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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 origins\(^6\) 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. 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.

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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manuscript</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sangallensis 762</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>9th century</td>
<td>The earliest extant manuscript, G is blindly faithful to the example from which it was copied. Corrections in two hands, G’ and G’.9 Uniquely contains headings - probably a later addition.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Londiniensis Ayscough</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>17th century</td>
<td>Much more recent than most others, but a careful copy of 9thc original and thus often considered equally reliable.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bamberg</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>9th century</td>
<td>Truncated version - occasionally offers valid readings where G is corrupt, but also offers its own corrections of perceived incorrect usage.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sangallensis</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>ninth century, some time after 84913</td>
<td>Vulgarisms ‘corrected’ to customary usage, but g does preserve some interesting readings that correspond to the better mss.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parisinus</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>11th century</td>
<td>Seems to share an ancestor with g, based on readings that only those two mss contain or omit.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

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.
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, thus potentially preserving the original text better than the other manuscripts do. (As Weber explains, 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. 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manuscript</th>
<th>Letter</th>
<th>Century</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Londinensis Harleianus</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>11th century</td>
<td>Has been changed to what was considered 'correct' Latin by its scribe, and often differs needlessly from better mss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pragensis</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>14th or 15th century</td>
<td>Probably the furthest from the original text and of all other extant mss, p is of little value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parisinus 6842</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>10th century</td>
<td>Occasionally useful in confirming the other mss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parisinus New Acquisition</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>11th or 12th century</td>
<td>Contains only introduction and first chapter, usually reads like H</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

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 ἄλοξ ήν, ‘sour aloe’
In Romance Fr. aluine, OFr. aluisne, (with variants aloisne, aloesne, aluesne, alonge), Lux. batteralzem Norm. aliène Olt. alóscia, Po. losna, Sp. aloja, OSp. alosna
Other reflexes Ge. Alsem, OHG. alahsan, Lux. alzem, Du. asem, MDu. alsene
Abbreviations of authors, works and manuscripts in which attestations have been found:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Name</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alex. Trall.</td>
<td>Alexander Trallianus Medicus</td>
<td>c. 525 – c. 605 CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By this author:</td>
<td>de febribus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aelian</td>
<td>Claudius Aelianus</td>
<td>c. 175 – c. 235 CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By this author:</td>
<td>de natura animalium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aus.</td>
<td>Decimus Magnus Ausonius</td>
<td>c. 310 – c. 395 CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By this author:</td>
<td>Epistulae</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aus. Ep.</td>
<td>Epistulae</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aus. Mos.</td>
<td>Mosella</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cael. Aur.</td>
<td>Caelius Aurelianus</td>
<td>5th century CE (but argued by some to be earlier)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By this author:</td>
<td>Acutarum sive Celerum Passionum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cael. Aur. Tard.</td>
<td>Tardarum sive Chronicarum Passionum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cath. Angl.</td>
<td>Catholicon Anglicum</td>
<td>1483 CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cod. Vind.</td>
<td>Codex Vindobonensis</td>
<td>804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isid.</td>
<td>Isidore of Seville</td>
<td>c. 560–636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By this author:</td>
<td>Etymologiei</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isid. Etym.</td>
<td>Etymologiae</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nat. Hist.</td>
<td>Naturalis Historia Pliny the Elder</td>
<td>1st century CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppian</td>
<td>Oppian</td>
<td>2nd century CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By this author:</td>
<td>Halieutica</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppian Hal.</td>
<td>Halieutica</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plin. Val.</td>
<td>C. Plinius Valerianus</td>
<td>c. 400 CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pol. Sil.</td>
<td>Polemius Silvius</td>
<td>5th century CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By this author:</td>
<td>Polemius Silvius, Laterculus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pol. Sil. Lat.</td>
<td>Polemius Silvius, Laterculus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prud.</td>
<td>Aurelius Prudentius Clemens</td>
<td>c. 348 – c. 413 CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By this author:</td>
<td>Apotheosis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prud. Apoth.</td>
<td>Apotheosis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinon. barthol.</td>
<td>Sinonoma Bartholomei, 1380 CE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By this author:</td>
<td>as published in “Sinonoma Bartholomei, a glossary from a fourteenth-century manuscript in the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Abbreviations of quoted works:

