

¹³⁵ Grant 1993, 378.

¹³⁶ Alkire & Roosen 2010, 13ff; Rohlfs 1968, 88.

¹³⁷ Walde-Hofmann 1938, LEW, 115.

¹³⁸ Grant 1993, 378.

¹³⁹ Vol.1, London 1975, p. 217, s. v. *brida*: see also Grant 1993, 379.

word is somehow used to refer to both equestrian and culinary equipment, as both would have been made out of metal. He does not elaborate any further on this hypothesis, and I am strongly inclined to disregard it entirely.

The final option, in my opinion the most likely possibility for *bridos*, is a type of skewer. Whilst the context cannot be the sole deciding factor, some support may be found in Anthimus' recipe: "*asse ita, ut capellentur et sic in bridos assentur aptiores sunt*". *capellare* is a late variation of *caedere*,¹⁴⁰ meaning 'to cut (up)'. We have established that the eel is roasted, and if the eel is also to be chopped into pieces, a skewer or spit is an easy way to achieve this. The skewer hypothesis has some supporters among scholars. Souter¹⁴¹ offers 'roasting-jack', although he neglects to provide an explanation for his translation, and follows it by a '(?)', which suggests he is merely guessing.¹⁴² However, taking into consideration several other translations, Souter might be close to the most reasonable option, a skewer. Klein¹⁴³ agrees with Souter, and proposes an etymology where Souter failed to do so: the word would be related to MHD *rîden*, OHG *rîdan*, from pre-OHG **wrîdan* (ASx *vrîdhan*), meaning 'to turn', 'to rotate' or 'to move slowly'. A *bridum*, he concludes, would then be a "*Bratenwender*" or turnspit, which is similar in its use to a skewer, with both requiring chunks of food to be pierced and roasted on a metal rod.

Caparrini,¹⁴⁴ in an article from 2009 discussing some of the Germanic lexis in *DOC*, compares two German reworked versions of *DOC* from the fifteenth century (see also *sodinga* below). These German texts, she notes, translate '*Spiss*' and '*spisse*', both meaning 'skewer'. Caparrini concedes that between the German versions and Anthimus' original, nine centuries passed, and it is by no means probable that the scribes were at that time still familiar with all the terms they found in *DOC*. Caparrini's suggestion is that, while a German reworking cannot constitute definitive proof in favour of 'skewer', it might offer some support in its favour. To my mind, when one takes into consideration all the various problems and hypotheses discussed above regarding this term, 'skewer' stands out as the most likely translation in its Anthimian context.

Cracatiu n. 46, f242

de pisce cracatiu caro fortior est – "The flesh of sturgeon is rather strong."

cracatio **g** *cracaucio* **l** *creatius* **P** *cracato* **H**

Meaning	sturgeon
Attestations	no other attestations known

¹⁴⁰ Grant 1993, 378; Du Cange 1883-1887, vol. 2, 149.

¹⁴¹ Souter 1949, 32.

¹⁴² See also Grant 1993, 378.

¹⁴³ Klein 1953, 126.

¹⁴⁴ Caparrini 2009, 189ff.

Origin	possibly Celtic ¹⁴⁵
In Romance	OPr. <i>creac, creat</i> , MFr. <i>creac, greac</i> (with a number of similar regional variations), NFr. <i>crat</i> ¹⁴⁶
Other reflexes	no reflexes known

Cracatiu is thought to come from a Celtic root, although the precise mechanisms have not as of yet been formulated in academic research. Schuchardt, in his article on words for fish as found in Polemius Silvius' *Laterculus*,¹⁴⁷ provides a fairly elaborate analysis in his discussion of various Latin names for sturgeon. What has been proposed so far seems to refer to the fish's appearance, with its seemingly armoured body and studded back. Conceding that the etymologies are not perfect, both in terms of phonology and meaning, Schuchardt lists as possibly related Irish *cairgeach* (Old Irish *cairrcech*) 'rocky', *craigeach* 'craggy', *creagach* 'rocky', Welsh *creigiog* 'craggy'. However, more likely contenders, he argues, are Welsh *crag* 'hard crust, coating', *cragen* 'shell', Gaelic *creachann* 'shell', where the Welsh *g* and Gaelic *ch* meet in an older Celtic *c*. Both the former group and the latter might be used to refer to the sturgeon, argues Milani,¹⁴⁸ with its grey back, course, bony scales on its skin, forming a complete armour on the top of the head.

The word *cracatiu* in this form is the earliest attestation of the word, found only in Anthimus. However, the meaning 'sturgeon' has been established to a reasonable degree of certainty through the appearance of a variant form (*cragacus*) in a late eighth-century Latin-Anglo-Saxon glossary,¹⁴⁹ which gives *styria* ('sturgeon') as the Anglo-Saxon equivalent. The word is also attested in various other sources as *cragacus*, *creacum*, *creatum* and *creatium*,¹⁵⁰ where we see the loss of the intervocalic *c*, undoubtedly through lenition of /k/ to /g/, and then loss of /g/.¹⁵¹

Fartalia n. 20, f231

lar(e)dum vero in fartalia missum interdum permittimus comedere – "Bacon may be eaten on occasion, if it is put in [?]"

fertalia **A** *farta talia* **I** *fartalio* **g**

Meaning	most likely either a type of cooking utensil, or very finely chopped food (herbs?)
Attestations	no other attestations known

¹⁴⁵ FEW II, 1266; Walde-Hofmann 284; Ernout-Meillet 147.

¹⁴⁶ FEW II, 1266.

¹⁴⁷ Schuchardt 1907, 653.

¹⁴⁸ Milani 1973, 391.

¹⁴⁹ As reproduced in Hessels, J (1890) An Eighth-century Latin-Anglo-Saxon Glossary, see 39, item C 921.

¹⁵⁰ Du Cange 1766, 1189-90; Schuchardt 1907, 653; Adams 2007, 331.

¹⁵¹ Alkire & Roosen 2010, 35, 45-7; Rohlfs 1968, 89.

Origin	unknown
In Romance	possibly (but very uncertain) Lang. <i>fartâlio</i> (“menues herbes potagères”), Prov. <i>Fartaïo</i> , with various verbal derivatives ¹⁵²
Other reflexes	no reflexes known

Fartalia is one of the most debated lemmata in the *DOC*, and unfortunately the wealth of available past research on *fartalia* is often inconclusive, and the various different sources often contradictory.

The different editions that include a translation are bipartite: on the one hand, the versions that translate a pot or dish, i.e. a cooking utensil,¹⁵³ on the other those that translate a type of food, possibly a sort of stuffing or chopped kitchen herbs.¹⁵⁴

These different translations seem to go back to a handful of glosses from older glossaries. There seem to be three general meanings, which are all represented in two or more glossaries, which may have been copied from one another. The first, which can be found in the Codex Vindobonensis 804, folio 187b,¹⁵⁵ lists the word as “*fartalia vel patella, phanne*”, and thus gives the meaning of a cooking utensil. The second gloss, found in the codex sangallensis 292,¹⁵⁶ folio 194, gives as synonym the OHG *vuarm muas*, meaning ‘cooked vegetables’, thus giving the first meaning of something edible. Finally, another gloss can be found in the *hermeneumata stephani*, nowadays available in Goetz 1892.¹⁵⁷ This is a Latin-Greek glossary, first printed by Henri Estienne (Lat. Henricus Stephanus) in the *Glossariis duobus e situ vetustatis erutis* in 1573, but of which the original manuscript was lost (apparently before it was ever dated).¹⁵⁸ For the *hermeneumata*, not even a broad date has been established, owing to the nature of the work (a compilation of didactic material by various anonymous authors), but the *terminus ante quem* for the work is the late 7th century.¹⁵⁹ The *hermeneumata* gives a Greek translation: *σύνκοπτα*.¹⁶⁰ This word is listed by Liddell and Scott¹⁶¹ as occurring only once, in the combination *σύνκοπτα λάχανα*¹⁶², meaning ‘finely chopped vegetables or kitchen herbs’¹⁶³. The latter two meanings, vegetables and kitchen herbs, are relatively close to one another semantically, and possibly, according to certain sources that will be discussed below, can be connected etymologically to the verb *farcire*.

¹⁵² FEW III 422.

¹⁵³ Amongst these are Souter 1949 144 “dish (of some sort)”; Rose 1877, 52.

¹⁵⁴ See also Caparrini 2009, 183-4.

¹⁵⁵ Schützeichel 2004, AAG, vol VII, 254. Apparently first listed by Hoffmann von Fallersleben 1834, page 42, item number 43; see also e.g. Rose 1877, 52; TLL vol. VI 1, 286, lin. 63-66.

¹⁵⁶ Schützeichel 2004, AAG, vol X, 401. First listed by Graff 1834, 612, under *jussol*; see also Hattemer 1844-1849, 277.

¹⁵⁷ page 360, line 7; see also TLL, vol. VI 1, 279, lin. 14-17

¹⁵⁸ Dickey 2012, 18; Goetz 1892, 346

¹⁵⁹ Dionisotti 1982, 91.

¹⁶⁰ Goetz 1982, 360, line 7; see also TLL, vol. VI 1, 279, lin. 14-17

¹⁶¹ Liddell & Scott 1940, entry *σύνκοπτα*.

¹⁶² See also Schwentner 1967, 231, and

¹⁶³ Schwentner 1967, 231

An important point to make is that most of the glosses vary in spelling, with the Codex Vindobonensis listing *fartalia* as it is found in G. However, the St. Gallen (*sangallensis*) gloss is written *faritalia - vuarm muas*, which makes it different not only from G, but even from all the other variations in the manuscripts. The same applies to the *hermeneumata stephani*, which lists *faratalia σύνκοπτα λάχανα*, again failing to match any of the extant manuscripts. This fact cannot be overlooked and weighs into the discussion in favour of the Cod. Vind. gloss, *fartalia vel patella, phanne*. Schwentner (1967) discusses all the above-mentioned glosses, and argues for the interpretation of *patella*, or pan. As Caparrini¹⁶⁴ mentions, one added difficulty in the case of the Cod. Vind. gloss is that it occurs in a list of foodstuffs (*De commestibilibus*¹⁶⁵). Schwentner has not failed to notice this, but sees in it a simple scribal error. *De commestibilibus* would have been followed by another list, namely one concerning cooking utensils (*De variis utensilibus*¹⁶⁶). He argues, therefore, that the scribe may well have prematurely copied the word, resulting in the appearance of a utensil in the list of comestibles.

However, it might be possible to connect the different spellings, and it can be argued that ultimately, they derive from the same source. Deroux¹⁶⁷ brings up the matter in his discussion of the word *lardum*, and asks whether *faratalia* is the original, and we are dealing with a syncopated version – or conversely, if *fartalia* is the ‘correct’ version, and we may be able to explain the extra *a* as a contamination by *farratum*, as proposed by Wulff in the TLL.¹⁶⁸ As for *faritalia*, he provides no solution.

The FEW¹⁶⁹ proposes an interesting possible derivative: Lang. *fartâlio* and Prov. *fartaïo*, both meaning “menues herbes potagères”. Von Wartburg derives the word, seemingly without any doubt, from the verb *farcire*, *fartum*, meaning ‘to fill or stuff’, and thus translates *fartalia* as ‘füllsel’ (or ‘stuffing’). Moreover, the FEW insists that the words listed as they appear in French fit perfectly from a semantic viewpoint, as they all refer to kitchen herbs that were used to season food. This connection, however, does depend to some extent on the assumption that *farcire*, *fartum* is in fact related, and, consequently, that the translation ‘stuffing’ is correct. However, the entry provides no further explanation of the suffix. I would argue that it brings to mind a neuter plural as used substantively, in which case the literal translation would be “the things that are stuffed (into sth)”. However, this does not account for the whole suffix, *-alia*, but only for the final part. One would then have to assume analogy from the normal *-alis* suffixes or some such unproven scenario. The suffix is therefore a problem to this hypothesis.

¹⁶⁴ Caparrini 2009, 183-4.

¹⁶⁵ Printed in Steinmeyer & Sievers 1879, DAHDG vol IV, 638.

¹⁶⁶ Printed in Steinmeyer & Sievers 1879, DAHDG vol III, 659, 4-31.

¹⁶⁷ Deroux 1988, 35.

¹⁶⁸ TLL, vol. VI 1, 279, 14-17

¹⁶⁹ FEW III, 422-3.

Klein (1953) proposes an entirely different etymology, seemingly an idea of his own, seeing in *far-* a Germanic prefix (Ge. *ver-*) and combining it with *-talia*, from Lat. *talea*, seeing in the term a sort of dish or plate. The choice for Lat. *talea*, however, combined with a Gmc. prefix, in my view seems somewhat arbitrary, and Klein does not elaborate on the idea.

At present, it seems, it is impossible to find a definite translation for *fartalia*. In favour of a utensil is the fact that the gloss which gives the word this sense is the only one that matches the spelling as found in the oldest and most reliable extant manuscript. At the same time, all of the manuscripts show variants in spelling, and even **G** is not infallible. This leaves some room for the possibility that the word was simply misspelled, either in all of the extant manuscripts, or in the extant glosses. Additionally, the appearance of the word in a list of foodstuff does give pause, and the semantic connection to ‘stuffing’ is an attractive one.

Fenea, n. 64, f248

fit etiam de ordeo opus bonum quod nos greci dicimus alfita latine vero polenta gothi vero barbarice fenea – “A good dish, which we Greeks call ‘alfita’, but in Latin is called ‘polenta’ and in the foreign tongue of the Goths ‘fenea’, is made with barley...”

feneae **A** *fenee* **I** *feneam* **B** *femea* **g**

Meaning	a dish made of barley, probably barley soup ¹⁷⁰
Attestations	no other attestations known
Origin	Germanic: Gothic
In Romance	no reflexes known
Other reflexes	no reflexes known

Fenea, like the above-mentioned *alfita* and *afratus*, is an explicit gloss, meaning that Anthimus tells his readers the word for a dish in other languages, seemingly just as an interesting piece of additional information. The reason why Anthimus decided to add this linguistic observation is somewhat mysterious. Having spent time at the Ostrogothic court, it is hardly open to doubt that he had learned more than just a single word, *fenea*, in the Gothic language. Why, then, did he only consider it appropriate to add a Gothic name for a dish in precisely this section? The same might of course be said of the other gloss in this section, Greek *alfita*. And yet the same question does not apply equally to *alfita*, as we find more than one Greek gloss in the work.¹⁷¹ *fenea*, on the other hand, is the only occurrence of a Gothic gloss. The reason cannot have been connected to the provenience of the dish itself – even allowing for

¹⁷⁰ Grant 1996, 112-3.

¹⁷¹ 25 Gr. *elleborus* and La./Gmc. *sitri*, 34 Gr. *afrutum* and La. *spumeum*, 78 Gr. *oxygala* and La./Gmc. *melca*.

the possibility that barley soup is a Gothic delicacy, the Greeks had been making it as well, and for a long time,¹⁷² a fact of which Anthimus was certainly aware.

Regarding the etymology of *fenea*, it appears to derive from PIE **pen-*, ‘to feed’, from which also La. *penus*, ‘storage for food’.¹⁷³ Orel¹⁷⁴ proposes a proto-Germanic form **fenjō̄*, from which to derive unattested Gothic **finja*.¹⁷⁵ From this hypothetical **finja*, Lat. *fenea* might well arise, especially in a time when *e* and *ĩ* were not distinguished easily or at all.¹⁷⁶ For a foodstuff as important as barley, which Dalby¹⁷⁷ describes as “one of the two major cereal staples of ancient societies”, this is not a far-fetched semantic connection.

Medus n. 15, f229; 76, f253

(15, f229) *cervisa bibendo vel medus et aloxinum quam maxime omnibus congruum est*– “Drinking beer or mead or absinthe is very good for everyone”;

(15, f229) *similiter et de metus bene factum ut mel bene habeat multum iubat*– “Similarly, concerning well-made mead, if it has a lot of honey, it does a great deal of good”;

(76, f253) *si quis crudis lactis vult bibere mel habeant admixtum vel vinum aut medus* – “If a person want to drink raw milk, it should have some honey mixed in, or wine or mead...”

(15, f229) *medus* **G B g metus A H medonem l mez P medo p;**

medus **B g H medis A medum l mezo P**

(76, f253) *medus* **G B g medum A l**

Meaning	mead
Attestations	no other attestations known (controversial – see discussion)
Origin	Germanic: possibly Frankish, through proto-Gmc. <i>*medus</i> , from PIE <i>*médhu</i> ¹⁷⁸
In Romance	only known in dialects of northern France: Zarphtic <i>mez</i> , OFr/MFr variously attested as <i>mies</i> , <i>miez</i> , <i>meuz</i> , <i>mierre</i> , <i>mî</i> , <i>mîs</i> , <i>mi</i> ¹⁷⁹ – the other Romance languages refer to mead with reflexes of <i>hydromel(i)</i> , the more frequently found Latin word for mead
Other reflexes	En. <i>mead</i> , Ge <i>Met</i> , Du. <i>mede</i> , Sw. <i>mjöd</i> , Da. <i>mjød</i> , No. <i>mjød</i> , Ic. <i>mjöður</i> , ON. <i>mjøðr</i> , OE. <i>meodo</i> , OHG. <i>metu</i>

¹⁷² Hippocrates mentions it several times in *Regimen on acute diseases*, see, in the 1886 translation by Adams, chapter 3, p284, chapter 4, p285, and chapter 10, p324.

¹⁷³ Lehmann 1986, 112; Orel 2003, 99.

¹⁷⁴ Orel 2003, 99.

¹⁷⁵ Lehman (1986, 112) and others refer to a source that is unavailable to me (Gundermann, G. (1906-7), *Germanische Wörter bei Griechen un Römern in Zeitschrift für deutsche Wortforschung*, vol. 8. In this article, mention is made of another attested form, *finjia*, to be found in Ugutio, *Liber derivationum*, also unavailable to me.

¹⁷⁶ Alkire & Roosen 2010, , 13ff; Rohlfs 1968, 88.

¹⁷⁷ Dalby 2003, 45.

¹⁷⁸ Walde-Hofmann 1938, vol2, 59; Mann 1984/87, 742-3.

¹⁷⁹ FEW XVI 545; Adams 2007, 333.

Medus, in terms of translation, is possibly the most straightforward of the non-Latin lemma in *DOC*. There seems to be practically unanimous agreement on its meaning, and even on its source. Germanic peoples provided both the word and the concept it represented.¹⁸⁰ An outlier is Isidore of Seville, who explains the term as deriving directly from *mel*, ‘honey’: “*Medus, quasi melus, quia ex melle fit*”.¹⁸¹ He accounts for the *d* where one would expect an *l* with the statement “*sicut calamitas pro cadamitas*”. While the *d/l* interchange was a phenomenon in Latin, it occurred in the opposite direction (*l* for *d*, not *d* for *l*) and cannot therefore serve to prove that *medus* is named after its principal ingredient. At any rate, the association is not entirely misplaced. PIE **medhu* might in fact refer to (liquid) honey, besides ‘a sweet drink’ or mead, and the etymon’s reflexes in the various branches refer to any of the above three, or otherwise to wine, intoxication, or nectar¹⁸². Walde-Hofmann suggests the origin might be Frankish, but follow it up with a (?) – presumably the choice for Frankish is based more on the concept mead than on the word. The drink was not widely known throughout the Mediterranean world,¹⁸³ and thus the word is likely to have arrived from Northern Europe, i.e. Frankish territory.

The date when the word was borrowed into Latin may actually be a lot earlier than its first attestation would suggest, as argued by Von Wartburg,¹⁸⁴ potentially making its inclusion in this list somewhat controversial. Anthimus is the earliest extant author who mentions the word. However, that the final *s* is preserved in French. Words in Romance normally owe their current form to the Latin accusative, which would be *medum* if the word were masculine. This cannot have been the case, as final *m* was lost in Romance.¹⁸⁵ *Medus* was therefore necessarily classed as a neuter in *-us*, meaning its accusative was also *medus*, resulting in the preservation of the final *-s* in French. Seeing that the case system was lost in Romance, and presumably had lost its force by Anthimus’ time, too, it is hard to imagine that *-us* was still recognised as a denominator as different declensions. This would suggest that the word was actually borrowed into Latin by the second century in the Northern area where it originated, and that it was restricted to that area, as demonstrated by the geographical concentration of the word’s reflexes in Northern France.¹⁸⁶

Regarding the attestations, Isidore of Seville should not be considered as such, because his work is something that might represent a modern Etymological dictionary – at any rate it is a lexicographical work, and his listing of *medus* might well be based on the attestation in Anthimus alone. The FEW¹⁸⁷ lists an attestation from the *Capitulare de villis*, which is from the

¹⁸⁰ FEW XVI, 545; Walde-Hofmann 1938, LEW, 59; Meyer-Lübke 1935, 449.

¹⁸¹ Isid. Etym. 20.3.13.

¹⁸² Mann 1984/87, 742-3.

¹⁸³ Dalby 2003, 210-1.

¹⁸⁴ FEW XVI, 545.

¹⁸⁵ Alkire & Roosen, 36.

¹⁸⁶ FEW XVI, 545.

¹⁸⁷ *Ibidem*.

9th century and therefore not relevant in this discussion. Souter¹⁸⁸ lists *medus* as being mentioned in two sources, the first one being Anthimus, and the second being Venantius Fortunatus, *Vita Radegundis*, XV:36. This last one, however, is actually not an attestation of the word *medus*, but of the concept: the *Vita Radegundis* actually reads *aqua(m) mulsa(m)*, which is another way of saying the same thing, i.e. ‘mead’.