- **DAHDG** Die althochdeutschen Glossen. Steinmeyer und Sievers, 1879.
- **LEW** Lateinische Etymologisches Wörterbuch. Walde-Hofmann, 1938.
- **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
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Celt.</td>
<td>Celtic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Da.</td>
<td>Danish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Du.</td>
<td>Dutch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>En.</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fr.</td>
<td>French</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gal.</td>
<td>Galician</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaul.</td>
<td>Gaulish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ge.</td>
<td>German</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gmc.</td>
<td>Germanic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gr.</td>
<td>Greek (Classical)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ic.</td>
<td>Icelandic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ir.</td>
<td>Irish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It.</td>
<td>Italian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lang.</td>
<td>Languedocian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lat.</td>
<td>Latin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lux.</td>
<td>Luxembourgish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHG</td>
<td>Middle High German</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBre.</td>
<td>Middle Breton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDu.</td>
<td>Middle Dutch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MFr.</td>
<td>Middle French</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ModGr.</td>
<td>modern Greek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MWe.</td>
<td>Middle Welsh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFr.</td>
<td>New French (1600 onwards, excluding current usage)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHG</td>
<td>New High German</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Norse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCor.</td>
<td>Old Cornish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OE.</td>
<td>Old English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFr.</td>
<td>Old French</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHG</td>
<td>Old High German</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIt.</td>
<td>Old Italian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ON.</td>
<td>Old Norse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPr.</td>
<td>Old Provençal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSp.</td>
<td>Old Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Po.</td>
<td>Portuguese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ro.</td>
<td>Romanian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sp.</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sw.</td>
<td>Swedish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umb.</td>
<td>Umbrian</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other abbreviations**

- adj.: adjective
- dial.: dialect
- DOC: *de observatione ciborum*
- 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. 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 specialist 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. 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, 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.

The source makes no more mention of Anthimus, but as Grant points out, 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

---


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 Franks\(^{30}\) (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 us 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 theudoricum* instead of *gloriosissino 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 – Adams 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). However, Liechtenhan, in his 1963 edition of DOC, argues that nam non was not in fact a typically Italian expression, whilst Weber sees in it a Graecism. 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, Rose 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. Grant 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. Moreover, Grant argues that there is no reason for Anthimus to call himself a legate to the
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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. 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. 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, 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. However, these did not occur until much later, with hic persisting even in the eighth century, and therefore

42 See also Burns, 1984, 94.
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.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{48} Admittedly the confusion centers around *ille*, *iste*, and *ipse*,\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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”,\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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 aput 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

\textsuperscript{47} Ibidem 302.
\textsuperscript{48} Flobert 1997, 19, 22; Weber 1924, 119.
\textsuperscript{49} Weber 1924, 119.
\textsuperscript{50} Alkire & Roosen 2010, 34.
\textsuperscript{51} for example, in section 1, *pane nitedum* (rubr.) and *pane nitidum*.See also Flobert 1997, 21.
\textsuperscript{52} Rose 1870, 46.
\textsuperscript{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. In section 56 concerning gourds, we read: “*tamen aput 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: “*cucumberis 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. He poses the possibility that Anthimus returned to Constantinople after emperor Zeno, who had sent him into exile, had died. In this scenario, Anthimus was sent as a legate by emperor Anastasius (Zeno’s successor), not by Theodoric, 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 Theodoric. 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. He cites the absence of any references to Theodoric as proof that it cannot have been written at his instigation to be sent as a diplomatic gift. However, if Anthimus were a legate sent to Theuderic by Theodoric, 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
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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 king\(^61\) (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 passage\(^62\)). 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 Rohlfs 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
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areas, where Anthimus resided? Was bilingualism 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, 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. 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’. 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. 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 Latin 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”. 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. Green 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. This higher
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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), 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 Burton 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. 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), and that she was apparently not an exception among Gothic royalty. 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 tradition. 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. Considering the position he held at the Ostrogothic court, he was probably, as Moorhead describes it, “of strong pro-Gothic leanings”, and thus truly an exception to the rule. Flobert, 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
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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 terms. 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 importance. 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 texts. As Grant 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. 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.

Burton raises a very interesting point in his conclusion, 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 Apollinaris 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. 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. 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
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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 indexe 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 lemma, 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.
2. The Lemmata

Afratus n. 34, f238

dec 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 (τὸ ἀφρᾶτον?)
In Romance no reflexes known
Other reflexes no reflexes known

Afratus is one of the interesting lemmata were 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; ἀφρὸς 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 (“ἀφρὸς enim Graece spuma dicitur”).