Naupridas n. 47, f242

naupridas vero nec nominare nec sanis nec infirmis hominibus – “Lampreys are not to be mentioned for either healthy or infirm people.”

naupridas **G A** *naupredas* **B g P** *lampidas* **I** *lamprede* **p**

Meaning	lamprey
Attestations	Pol.Sil.Lat. 10.9 “ <i>naupreda</i> ”, <i>Vita S. Hermelandi</i> [...] part. 1. pag. 393. <i>naupreda</i> ¹⁸⁹
Origin	possibly Celtic, but unconfirmed
In Romance	OFr. <i>lomproie</i> , MFr. <i>lomproise</i> , <i>lampraye</i> , Fr. <i>lamproie</i> , OPr. <i>lampreda</i> , <i>lampreza</i> , It. <i>lampreda</i> , Piem. <i>lanprè</i> , Cat. <i>llamprea</i> , OCat. <i>lampresa</i> , Wall. dial. <i>amproye</i> ¹⁹⁰ .
Other reflexes	OHG <i>lampreta</i> , Ge. <i>lamprete</i> , ON. <i>lampreda</i> , ¹⁹¹ OE. <i>lamprete</i> ¹⁹² , MDu. <i>lampreie</i> , Du. <i>lamprei</i>

An immediately visible problem with *naupridas* is that the reflexes are quite obviously different from the etymon. The relevant literature does not provide a straightforward answer. Thomas¹⁹³ states that “les langues romanes [...] n’offrent aucun trace d’un premier élément *lam* – au lieu de *nau* –.” Schuchardt¹⁹⁴ offers no solutions, stating: “Dunkel ist ferner der Übergang von *naupreda* in *lampreda*.” The best option, he argues, is that the name of another fish influenced the word, and that it changed by a type of analogy. He concedes, however, that the fish names which are at this point recognisably similar to *lamproie* and its cognates, do not belong to fish that are likely to be confused with the lamprey.¹⁹⁵

¹⁸⁸ Souter 1949, 247.

¹⁸⁹ Du Cange, 1883-1887, vol 5, col. 580c, entry *naupreda*.

¹⁹⁰ FEW V, 146-7. Sp. Po. *lamprea* appear to derive from French, not Latin, as intervocalic loss of /t/ should not occur in Spanish and Portuguese, see Alkire&Roosen 2010,45, 220; Murray & Bradley 1908, vol 6 part 1, 43.

¹⁹¹ FEW V, 147.

¹⁹² Köhler 1906, 53 – note that OEn. *lamprete* is not related to MEn. *lamprei(e)* and En. *lamprey* derive from an Old French loan.

¹⁹³ Thomas 1906, 185.

¹⁹⁴ Schuchardt 1906, 724.

¹⁹⁵ For instance, the mahi-mahi (Cat. *llampuga*, Sp. *llampuga*, It. *lampuga*, Sic. *lampuca*), Schuchardt 1906, 724.

One etymology that has been proposed,¹⁹⁶ is that *lampreda* is a metathesised form of *lam-petra*, or ‘stonelicker’ (*lambere* ‘to lick’ and *petra* ‘stone’). The name is undoubtedly connected to the animal’s habit of attaching itself, with its mouth, to rocks.¹⁹⁷ It must be, however, that the etymology is based on this habit, rather than the opposite, because as discussed above, the oldest attested form is *naupreda*, not *lampreda*.¹⁹⁸ Thomas, in addition, argues that the Romance forms prove that the normal ending was *-preda*, not *-petra*.

If not *lampetra*, what could the etymology be? Rose¹⁹⁹ suggests a connection to Celtic. He connects *nau-* to Gaulish *naw* (also Irish *nóí* and Breton *nao*), ‘nine’, and *brith* (Ir. *brit*, We. *brith*, Gael. *brioth*) meaning ‘fleck’, ‘speck’, leading him to a name of the nature ‘seven-specked’. However, this connection seems unlikely to me because there is no reason to assume that the initial consonant /b/ in *brith* would have fortified in Latin. Dottin²⁰⁰ points to another French name of the lamprey, “*sept-yeux*” (‘seven-eye’) and “*bête a sept trous*” or ‘seven-holed beast’ – see also Geerman *Neunaugen*, Dutch *negenogen*, both names for the lamprey meaning ‘nine-eye’. Whilst the connection to *sept-yeux* and *Neunaugen/negenogen* is certainly interesting, it is not by any means a commonly accepted etymology, and compelling evidence to explain the word’s origins beyond doubt are lacking.

The spelling variations *naupredas/-pridas* may easily be explained as scribal error. *ē* and *ĩ* merged in later Latin, which might well have led to confusion regarding the correct pronunciation of the word (see also *bridos* above).²⁰¹ Finally, an interesting note on the above-mentioned Walloon variation *amproye* is that this form looks like the initial *l* was, at some point, wrongly interpreted as an elided article: **l’amproye* instead of *lamproye*.²⁰²

Platensis n. 42, f241

de platense (rubr) – “concerning plaice”

platensis vero vel solere unium genus est– “the plaice and sole are of the same kind”

platensis **G** *placensis* **A** *platinsis* **B** *platensi* **P**

Meaning	a fish, most likely the plaice
Attestations	Aus. Ep. XIV.60, 4 th century ²⁰³ “ <i>platessae</i> ”
Origin	Possibly Greek <i>πλατύς</i> , ‘flat or broad’, ²⁰⁴ but Schuchardt ²⁰⁵ proposes a

¹⁹⁶ Diez 1887, 187.

¹⁹⁷ Köhler 1906, 52.

¹⁹⁸ See also Murray & Bradley 1908, vol 6 part 1, 43.

¹⁹⁹ Rose 1870, 55. See also Dottin 1920, 274, who proposes Ir. *nóí*, Gaul. *naw*, and Bret. *nao*.

²⁰⁰ Dottin 1920, 274; he refers to Rolland 1881, vol 3, 97.

²⁰¹ Alkire & Roosen 2010, 13ff; Rohlf 1968, 88.

²⁰² See also Thomas 1902, 21.

²⁰³ Evelyn-White 1919, 48.

²⁰⁴ Walde-Hofmann 1938, vol II, 319; Ernout & Meillet 1985, 513.

In Romance	Celtic root with a Lat. suffix – see discussion of the lemma below OFr. MFr. <i>plais</i> , MFr. <i>playe</i> , <i>plaiž</i> , <i>pleiž plois</i> , <i>plaise</i> , <i>pleisse</i> , Fr <i>plie</i> , It. <i>platessa</i> , Cat. <i>platussa</i> , Sp. <i>platuja</i> , <i>platija</i> , Po. <i>patruça</i> ²⁰⁶
Other reflexes	MHG. <i>plattise</i> and <i>blatise</i> , NHG. <i>platteise</i> , MDu. Fl. <i>pladijs</i> , En. <i>plaiçe</i> , Serb. <i>platusă</i> , ²⁰⁷ Bas. <i>platuxa</i> . ²⁰⁸

Based on the term's various reflexes, which all mean 'plaiçe', this is most likely the correct translation. Additionally, Anthimus himself states that *solere* and *platessa* are related – *solere* (often read as *solea*) is the sole, another flatfish. The oldest attestation for the flatfish in question comes from Ausonius' epistles (XIV, *Ausonius to Theon*): *platessa*, or in some glosses *platissa*.²⁰⁹ Anthimus' spelling, according to von Wartburg, might be a spelling error that reflects the pronunciation at the time of writing. Adams sees in it a regional variation in use in southern Gaul²¹⁰. This is possible, although hypercorrection might be more likely to account for the insertion of *n* before *s*. This spelling would not necessarily reflect the contemporary (or regional) pronunciation, considering that /ns/ was reduced to /s/ at an early stage,²¹¹ and that none of the reflexes suggest an *n* was ever regularly inserted in *platessa*. The spelling variation, at any rate, does not seem to me to pose any problems.

The etymology of *platessa* and its variants is often thought to be Greek *πλατύς*.²¹² This adjective means 'flat' or 'broad', and was apparently adopted into Latin no later than Pliny.²¹³ Von Wartburg, after Thomas (1906), suggests that the oldest French forms, *plais* and *plaiž*, cannot have been derived from *platessa*, as the word-ending (i.e. the vowel and the gender) do not match.²¹⁴ The only way to connect the two words, he argues, is by assuming the existence of a form with an earlier suffix *-īx*, *-īcem*, giving the unattested form **pladix*, gen. **pladicem*²¹⁵. This suffix is seen in other animal names, such as *perdix* (a partridge), *coturnix* (a quail), and *dentix* (also *dentrix*, a type of fish). Whichever languages and dialects retained the word, von Wartburg argues, then changed the gender, transforming it from a masculine into a feminine, varying with or without preservation of the auslaut consonant, leading to forms such as MBre. *playcenn* in the former case, and Lat. *platessa* in the latter. The word then entered into northern neighbouring languages with a geminated *tt*: MHG. *plattise*, NHG. *platteise*. Additionally, von Wartburg proposes a suffix *-ussa*, particular to the mediterranean area, and which yielded the reflexes as seen today in Spanish, Catalan, and Portuguese. This explanation, then, only accounts for two out of three objections von Wartburg has against the

²⁰⁵ Schuchardt 1901, 348ff, and 1902, 423ff.

²⁰⁶ FEW IX, 42..

²⁰⁷ Ibidem.

²⁰⁸ Löpelmann 1968, 1024.

²⁰⁹ FEW IX, 42.

²¹⁰ Adams 2007, 332.

²¹¹ See also Alkire & Roosen 2010,35.

²¹² Walde-Hofmann 1938, vol II, 319; Ernout & Meillet 1985, 513; FEW IX 42, 51.

²¹³ *πλατύς* is attested in Nat. Hist. book XXVI, chapter 58.

²¹⁴ FEW IX, 42, after Thomas 1902, 118.

²¹⁵ Thomas 1902, 118. See also 1906, 187.

derivation of *plie* from *platessa*, as it passes over why the gender would change, stating only that it must have happened.

Another hypothesis is proposed in two articles on various etymological conundrums by Schuchardt, who sees in *platessa* a Celtic formation.²¹⁶ In this pair of articles, Schuchardt reacts to and expresses his disagreement with the etymologies as listed in the *Dictionnaire général de la langue française* and in Thomas' *Mélanges d'étymologie française*, the former of which asserts that the etymology is unclear, whilst the latter proposes **pladix*, as discussed above.²¹⁷ Schuchardt argues against the first that it implicitly rejects Latin *platessa* as a possible etymology, and asks why this should be. The arguments against Thomas' article are more elaborate and will be discussed here in more detail.²¹⁸ Schuchardt rejects the notion of a form **pladīce* on the grounds that there are no other cases of nouns derived from adjectives with a suffix *-īce*. He adds that Romanian *plătica* cannot be put forward as evidence, as it comes from Slavic (see Russ. *plotva*, *plotica*; Slov. *platica*, *platnica* et cetera).²¹⁹ Moreover, he argues, the suffix *-essa* is equally unlikely in a Latin context where a noun is to be derived from an adjective, in this case either *plattus* or *platus*. The only conclusion, Schuchardt reasons, is that the suffix is not, in fact, Latin, but based on a Celtic form. Especially in the case of the plaice, he argues, it is entirely plausible that Latin speakers would adopt the Celtic word, as the plaice was hardly commonly found in the Mediterranean. He then proposes to derive the term from a Celtic root **lit-*, 'broad', from which he derives Welsh **ledd-* as found in *lledan* and *lleden* 'flatfish', or otherwise from **litt*, 'flat', as found in Welsh *llyth*, 'flat', and *llythien* (pl. *llythi*) 'flatfish'. One must then assume the existence of an unattested **litissā* or **littissā*, with a Celtic suffix. Latin *platessa* was then based on one of the latter forms, which a Latinised stem. Schuchardt seems determined to include a Greek suffix *-ισσα* in his explanation of events as well, possibly to reinforce the case for a Latin suffix that would otherwise be even more unexpected than it already was.²²⁰ I wish to point out that the suffix *-ισσα*, however, is only attested once in Greek, and seems to be a relatively obscure fem. sg. form of *στῦλιτης*, 'standing on a pillar'.²²¹ It seems unlikely to me that a Latin suffix, especially one that Schuchardt deems 'unlateinisch',²²² would be formed after such a rare and scarcely-attested form – there is no impetus either in Latin or in Greek for such a form to be created.

Another, later form, *platesia*, also surfaces, and Schuchardt sees in it another Celtic form, but it seems to have been used in a different meaning from *platessa*: in archbishop Alfric's *Colloquium*²²³, we read, in an enumeration of types of fish, "*platesia, et platissa*", with the

²¹⁶ Schuchardt 1901, 349, and 1902, 423ff.

²¹⁷ Hatzfeld, A., Darmesteter, A., & Thomas, A. (1890) *Dictionnaire général de la langue française : Du commencement du 17e siècle jusqu'à nos jours*. Paris: Delagrave. p 1757; Thomas 1902, 118.

²¹⁸ Schuchardt 1902, 423-4.

²¹⁹ Schuchardt 1902, 423. Note that Thomas does not mention Rom. *plătica* in his argument.

²²⁰ Schuchardt 1902, 424.

²²¹ Liddell & Scott 1940, entry *στῦλιτης*.

²²² Schuchardt 1902, 423.

²²³ Wright & Wülker, 1884, 94.

accompanying translation “fage and floc”. Precisely which fish “fage and floc” are, is not clear, but they do seem to be different types of fish. Regardless, the two words got confused in writing, creating hybrid forms *platesa* and *platisa*, and the nuance in meaning between the two words, Schuchardt argues, was lost in Romance. Moreover, forms like *plaise*, *plaise* (which must have undergone syncope in the meantime, although Schuchardt does not specify this), then lost their auslaut consonant, yielding Middle French *plai* and *plei*.

Both of the above hypotheses require an undesirably large amount of assumptions, while leaving unexplained some of the problems that the authors themselves proffer (notably the gender shift in the former, the differing forms and meanings in the latter). It is interesting to note, however, that in either of the scenarios, the fish is named after its shape. Interestingly, a similar etymological development can be noted in Germanic, where we find En. *flounder*, Old Norse *flydhra*, from Proto-Germanic **flunthrjo*, a suffixed and nasalized form of PIE **plat-* “to spread”.²²⁴

Sitri n. 25, f234

elleborum herbam que latine dicitur sitri – “...the herb hellebore, which in Latin is called ‘sitri’...”

varatrum P om B

Meaning	hellebore
Attestations	no other attestations known
Origin	Possibly Germanic ²²⁵ - the FEW suggests it is Italic and not a loanword
In Romance	Fr. dial. <i>sidr�, s�r�, siur�, s�ire, s�tru</i> and various other variations ²²⁶
Other reflexes	OHG, MGe. <i>sitterwurz</i> , OE. <i>settergrasse</i> and <i>setterwort</i> ²²⁷

We find a rather curious gloss here, as Anthimus first mentions the plant hellebore by its name (*h*)*elleborus*, after which he says that in Latin, the plant is referred to as *sitri*. This is somewhat surprising, considering what we know of Latin lexicon, namely that (*h*)*elleborus* seems to have been an acceptable choice. No other sources mention *sit(e)rus*, whilst *helleborum* (also *elleborum*) is a reasonably common word throughout the ages, occurring as early as in Plautus’ *Menaechmi* and *Pseudolus*, and making appearances throughout Classical Latin. Therefore, the word by no means seems rare. Considering the three-century hiatus between the latest known source before Anthimus (Tertullian’s *De Spectaculis*²²⁸, written around 200CE, and Anthimus, roughly 300 years later), it is not impossible that the word had gone in disuse by the time *DOC* was written.

²²⁴ De Vries 1977, Altnordisches Etymologisches W rterbuch, 134.

²²⁵ Adams 2007, 334.

²²⁶ Ibidem; FEW FEW XI, 661.

²²⁷ FEW XI, 661; Adams 2007, 334.

²²⁸ Chapter 27 section 1, “Nemo venenum temperat felle et elleboro (...)”

The FEW²²⁹ is helpful in examining the situation of the hellebore plant in Latin. There were multiple words in Latin for the same plant, to wit *helleborus*, *veratrum*, and apparently *sit(e)rus*. (*helleborus* is a Greek loanword, whilst the pure Latin form was *veratrum* (this also explains the variant reading in P). This latter form, says the FEW, still lives on in many Romance languages (It. *veratro*, Cat. *veladre*, Fr. *vératre*). The former term, (*helleborus*, was passed on through scholarly Latin, known by physicians and apothecaries, but managed to penetrate into common parlance, leaving us Fr. *ellebre*.²³⁰

The FEW²³¹ suggests that *sitri* is, as Anthimus states, a perfectly normal Latin (albeit syncopated) form, *siterus*. The lack of corresponding forms, the FEW argues, is evidence that the word is Italic, and it is furthermore suggested that it was borrowed into Old English by being used medicinally. The medical texts from the time, which would have been Latin, would have then spread the word. Adams,²³² on the other hand, insists that the origins of the word are Germanic, and that the Old English reflexes are evidence of this.²³³ The fact is that the evidence for either argument is scarce, as the attestations are simply lacking. It cannot therefore be confirmed whether or not *sitri* is a Germanic loanword .

What the gloss does tell us, however, is that Anthimus considered the word a valid Latin option. It is possible that he still saw the word *elleborum* as a Greek loanword, despite how firmly embedded it must have been in Latin by the sixth century, recognising in it the word he knew from his mother tongue. Perhaps, if the word was truly Germanic, Anthimus had learned the word *sitri* after his arrival in Italy, and therefore saw it as Latin. Another possibility is that the Italic hypothesis is correct, and in stating that “*elleborum erbam que latine dicitur sitri*”, Anthimus merely recognises the word’s Italic origin.

Sodinga n. 3, f222

de carnibus vero vaccinis vaporatas factas et in sodinga coctis utendum – “Beef, however, should be consumed having been steamed and cooked in a [pot] or [sauce]”

saudinga **A** *haut igne* **I** *setinga* **gp** *seodinga* **P** *sodingas* **H**

²²⁹ FEW IV, 399.

²³⁰ Ibidem, 400.

²³¹ FEW XI, 661.

²³² Adams 2007, 334.

²³³ For the Old English reflexes, see also Gerard 1597, 826-7; Wright 1898-1905, 209 (entry: bear’s foot). Watts 2007, 364, proposes another etymology for *setterwort*, after Grigson 1952: “[...] cattle were treated with it when they coughed. It was done by making a hole in the dewlap with a setter, or thread (hence the name Setter-grass, or Setterwort”. This etymology, if it may be called that, comes from a work on botany, not linguistics. More importantly, the earliest attestations of the word are written *saturgresse* (sinon. barthol., 18, 14thc) and *satyr grysse* (cath. angl. 331-2, 15thc), making Watts’ version of events look rather folk-etymological, with a reversed cause and effect. The other way around, as found in some older works on animal husbandry, seems more probable: the verb ‘to setter’ as originating from *setterwort* (“To Setter; to cut the Dewlap of an Ox or Cow, into which they put Helleboraster, which we call Setterwort.”, Ray 1691).

Meaning	uncertain, possibly a type of utensil (dish, pot) or a type of sauce or gravy
Attestations	no other attestations known
Origin	most likely Germanic (related to * <i>sauþ</i> -?)
In Romance	no reflexes known
Other reflexes	no reflexes known

The word *sodinga* occurs only in *DOC*, which makes translating it confidently very difficult. With no known cognates or derivatives, the only thing a translation can be based on is the context in which it is found, and this is no simple task, as the text leaves room for various interpretations. A factor that complicates the matter somewhat, is the following sentence: “*etiam et in iuscello ut prius expromatas una unda mittat*”. *Sodinga* has been variously translated in the different editions of *DOC* as either a type of pot or dish, or otherwise a type of sauce or gravy. Some see in the following sentence evidence that *sodinga* is a sauce – *iuscello* confirms that the meat is meant to be cooked in some sort of gravy. However, the opposite point of view is that *iuscello* would be entirely superfluous if *sodinga* was indeed a sauce, and therefore constitutes evidence that *sodinga* is a piece of equipment.

Rose²³⁴ is among those who adhere to the hypothesis that *sodinga* is a pot or pan. He quotes Du Cange²³⁵, who, in turn, quotes a manuscript from around 1130 CE, as printed in Muratori (*Antiquitates Italicae medii aevi* vol IV, 909), saying “[...] *qui in ipso die impositurus est mensae suae prius ferculum, id est sodingam*”. The word indicates that *ferculum* is explained or specified with the additional *sodinga*, which suggests that this word was, at the time this phrase was written, quite known, and indeed referred to some type of cooking utensil in which food could be contained and cooked. This interpretation can be found also in Weber,²³⁶ who proposes ‘casserole’, and Grant,²³⁷ who translates ‘dish’. Flobert²³⁸ only makes mention of *sodinga* in a footnote, where he translates it as ‘cooking pot’ and links it to German ‘*sieden*’. Rose²³⁹ further suggests the word might be related to Germanic ‘*siuden*’, ‘to boil’ or ‘to cook’.

On the other hand, there are those who see in *sodinga* not a utensil but an ingredient in which the meat is to be cooked. Klein²⁴⁰ translates *sodinga* as a meat stock, linking it to proto-Germanic **sauþ*- from which German *sieden* derives. From the same etymon can also be derived Old Norse *sjôða* and Gothic *sauþs*, both ‘sacrificial animal’, and with umlaut Old Norse *seyþ*, ‘boiling water’. Klein points also to the zero-grade form, **suþ*, from which derives

²³⁴ Rose 1877, 57.

²³⁵ Du Cange 1954, VII, 508.

²³⁶ Weber 1924, 72.

²³⁷ Grant 1996, 51.

²³⁸ Flobert 2002, 428.

²³⁹ Rose 1877, 57.

²⁴⁰ Klein, 1953, 124-5.

Old Norse *sop*, “siedendes Wasser, in dem man Fleisch gekocht hat; Fleischzuppe”.²⁴¹ Caparrini²⁴² compares the German translations of the text, which, she argues, might shed more light on the meaning of the lemma. The German translations that Caparrini examines are in reality reworked versions. Both date from the fifteenth century, and are thought to have been composed in Austrian-Bavarian areas (see also *bridos*, discussed above). Caparrini observes that both versions neglect to render one term from the Latin text. Although it is not proven beyond doubt which word is left out, Caparrini considers the omission of *sodinga* the most likely. The manuscripts read: “Dein fleÿsch sey Öchsein vnd wol geschawmet vnd mit guter prüe [...]” (W); “dein fleisch sey ochsein vnd wol geschoumpt vnd mit guter prue [...]” (S). ‘*prüe*’ or ‘*prue*’ refers to a type of sauce or gravy, as *iuscello* in the Latin text. This, she argues, could mean that the scribe knew that the word had the same meaning as *iuscello*, i.e. ‘gravy’, and therefore decided to summarise the passage into a shorter passage than that what was written by Anthimus. This would not be the first abridged passage in those editions, as the scribes seem to have left out certain other passages that were apparently deemed superfluous, obvious, or irrelevant. However, she concedes that it is equally possible that the scribe simply did not know the meaning of the word, and omitted it for that reason. A comparison with the German re-elaboration of the text is, therefore, inconclusive.

Irrespective of the meaning of the word, the origin must be Germanic, and the root is certainly related to German *sieden*, proto-Germanic **sauþan*, or to the root **sauþ* or its zero-grade **suþ*, as proposed by supporters of both hypotheses regarding the word’s most correct translation. I would argue in favour of interpreting *sodinga* as a sauce or gravy, considering that most of the Germanic cognates signal something that is or must be cooked or boiled (water and sacrificial animals, i.e. meat), but seemingly never a pot or pan.²⁴³

Tecunis n. 45, f242

tecunis dicuntur esse filii esocum – “Parr are said to be the young of the salmon...”

teccuris **A** *teccones* **B** *teaones* **g** *beaones* **p** *teones* **P** *teconis* **H**

Meaning	parr, young salmon
Attestations	no other attestations known in the spelling of G , but Pol.Sil.Lat. <i>tecco</i> ²⁴⁴ (5 th c)
Origin	probably Celtic: Gaulish ²⁴⁵
In Romance	MFr. NFr. <i>tacon</i> “jeune saumon” plus regional variations including

²⁴¹ Klein 1953, 124, after Kluge-Götze, 15e Aufl., 1951, 723.

²⁴² Caparrini 2009, 189ff.

²⁴³ Philippa 2009, entry *zooi*, suggests as zero-grade form **suda*, with the relevant reflexes OE *ge-sod* ‘dish, cooked food’; ON *soð* ‘brew’.

²⁴⁴ See Thomas 1906, 194.

²⁴⁵ FEW XIII.1, 149, Meyer-Lübke 711, 8608, Walde-Hofmann vol 2, 653 and Ernout-Meillet 678.

Chateauroux, Indre *tacon* “sorte de petite truite”²⁴⁶, Cat. *tacó*²⁴⁷

Other reflexes no reflexes known

The word *tecco* first occurs in Polemius Silvius, but without an accompanying definition – in Anthimus, however, we are told that *tecunis dicuntur esse filii esocum*, ‘*tecunis* are said to be the young of the salmon’, what translators have variously translated as parr or salmlets,²⁴⁸ but at any rate, salmon’s young. The reflexes largely reflect this meaning (bar some exceptions, which will be discussed in more detail below), supporting that both Anthimus’ observation and the translation ‘parr’ are accurate. The spelling variation found in **G** may reflect degemination of geminate consonants, not an unusual phenomenon in Vulgar Latin.²⁴⁹ The variation with *a* in **g** and **p** (*teaones* and *beaones* respectively) are almost certainly scribal errors, where a double *c* was read as *a*. This is not an unusual type of error – if the letters are close enough, geminate *c* can look quite similar to *a*. See also *aloxinum* above.

The FEW, Meyer-Lübke, Walde-Hofmann and Ernout-Meillet all agree that the origin of the word must be Gaulish. Walde-Hofmann, after Dottin,²⁵⁰ suggests it might be related to Welsh *techu* ‘to hide’, but omits any further explanation. Whilst these authors agree, then, that the root must be Celtic, there are no suggestions to be found as to what that root was exactly, and as Adams²⁵¹ observes, it has not been confirmed by later scholarly research.

Other suggestions have been rejected. Thomas²⁵² discusses in great detail *tecco* and some of its derivations, touching upon a suggestion by Littré²⁵³ that *tacon* is somehow related to *tac* “pointe” (‘dot, fleck’, presumably in reference to the fish’s speckled skin), which would make the origins of *tecco* Germanic, rather than Celtic. Thomas refutes the idea, arguing that the oldest attested form of the word is *tecco*, not **tacco*. Barbier²⁵⁴ similarly argues for a connection to the fish’s appearance and argues for a Celtic root **tecc*, meaning fleck. Von Wartburg argues against this hypothesis that nothing within Celtic justifies the supposition of such a root. Thomas also discusses an idea set forth by Jaubert²⁵⁵ that the *tacon* is in fact not a salmon at all, but a similar-looking fish that is inappropriately called by the same name. Thomas²⁵⁶ argues that in all likelihood, Jaubert has confused different species of fish, names the *tacon* and the unrelated *taco* or *tacaud*, which is a species of *Gadus*.

Finally, Schuchardt, in response to Thomas,²⁵⁷ has formulated an alternative hypothesis,

²⁴⁶ FEW XIII.1, 148; regional variations include Chateauroux, Indre *tacon* “sorte de petite truite” (see Jaubert 1856, 346-7), BLim. *técou* “jeune saumon”, Basse-Auvergne *tacon*, Old Béarnese *tocaa*, Béarnese *toucaa*.

²⁴⁷ Coromines et al. 1980, 198ff.

²⁴⁸ Weber 1924, 33, Grant 1996, .

²⁴⁹ Alkire & Roosen 2010, 44; Rohlfs 1968, 88-9.

²⁵⁰ Walde-Hofmann vol 2, 653; Dottin 1920, 291.

²⁵¹ Adams 2007, 331.

²⁵² Thomas 1906, 194-6.

²⁵³ Thomas (1906, 196) gives no reference.

²⁵⁴ FEW XIII.1, 149; Barbier (1920) *Revue de philologie française*, 32.

²⁵⁵ Jaubert 1856, 346-7.

²⁵⁶ Thomas 1906, 194-5.

²⁵⁷ Schuchardt 1906, 732; in response to Thomas 1906.

placing some doubt on the Celtic origin of the word. Whilst agreeing mostly with Thomas' findings, he expresses some dissatisfaction with the latter's explanation, owing to the fact that Thomas does not account for the *a* in the younger derivation *tacon*. Schuchardt argues for a form **tacco*, stating that this form might easily come from Germanic, ignoring, however, what Thomas had already established, namely that the oldest attested form is *tecco*, not **tacco*. But even *tecco*, Schuchardt insists, does not irrefutably point to Celtic, but could well be related to Italian (*at*)*tecchire*. This verb, Schuchardt argues, relates to growing, especially of children. This last point is not entirely accurate: the word might occasionally be applied to people, but it is actually an agrarian term, more commonly used for plants in the sense of 'taking root'.²⁵⁸ The connection with the growth of offspring, therefore, whilst not an impossible semantic shift, does not seem very probable. Schuchardt's following observation, namely that the regional variations *tocan* (having arisen from *tacon* by metathesis) was influenced somehow by the verb *toccare*, seems especially unfounded to me.

A last note on the difference in meaning between the various regional varieties as listed in the FEW, with most words referring to (young) salmon, but one referring to trout (see footnote 152 and Jaubert 1856, 346-7), is in order. Von Wartburg lists Jaubert as his source for this variation, but as discussed above, Thomas has demonstrated that this source is almost certainly incorrect. The FEW may thus well be in error when listing "sorte de petite truite" among the various meanings. Vialle, in his *Dictionnaire du Patois de Bas-Limousin*²⁵⁹, remarks the following under *técou*: "Jeune saumon, *tacon*. C'est un de nos meilleurs poissons d'eau douce. Il ressemble beaucoup à la truite, mais on l'en distingue principalement par des bandes rouges transversales. Sa chair est aussi plus délicate." Perhaps the confusion between the trout and the salmon can be explained, at least in part, by Vialle's observation that they look extremely similar.

Trucanti n. 44, f242

trucanti illi minuti pisciunculi assi vel frixi apti sunt – "Gudgeon, those little fish, are suitable to be eaten roasted or fried."

trucanti **G A H** *tracanti* **B p** *troganti* **g P**

Meaning	gudgeon ²⁶⁰
Attestations	no other attestations known
Origin	possibly Celtic (Gaulish) ²⁶¹
In Romance	Gallo-Romance only, OPr. <i>tregan</i> ('sorte de poisson, goujon' -

²⁵⁸ Accademia della Crusca 1863, .

²⁵⁹ Vialle, 1824, 276.

²⁶⁰ FEW XIII.2, 324. Young trout or salmon trout has also been suggested, see Dalby 2003, 333 and Andrews 1955, 315; in translation Weber 1924, 33, Grant 1996, 67.

²⁶¹ FEW XIII.2, 324.

gudgeon), MFr. *tregand*, NFr. *trigant*, Lang. *tregan* ('goujon'); also OPr. *troguan*, *troguen*, *draugoen*, Lang. *turgan* ('lotte' - monkfish).²⁶²

Other reflexes no reflexes known

The word *trucanti*, yet another hapax exclusive to Anthimus, occurs in one of the sections on fish. Von Wartburg²⁶³ touches on Anthimus in his discussion of *trucantus*, and he is confident that it derives from a Gaulish word²⁶⁴, presumably with the same meaning. The word most certainly refers to some species of fish, but it is debated which one exactly. The FEW, Walde-Hofmann, and Meyer-Lübke²⁶⁵ all agree on *gründling*, or 'gudgeon'. This certainly fits the reflexes that the FEW gives (see above). As Adams notes, "the words perhaps had a tendency to shift meanings"²⁶⁶. It certainly seems that way from what can be found in various French dialects, which vary in meaning between gudgeon and monkfish, as listed above, with additional meanings in various Occitan dialects being "vieille truite" ('old trout'), "petit goujon" ('small gudgeon'), "atherina", and "éperlan" ('smelt').²⁶⁷ Adams also points out that in the FEW, the reflexes have been divided into two groups based on the vowel in the first syllable, with the first group representing those reflexes with a front vowel, and the second group those with a back vowel. Von Wartburg points out that the two spelling variations found in the different manuscripts (*tracanti* and *troganti*) are partly reflected in the Occitan dialects (see reflexes above). The two variations, i.e., those with a front vowel and those with a back vowel, might reflect a more or less parallel development of the same word. Each of these groups contain regional varieties with a deviating meaning, but the one word that both groups have representatives for is 'goujon', or 'gudgeon'. For this reason, I find this the most plausible translation for *trucanti* in *DOC*.

As for the suggestion of 'young (salmon) trout', the various authors who propose this interpretation do not offer an explanation for their choice. A possibility, I believe, is that the word *trucantes* is mentioned in *DOC* relatively briefly after *truca* ('trout', see below). The word *trucanti* is then, by association, interpreted as a diminutive or a derivation of *truca*. This idea might be reinforced by the following section, which mentions *tecunis [...] filii esocum* ("the young of the salmon"), making perhaps, at least for some, a bridge from one type of fish's young to another. However, in my opinion there is nothing in *DOC* or in the word itself to suggest that *trucanti* refers to young salmon. As far as I am aware, there is no suffix -*antus* that might form a diminutive in Latin, or in fact any kind of derivative, which means there is no evidence that the two words are related.

A final suggestion comes from Souter²⁶⁸, who proffers "a very small edible fish, a sardine(?)

²⁶² FEW XIII.2, 324-5.

²⁶³ FEW XIII.2, 325.

²⁶⁴ See also Walde-Hofmann's comparison of *trucantus* to Gaulish *craxantus*, 'a toad', vol 1, 286, on the grounds of the suffix, cf also Ernout-Meillet, 704.

²⁶⁵ Meyer-Lübke 1935, 743, 8941.

²⁶⁶ Adams 2007, 331.

²⁶⁷ FEW XIII.2, 324-5.

²⁶⁸ Souter 1949, 432

(Anthim. 44)”. The question mark, not a unique feature in Souter (see *bridos* above), suggests that the suggestion is no more than a guess, presumably based on the context. I will therefore not consider it as a possibility, due to the absence of any other arguments in favour of this translation.

The spelling variations in **P** (*troganti*) largely reflect changes from Latin to Romance, including lenition of the velar stop /k/ to /g/ and the change of /u/ (if it was a short *u*) to /o/.

As for the origin of the word, the FEW²⁶⁹ asserts that it is indubitably Gaulish, but does not propose an etymon. The other standard works of reference give similar solutions, and therefore a plausible etymon is lacking.

Tructa n. 39, f240

Tructa et perca aptiores sunt ab aliis piscibus – “Trout and perch are more suitable than other fish.”

(no variations)

Meaning	trout
Attestations	C. Plinius Valerius 5.43 ²⁷⁰
Origin	Probably Greek τρώκτης ²⁷¹
In Romance	It. <i>trota</i> , Sp. <i>trucha</i> , Fr. <i>truite</i> , Po. <i>truta</i> , Cat. <i>truita</i> ²⁷² , many dialectal variants
Other reflexes	Late OEn. <i>truht</i> , En. <i>trout</i> ²⁷³ , Alb. <i>trofte</i> ²⁷⁴

It is difficult, seeing that Anthimus does not go into much detail, to be absolutely certain which fish in *DOC* is referred to by which name. Apart from indications of the firmness of the fish’ flesh, there are very few clues in *DOC* that might help the modern reader distinguish between different species of fish. Andrews (1955) braves what he describes as “frustrating confusion”²⁷⁵ regarding Latin and Greek names for salmon and trout, and goes into great detail concerning the *tructa* in his incredibly helpful article, concluding that the Latin *tructa* refers to both the modern *Salmo tructa lacustris* and the *Salmo tructa macrostigma*,

²⁶⁹ FEW XIII.2, 325.

²⁷⁰ See Lewis and Short 1879, entry *tructa* – the source they refer to was unfortunately unavailable to me.

²⁷¹ Walde-Hofmann 1938, LEW 710.

²⁷² FEW XIII.2, 325.

²⁷³ look up oed page .

²⁷⁴ LEW 710.

²⁷⁵ Andrews 1955, 308.

both species of freshwater trout. This same conclusion is found in most important works of reference.²⁷⁶

Andrews mentions and compares several Latin sources, in an attempt to shed light on where the word *tructa* comes from - the derivation from Greek *τρώκτης* seems probable, but is not uncontested. Ernout-Meillet²⁷⁷ states: “semble sans rapport [...] avec le gr. *τρώκτης*, qui désigne un tout autre poisson, une sorte de thon = *ἀμύια*”. Andrews confirms this, citing an account describing how to fish for *ἀμύια*, found in Oppian (Hal. 3.144-8), which is almost identical to what Aelian (N.A. 1.5) says about the *trocta*, a saltwater fish, quite dissimilar from the freshwater trout²⁷⁸. Given, however, the many reflexes in Romance, which all refer to the trout, there can hardly be any doubt that *tructa* does in fact refer to the species of *Salmo tructa*. There is one piece of evidence in favour of Greek *τρώκτης* as a trout: the albanian *trofte* (‘trout’) derives from Classical Greek *τρώκτης*, which thus must somehow be connected to the trout²⁷⁹ - the alternative is an astounding coincidence in two different language families, which both borrow a term for one fish and both apply it to another afterwards. Andrews proposes the following solution: *τρώκτης* comes from the verb *τρώγω*, ‘to gnaw or nibble’, and refers to the animal’s voracity. Aelian’s account of the *ἀμύια* depicts a fish with large or particularly sharp teeth that will swim towards the fisherman in an attempt to sever the line, confirming the image of a ‘gnawer’ - it is possible, argues Andrews, that the same was true of the trout and the name was shared by the two species, one having gained the name later by extension, one being the original ‘gnawer’²⁸⁰. Strangely, Coromines et al²⁸¹ suggest for the Catalan form *truita* a Celtic etymon **trúkantos*. It is interesting that Coromines would suggest such a form for *truita*, whilst it looks so similar in form to *trucanti* above.

As for the form of the word itself, Andrews²⁸² argues that the Classical Latin form (of which, however, there are no attestations) would have been *trota*, suggesting an oral borrowing from Greek, where $\omega > \rho$. Mentioning also that there is no evidence for this in Classical literature, he argues that linguistic evidence does suggest that at the time the Romans acquired the word from Greek speakers in Magna Graecia, it was already applied to the trout, and that it was not an exclusively Roman innovation to apply the word to that species as opposed to the *ἀμύια*. The remnants of this root in Italian (*trotta*) and some Italian dialects (e.g. Sic. *tróttta*, Cal. *tróttta*, Irp. *tróttta*) point to Greek (with o from ω) rather than Latin *tructa*, and all of these mean ‘trout’, providing evidence for a Greek origin²⁸³. A final additional complicating factor in the discussion of the etymon and its reflexes, which is not mentioned

²⁷⁶ Ernout & Meillet 1985, DELL 704; Walde-Hofmann 1938, LEW 710; Meyer-Lübke 1935, REW 743; Souter 1949, GLL 432.

²⁷⁷ Ernout-Meillet 1985, DELL 704.

²⁷⁸ Ibid 314.

²⁷⁹ Ibid 316.

²⁸⁰ Ibid.

²⁸¹ Coromines et al. 1980, 903-4.

²⁸² Andrews 1955, 316.

²⁸³ Ibid.

in any of the relevant literature, are the reflexes in Spanish and Portuguese. These forms are not as you might expect: short u is normally expected to yield o in both, whilst in reality we find u .

3. Analysis and conclusions

The conclusions that may be drawn from the non-Latin lexis in the cooking terminology in *Anthimus' de observatione ciborum epistula* are varied and cover more than one topic.

Starting with some simple statistics, what follows is a breakdown of the various loanwords and their language branches. The total number of lemmata discussed above is 17, of which 16 have been assigned a (probable) language branch of origin. *fartalia* remains of unknown origin and will be excluded from the following analysis. One word has been assigned two possible branches, as evidence on which to base a choice in favour of one or the other was not compelling enough. That word has been marked with an asterisk in the table below. The distribution is as follows:

Germanic	Celtic	Greek
bradonis	cracatiu	alfita
bridos	naupridas	afratus
fenea	platensis*	aloxinum
medus	tecunis	azimus
sitri	trucanti	platensis*
sodinga		tracta

We see a fairly clear three-way division, with six words from the Germanic language branch, and four and five confirmed words from Germanic and Greek respectively. The latter two categories share one more unconfirmed lemma which might belong to either group. This gives us an average of five words for Celtic and Greek each.

There is yet another subdivision to make within the Germanic branch, which will be discussed further below.

When looking more closely at the nature of the words, this division becomes interesting in terms of the reality they appear to represent. The Celtic words are, without exception, fish names. Fish, in times before refrigeration, was a product that was very locally available. Of course preservation techniques existed and had been employed for centuries before *Anthimus' time* (literary evidence for *cetariae*, salt vats in which fish were salted, goes as far back as the second century BCE).²⁸⁴ However, *Anthimus* does not write about preserving fish, but about eating it fresh. Therefore, the fish would have had to be available in the region where the intended readers of the work resided. This fits perfectly with what we know of *Anthimus' reader*, king Theuderic, who had his court in Gaul. It is not surprising that fish that were available there, would be referred to by their Gaulish name. (Interestingly, even

²⁸⁴ Thurmond 2006, 224.

among the Celtic loanwords that had been introduced into Latin well before Anthimus' days, there is one fish commonly found in Gaul: *esox*, the salmon. Clearly this rule did not apply exclusively to the Latin of Anthimus' days.)

Out of the Greek words, two are glosses: *alfita* and *afratus*. These two terms both refer to a dish, of which Anthimus feels compelled to add the Greek name, as well as the Latin and, in one case, Gothic. These two words seem to be a personal touch on Anthimus' part, as there is no real need to use the Greek term here – for each, a perfectly acceptable Latin term (*polenta* and *spumeum* respectively) is available. Moreover, as demonstrated by the physician's explanation of the terms, these were not loanwords that appear to have been in current use in Latin. They must therefore be explained by a desire on the authors part provide some interesting information, a personal note, or to hint at his origins.

To explain the use of *aloxinum* is not so straightforward, as its presence in northern Gallo-Romance, in contrast to its absence from most other regions of the former Empire, is unexplained. If Anthimus introduced the term himself by writing it in *DOC*, as some believe, the choice would be odd as his readers might not yet know and understand the word. As demonstrated in the discussion of the lemma, however, this scenario is not very likely.

Anthimus explains the other two Greek terms mentioned above, clearly aware that they were not commonly-used terminology – his omission of an explanation of *aloxinum* suggests that he expected his readers to be familiar with the term. As is the case with *azimus*, it may be that Anthimus, being a native Greek speaker, simply preferred these Greek terms over the Latin alternatives. Considering that apparently both *azimus* and *aloxinum* were acceptable choices, these lemmata do not seem to constitute an introduction of foreign, unfamiliar lexis into the Latin tractate.

Concerning *truca*, if it is truly of Greek origin, this too appears to have been an acceptable term. Referring once more to Green,²⁸⁵ if reflexes of an etymon are found in all or most Romance languages, this might indicate that the word was borrowed into Latin before approximately 400 CE. It. *trota*, Sp. *trucha*, Fr. *truite*, Po. *truta*, Cat. *truïta* show that the reflex of *truca* is a thoroughly Romance word. When it was introduced, therefore, is difficult to say: the scarce attestations suggest it was rather more recent, whilst its ubiquity in Romance suggests an earlier date. At the same time, as noted in the discussion of the historical context of *DOC*, hapax legomena are not as rare as one might expect, and it could simply be a coincidence that *truca* is attested only in Anthimus. Regardless, the word must have been thoroughly assimilated by the time Anthimus' composed his *epistula*.

As was briefly mentioned above, there is a subdivision to make within the words of Germanic origin: those that are thought to come from Gothic, and those that are thought to come from Frankish. However, as mentioned in the introduction, determining the precise origins of Germanic loanwords is extremely difficult, and in the case of Frankish and Gothic, very little can be said in favour of the one over the other.

²⁸⁵ Green 1998, 185, 189.

The specifics concerning the Germanic origins of three words, *bridos*, *sitri* and *sodinga*, cannot be confirmed at all, owing to the difficulty in finding a suitable etymon for these lemmata. The terms are, quite simply, too obscure to be categorised in a narrower class than simply 'Germanic'.

Out of the remaining three, *fenea* is an explicit gloss, meaning that Anthimus did not consider the term likely to be understood by his readers. He says, moreover, that the Goths call barley *fenea* "in their foreign tongue", whence it follows that he considered this term somewhat exotic. This term, therefore, was not a loanword in common use in Latin.

The remaining words are thought by some to reflect Frankish origins. However, this has not been confirmed by any irrefutable evidence. In the case of *medus*, the idea that the source must be Frankish seems to be based more on what is known about the history of mead, than on any linguistic evidence. As for *bradonis*, there is some suggestion that the word may have come from Frankish territory, based partly on linguistic evidence, and supported, as in the case of mead, by what is known of the history of ham.

Disregarding for the moment the outlier *fenea*, there does not seem to be a solution for these lemmata. These words may or may not have been in common use in Latin during a particular period in a particular area. Anthimus wrote for a Frankish king, so he may have chosen his words accordingly, selecting typically Frankish terms. The author spent a great deal of time at the Ostrogothic court, so he may have learned the words there. It is equally possible that the terms were widely used throughout the area, but that they are not reflected in written records. These words, at any rate, can contribute little to the discussion about the specific linguistic situation in which *de observatione ciborum* was written, that is, whether Anthimus was at the Ostrogothic court, or already with the Frankish king in Gaul.

What can be answered to some extent, is how representative the treatise is of more general contact language phenomena. In earlier sections on the historical context of the work, reasons for borrowing were discussed. One of the principal reasons, it was shown, is a lack of a certain technical term in the speaker's first language. It was demonstrated that directly attested loanwords were usually technical terminology. When a Latin author committed the faux-pas of inserting a loanword into his text, it was usually because Latin lacked the word to express the concept he wanted to discuss. In the case of *DOC* we might say that Latin represents this first language. Even though Latin is not Anthimus' mother tongue, it is, in this case, the standard language in which the work was composed, and which was evidently understood by both the author and the intended audience.

For the following analysis, it is necessary to specify what is intended by a loanword. We might say that any word that is not part of the inherited lexicon, and that cannot be reduced to proto-Italic, in short, that was introduced into Latin from another branch after the language had split off from its Italic sister languages, is a loanword. Of course, this means that *DOC* contains vastly more loanwords than what has been included in the selection above. The following analysis aims at placing *DOC* in its own historical context and determining how representative it is of that period, which means including all of these

words is hardly helpful. It is much more useful to limit the non-Latin lexis to that which was introduced after what is conventionally considered to be Classical Latin. When applying this criterion, we find a small amount of additional words. To be precise, we find two more non-Latin lemmata: *catamodicum* and *exbromare*. *Catamodicum* looks like a compound of the Greek preposition *κατά* with the Latin adjective *modicus*, ‘in moderation’.²⁸⁶ This looks more like interference (the incorrect imposing of one language upon the other, not unusual in Anthimus’ language²⁸⁷) than a proper loanword, especially as it does not appear to have been attested elsewhere (disregarding a single attestation in the later Middle Ages). The other term, *exbromare*, appears to be a neologism based on a loanword, *bromosus*, ‘stinking, fetid’, from Greek *βρῶμος*, ‘stench’. It was attested first in Apicius, which is admittedly a culinary context. This is undoubtedly the reason that Walde-Hofmann²⁸⁸ suggest “durch Sieden den schlechten Geruch entfernen”. However, the particulars of the method, “removing a bad smell through boiling” seem to be inferred entirely from the context. Ernout-Meillet²⁸⁹ suggests the much more cautious, and in my opinion, more accurate, “enlever la mauvaise odeur” or ‘to remove a bad smell’. The term might be applied to cooking, but is not necessarily restricted to the culinary realm. What the term does represent, however, is a technical term for which, as far as I am aware, there was no Latin equivalent. What this tells us is that the reasons for borrowing words were the same in Anthimus’ case as it was for other authors in the centuries before him: where Latin lacked a specific term, the concept necessarily had to be described by a non-Latin word. This means that, while the amount of loanwords might appear higher than usual, *DOC* is not, in reality, such an exceptional text in terms of non-Latin lexis.

There is one final comparison to be made. Above, the question is asked what a loanword is. The answer was that any word that can not be reduced to proto-Italic, or that is not part of the inherited lexicon, may be considered a loanword. Applying these criteria, there are many more loanwords to be found in *DOC*, to the extent where it would be very difficult to count them all. Of the older loanwords in *DOC*, many of them had been so firmly embedded in Latin by the time Anthimus composed his tractate, that they are extremely difficult to recognise as non-Latin lexis. In fact, the term ‘non-Latin’ does not exactly apply here, as loanwords effectively stop being loanwords once they are no longer recognised as such, which may have been the case for many of the older loanwords in *DOC*. It would be more correct to speak of non-Italic than non-Latin in such cases. A brief survey of the text reveals that the older, Classical loanwords outnumber the more recent foreign lemmata discussed in this research.²⁹⁰ What this shows us, is nothing new: language contact and borrowing are

²⁸⁶ See also Weber, 1924, 97.

²⁸⁷ Adams 2003, 28; 496.

²⁸⁸ Walde-Hofmann, LEW, 425.

²⁸⁹ Ernout-Meillet, DELL, 76, entry *brōmus*.

²⁹⁰ A brief survey resulted in the following list of the slightly more obvious loanwords, or Latin neologisms based on loanwords: *ascalonia*, *cervisia*, *larido*, *rhus*, *butiro* (also *boutyro*), *gabata* (also *gavata*), *oxygala*, *melca*, *esox*, *carifofili*, *gingiber* (also *zingiber(i)*), *tisana* (also *ptisana*), *deiusum* (see *ieiunum*), *spleneticus* (after *splen*, from Gr. *σπλήν* – the

phenomena inherent to Latin throughout the ages. What it also demonstrates, is that the language found in Anthimus' text is not as exceptional as it might seem at first sight. The text might have a certain exotic quality, but this image may be explained by a number of factors that are not so extraordinary on an individual level.

Firstly, the presence of a number of unexplained loanwords (*sodinga, bridus, fartalia*), may contribute to the image of a text that is higher in foreign vocabulary than is deemed normal. Secondly, some of the lemmata did not yield many reflexes in Romance, probably because they were in use only very locally (notably *cracatiu, tecunis, trucanti*). Although these words are absent from Romance, they have yielded reflexes in certain areas of France, meaning that they must have been in use in Latin at least in those areas, and not only by the Gaulish speakers – their presence in French dialects is testimony to their use by Latin speakers, too. Thirdly, the text contains a number of hapax legomena that might appear more exceptional than they truly are. As mentioned in the discussion of the work's historical context, hapax legomena are by no means rare, and they do not necessarily represent scarcely-used or unusual words – their near-absence from the written record can be purely coincidental. Lastly, it can be established, as mentioned above, that Anthimus' style was pronouncedly more colloquial than what was usual for Latin authors. What this means, however, is not that the vocabulary of Anthimus' work was exceptional. The style of the *epistula* is what is exceptional, as is the fact that these words were written down. However, as it appears, the words themselves, and especially the phenomenon they represent, were quite ordinary.

Latin reflex of the PIE is *lien*), *spatula, sfera* (also *sphera*), *rubus, phthisicus, pistacia* (*pistacia*, the fruit, is admittedly first attested in the fourth century – however *pistacium*, which is the tree, is attested earlier). This list is not exhaustive.

Bibliography

Text editions

Unknown (9th c) *Epistola Antemi viri inlus[tris] com. et ligatarii ad gloriosum Theodericum regem francorum*, in St. Gallen, Stiftsbibliothek, Codex Sangalensis 762, consulted at <http://www.e-codices.unifr.ch/en/csg/0762/217>

Liechtenhan, E. (1928) *Corpus Medicorum Latinorum Vol. III.1. Anthimi de observatione ciborum epistula ad Theudericum regem Francorum*. Leipzig: Teubner

Rose, V. (1877) *Anthimi de observatione ciborum epistula ad Theudericum regem Francorum*. Leipzig

– (1870) *Die diätik des Anthimus an Theuderich König der Franken*, in *Anecdota graeca et graeco-latina* vol 2, 41-62. Berlin

Classical sources and sources of attestations

Alexander Trallianus Medicus, *de febribus*. Edited by T. Puschmann. Vienna, 1878-9

Archbishop Alfric, *Colloquy*. In *Anglo-Saxon and Old English vocabularies*. Edited by Wright, T. & Wülker, R.P. Vol. 1. London: Trübner, 1884.

Aurelius Prudentius Clemens, *Apotheosis*. In *Prudentius, with an English translation by H.J. Thomson*. London, 1949

Aulus Cornelius Celsus, *de medicina*. In *The Loeb Classical Library: Celsus, De Medicina, with an English translation by W.G. Spencer. In two Volumes. (Vol I)* London, 1935.

Decimus Magnus Ausonius, *Epistulae*. In *Ausonius: with an English translation by Hugh G. Evelyn-White, vol II*. London: W. Heinemann, 1919.

Festus, S. Pompeius, *De verborum significatu quae supersunt cum Pauli epitome*. Edited by W.M. Lindsay. Leipzig: B.G. Teubner. 1913.

Hippocrates, *Regimen in acute diseases*. In *The genuine works of Hippocrates*. Translated by Francis Adams. London, 1886.

- Malchus, *Historia*. In *Dexippi, Eunapii, Petri Patricii, Prisci, Malchi, Menandri, Historiarum quae supersunt*, edited by Bekker, I. and Niebuhr, B.G., Bonn, 1829.
- Pliny the elder, *The Natural History*. Translated by Bostock, J., Riley, H. and Henry, T. London, 1893
- Pliny the Elder, *The Natural History*. Translated and annotated by John Bostock, M.D., F.R.S. H.T. Riley Esq., B.A. London, 1855
- Pliny the elder, *Naturalis Historia*. Edited by Mayhoff, K.F.T. Leipzig, 1906
- Polemius Silvius, *Laterculus*. Edited by Mommsen, Th. Leipzig: Hirzel, 1853.
- Sidonius. *Letters: Books 3-9*. Translated by W. B. Anderson. Loeb Classical Library 420. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1965.

Secondary sources

- Accademia della Crusca (1863) *Vocabolario degli Accademici della Crusca*. Firenze: Nella Tipographia Galileiana di M. Cellini e.c.
- Adams, N.J. (2003) *Bilingualism and the Latin language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- (2007) *The Regional Diversification of Latin 200 BC - AD 600*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- (2013) *Social Variation and the Latin Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Adams, N. J. & Janse, Mark. (2002) *Bilingualism in ancient society: Language contact and the written text*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Alkire, T. & Roosen, C. (2010) *Romance languages: a historical introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Andrews, A.C. (1955) "Greek and Latin Terms for Salmon and Trout". In *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* Vol. 86, 308-318.
- Baldwin, B. (1977) "Malchus of Philadelphia". In *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, vol 31, 89-107.
- Beekes, R. (2010) *Etymological dictionary of Greek*. Leiden: Brill.
- Bloch, O., & Von Wartburg, W. (1968) *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue française (5e éd. rev. et augm.)*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.

- Bomhard, A.R. & Kerns, J.C. (1994) *The nostratic macrofamily: a study in distant linguistic relationship*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Brüch, J. (1913) *Der Einfluss der germanischen Sprachen auf das Vulgärlatein*. Heidelberg: C. Winter.
- Burns, T.S. (1982) "Theodoric the Great and the Concepts of Power in Late Antiquity". In *Acta Classica. Journal of the Classical association of South Africa*, vol 25, 99-118.
- (1984) *A history of the Ostrogoths*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Burton, P. (2002) "Assessing Latin-Gothic interaction". In Adams, J.N. (Ed.), *Bilingualism in ancient society*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Caparrini, M. (2009) "Per un approfondimento dei germanismi dell'Epistula Anthimi de observatione ciborum: *bridum / spiss, sodinga / prue*". In *Linguistica e Filologia* 29, 179-196.
- Coromines, J. (1976). *Diccionario crítico etimológico de la lengua castellana (3a reimpresión)*. Madrid: Gredos.
- Coromines, J., Gulsoy, J. & Cahner, M. (1980) *Diccionari etimològic i complementari de la llengua catalana*. Barcelona: Curial Edicions Catalanes; Caixa de Pensions La Caixa.
- Dalby, A. (1996) *Siren Feasts. A history of food and gastronomy in Greece*. London and New York: Routledge
- (2003) *Food in the ancient world from A to Z*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Darling Buck, C. (1906) "The General Linguistic Conditions in Ancient Italy and Greece". In *The Classical Journal*, Vol. 1, No. 4, pp. 99-110.
- Delatte, L., Evrard, E., Govaerts, S, & Denooz, J (1981) *Dictionnaire fréquentiel et Index inverse de la langue latine*. Liège: L.A.S.L.A.
- Deroux, C. (1988) "Une acception nouvelle pour le mot LARDUM". In Sabbah, G. (Ed.), *Études de médecine Romaine*. Saint-Étienne: Université de Saint-Étienne.
- (2002) "Anthime, un médecin gourmet du début des temps mérovingiens". In *Revue belge de philologie et d'histoire*, tome 80, fasc. 4, 1107-1124.
- Diefenbach, L. (1857) *Glossarium latino-germanicum mediae et infimae aetatis; e codicibus manuscriptis et libris impressis concinnavit Laurentius Diefenbach*. Frankfurt am Main: J. Baer.
- Diez, F. (1887) *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der romanischen Sprachen*. Bonn, Adolph Marcus.

- Dickey, E. (2012) *The Colloquia of the Hermeneumata Pseudodositheana*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dietz, F.R. (1834) *Theophili, Meletii, Damascii, Ioannis, aliorum Scholia in Hippocratem et Galenum; vol 1*. Königsberg: Gebrüder Borntraeger Verlagsbuchhandlung.
- Dionisotti, A. C. (1982) "From Ausonius' Schooldays? A Schoolbook and Its Relatives." In *The Journal of Roman Studies*, 72: 83-125.
- Dottin, G. (1920) *La langue gauloise : Grammaire, textes et glossaire*. Paris: Klincksieck.
- Du Cange, C., et al. (1954) *Glossarium mediae et infimae latinitatis: Sequuntur glossarium gallicum, tabulae, indices, dissertationes*. Graz: Akademische Druck- und Verlagsanstalt.
- (1883-1887) *Glossarium mediae et infimae latinitatis, éd. augm.* Niort: L. Favre.
- Ernout, A. & Meillet, A. (1985). *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine: Histoire des mots (4^{ème} édition, 4^{ème} tirage augmenté d'additions et de corrections nouvelles par Jacques André)*. Paris: Klincksieck.
- Flobert, P. (1997) "Le Latin à la cour de Clovis selon Anthime". In Petersmann, H. & Kettemann, R. (Eds.) *Latin vulgaire - latin tardif. Actes du V^e Colloque international sur le latin vulgaire e tardif, Heidelberg, 5-8 septembre 1997*. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag C. Winter.
- (2002) "Latin–Frankish Bilingualism in Sixth-Century Gaul: The Latin of Clovis". In Adams, J.N., Janse, M. & Swain, S. (Eds.) *Bilingualism in ancient society: language contact and the written text*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gamillscheg, E. (1970). *Romania Germanica: Sprach- und Siedlungsgeschichte der Germanen auf dem Boden des alten Römerreiches*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Gerard, J. (1597) *The herball or Generall historie of plantes. Gathered by Iohn Gerarde of London Master in Chirurgerie very much enlarged and amended by Thomas Iohnson citizen and apothecarye of London*. London: Iohn Norton.
- Gerabek, W.E., Haage B.D., Keil, G., & Wegner, W. (2004) *Enzyklopedie Medizingeschichte*. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Goetz, G. (1888) *Corpus glossariorum latinorum*. Leipzig: Teubner.
- Graff, E.G. (1834-1846) *Althochdeutscher Sprachschatz oder Wörterbuch der althochdeutschen Sprache*. Berlin: Nikolaische Buchhandlung.
- Grant, M. (1993) "A Problematical Word in Anthimus' "De observatione ciborum epistula" 43". In *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 136, 377-9.

- (1996) *Anthimus. De observatione ciborum. On the observance of foods*. Totnes: Prospect Books.
- Green, D. (1998) *Language and history in the early Germanic world*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Grigson, G. (1952) *Gardenage: or, the plants of Ninhursaga*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Groen, N. (1926) *Lexicon Anthimeum*. Amsterdam: H.J. Paris.
- Hattemer, H. & Stiftsbibliothek Sankt Gallen (1844) *Denkmahle des Mittelalters: St. Gallen's altteutsche Sprachschaeetze*. St. Gall: Scheitlin und Zollikofer.
- Hen, Y. (2006) "Food and drink in Merovingian Gaul". In B. Kasten (Ed.), *Tätigkeitsfelder und Erfahrungshorizonte des ländischen Menschen in der Frühmittelalterlichen Grundherrschaft (bis ca. 1000)*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.
- Herman, J. & Wright, R. (2000). *Vulgar Latin*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Herrtage, S.J.H. (1881) *Catholicon Anglicum. An English-Latin wordbook, dated 1483*. London: Trübner.
- Hessels, J. (1890) *An Eighth-century Latin-Anglo-Saxon Glossary. Preserved in the Library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge. (Ms. N^o.144)*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hunt, T. (1994) *Anglo-Norman Medicine, vol I*. Cambridge: Brewer.
- Jaubert, H. (1856) *Glossaire du centre de la France*. Paris: N. Chaix.
- Keyser, P. & Irby-Massie, G.L. (2008) *The encyclopedia of ancient natural scientists: The Greek tradition and its many heirs*. London: Routledge.
- Kluge, F. & Seebold, E. (2011) *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Köhler, J.J. (1906) *Die altenglischen Fischnamen*. Heidelberg: C. Winter.
- Lehmann, W. (1986). *A gothic etymological dictionary*. Leiden: Brill.
- Lewis, C. & Short, C. (1879) *A Latin Dictionary. Founded on Andrews' edition of Freund's Latin dictionary. revised, enlarged, and in great part rewritten by Charlton T. Lewis, Ph.D. and Charles Short, LL.D.* Oxford, Clarendon Press. Consulted at <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/>

- Liddell, H.G. & Scott, R (1940) *A Greek-English Lexicon. Revised and augmented throughout by Sir Henry Stuart Jones with the assistance of Roderick McKenzie*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Löpelmann, M. (1968) *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der baskischen Sprache: Dialekte von Labourd, Nieder-Navarra und La Soule*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter & Co.
- Mann, S.E. (1984) *An Indo-European Comparative Dictionary*. Hamburg: Buske.
- Meader, C. (1901) *The Latin pronouns is, hic, iste, ipse: A semasiological study*. New York: The MacMillan Company.
- Meyer-Lubke, W. (1935) *Romanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch (3. vollständig neubearb. Aufl.)*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Milani, C. (1973) "Anglico-Celtica". In Milani, C. (2009) *Varia Linguistica*. Milano: EDUCatt.
- Moorhead, J. (1992) *Theodoric in Italy*. Oxford: Oxford Clarendon Press.
- Murray, J.A.H. & Bradley, H. (1908) *A New English Dictionary on Historical Principles: Founded Mainly on the Materials Collected by the Philological Society*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Niedermann, M. (1910) "Zur griechischen und lateinischen Wortkunde". In *Indogermanische Forschungen*, vol 26, 43-59
- Orel, V. (2003) *A handbook of Germanic etymology*. Leiden: Brill.
- Panhuis, D. G. J. (1998) *Latin grammar*. Leuven & Apeldoorn: Garant.
- Philippa, M., & Debrabandere, F. (2003) *Etymologisch woordenboek van het Nederlands. Dl.1 A-E*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- (2005). *Etymologisch woordenboek van het Nederlands. [Dl. 2] F-Ka*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- (2009) *Etymologisch woordenboek van het Nederlands. [Dl. 4] S-Z*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- Pokorny, J. (1959) *Indogermanisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Bern: Francke.
- Prati, A. (1970). *Vocabolario etimologico italiano (Nuova ed.)*. Milano: Garzanti.
- Ray, J. (1691) *A collection of words not generally used, with their significations and original in two alphabetical catalogues, the one of such as are proper to the northern, the other to the southern countries: with an account of the preparing and refining such metals and minerals as are gotten in England*. London: . Consulted at:
http://gateway.proquest.com/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:65254:42

- Rohlf, G. (1947) "Germanisches Spracherbe in der Romania". In: *Sitzungsberichte. Philosophisch-historische Classe*, 1944/46, 8.
- (1968) *Vom Vulgärlatein zum Altfranzösischen*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.
- Rolland, E. (1881) *Faune populaire de la France*. Paris: Masionneuve & cie.
- Rose, V. (1870) "Die diätik des Anthimus an Theuderich König der Franken". In *Anecdota graeca et graeco-latina* vol 2, 41-62.
- Schuchardt, H. (1906) "Zu den Fischnamen des Polemius Silvius". In *Zeitschrift für Romanische Philologie*, vol 30, 712-732.
- (1907) "Etymologisches". In *Zeitschrift für Romanische Philologie*, vol 31, 641-666.
- Schützeichel, R. (2004) *Althochdeutscher und Altsächsischer Glossenwortschatz*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Schwentner, E. (1967) "Lat. fartalia, faritalia, faratalia und Verwandtes". In *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie*, 110(3), 230-233.
- Simpson J.A. and Weiner E.S.C. (1989) *The Oxford English Dictionary*. 2nd edition. Oxford, Clarendon Press.
- Souter, A. (1949) *A glossary of later Latin to 600 A.D.* Oxford: The Clarendon Press.
- Steinmeyer, E. & Sievers, E. (1879) *Die althochdeutschen Glossen*. Berlin: Weidmann.
- Thesaurus linguae latinae (Ed. altera.. ed.). (1990) Online edition: de Gruyter.
<http://www.degruyter.com/view/db/tll>
- Thomas, A. (1906) "Le Laterculus de Polemius Silvius". In *Romania* 35, 161-197.
- (1902) *Mélanges d'étymologie française*. Paris: Université de Paris.
- Thurmond, D.L. (2006) *A Handbook of Food Processing in Classical Rome. For Her Bounty No Winter*. Leiden: Brill.
- Vialle, J. (1824) *Dictionnaire du patois du Bas-Limousin (Correze), et plus particulièrement des environs de Tulle. Mis en ordre, augmenté et publié par Joseph-Anne Vialle*. Tulle: J.-M. Drappeau.
- Vitiello, M. (2006) "'Nourished at the breast of Rome': the queens of ostrogothic Italy and the education of the Roman elite". In *Rheinisches Museum Für Philologie*, 149(3/4), 398-412.
- Von Wartburg, W. (1922-2003) *Französisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Consulted online at
<https://apps.atilf.fr/lecteurFEW/>

- Walde, A. & Hofmann, J.B. (1938) *Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Heidelberg: C. Winter.
- Walde, A. & Pokorny, J. (1927) *Vergleichendes Wörterbuch der indogermanischen Sprachen*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Watts, D.C. (2007) *Dictionary of Plant Lore*. Amsterdam [etc]: Elsevier.
- Weber, S. (1924) *Anthimus, De observatione ciborum: text, commentary and glossary, with a study of the Latinity*. Leiden: Brill
- Wright, J. (1898-1905) *The English Dialect Dictionary*, 6 vols. London: Oxford University Press.