According to Liddell and Scott95, there are only two Greek sources that mention τὸ ἀφρᾶτον (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 ἀφρᾶτον.
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. 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 ἀφράτον 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
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attestations</td>
<td>none in Latin, but frequently found in Greek, ἀλφίτα (n., nt. pl.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Origin</td>
<td>Greek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Romance</td>
<td>no reflexes known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other reflexes</td>
<td>no reflexes known</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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
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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 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. 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, Beekes\(^{100}\) gives the form ἄλφι (pl. ἄλφιτα, from which the back-formated Homeric sg. ἄλφιτον) and suggests a possible connection to Albanian elb, ‘barley’, with a possible PIE etymon *h2elbʰi, ‘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.”

**Alexanum** B aloxum g

**Meaning**

wormwood, absinthe

**Attestations**

no other attestations known

**Origin**

Greek ἄλοη ὀξης, ‘sour aloe’\(^{101}\)

**In Romance**

Fr. aluine, OFr. aluisne, (with variants aloisne, aloesne, aluesne, alonge\(^{102}\)), Lux. batteralzem\(^{103}\) Norm. aliène\(^{104}\) Olt. álóscia, Po. losna, Sp. aloja, OSp. alosna\(^{105}\)

**Other reflexes**

Ge. Alsem, OHG. alahsan, Lux. alzem, Du. alem, MDu. alsene\(^{106}\)

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 peninsula\(^{107}\), 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 derivatives\textsuperscript{108}.

One theory is that Anthimus, being a native speaker of Greek, introduced aloxinum to northern Gaul himself. This theory is mentioned and granted some credibilty by Bloch and von Wartburg in the DELF (1968, 4), and by von Wartburg in the FEW I, 75\textsuperscript{109}. However, in a later volume of the FEW\textsuperscript{110}, 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, alfitu 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 Mediterranean\textsuperscript{111} (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 aloxnum 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 aloci-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 nititdum bene fermentatum non azimum – “White bread, well leavened, not unleavened...”

agimun g

Meaning unleavened
Attestations very frequent in Vulgate, St. Jerome (383 - 392 CE.) (spelled azym-);
Prud. Apoth. (353) “stultum est sic credere sacrum (...) similaginis azymon esse”
Origin Greek ἡ ζύμη, ‘the leaven’ (‘yeast’) with neg. part. ἀ - ἀζύμη
In Romance It. azzimo, Sp. ácimo, Fr. azyme, Ro. azima (n., unleavened bread), Po. ázimo
Other reflexes ModGr. αξυμος,
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 Pliny\(^{112}\) 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 l *pradonos* g *pradones* g’ *brado* P

Meaning: probably a type of roast, a joint of meat, a ham

Attestations: no other attestations known

Origin: Germanic, likely Frankish, *brädo*, from pgm. *brēda* or *brêda*\(^{115}\)

In Romance: OFr./MFr. *braon* (‘piece of meat for roasting’)\(^{116}\), Olt. *bradone* (‘falda del vestito che pende dalla congiuntura della spalla – ‘piece of fabric of the clothes that hangs from the shoulder’)\(^{117}\), It. *brandello* (‘shred, scrap’)\(^{118}\), Sp. *brahon* (‘doblez que ceñia la parte superior del brazo’ – ‘fold that covers the upper arm’)\(^{119}\), Cat. *braó* (‘nom de la part alta del braç’ – ‘the upper part of the arm’)\(^{120}\)

Other reflexes: E. *brawn*, from OE. *brahun* (‘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 resoluto quibus diximus generibus spuma ita concreta pro fermento utuntur, qua de causa levior illis quam ceteris panis”; “panis hordeaceus ervi aut cicerulae farina fermentabatur”.


\(^{114}\) 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 I, 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 charmue 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 Wartburg\(^{124}\), 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 *brǣda*. 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 *bʰreḥ-*.\(^{125}\) Kluge\(^{126}\), 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.
*brēda-/ōnlō 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, Brüch\textsuperscript{127} 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 ā, 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, Brüch 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 l *bredo* B p *breto* g *bredu* P *brid H*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>unclear, likely a type of kitchen equipment, possibly a skewer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attestations</td>
<td>no other attestations known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Origin</td>
<td>most likely Germanic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Romance</td>
<td>no reflexes known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other reflexes</td>
<td>no reflexes known</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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*.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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,\textsuperscript{130} there are other occurrences in *DOC* where Anthimus describes sauces or gravies, and these words are invariably followed by a

\textsuperscript{127} Brüch 1913 (*Der Einfluss der germanischen Sprachen auf das Vulgärlatein*), 32ff.

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

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

\textsuperscript{130} Grant 1993, 378; Caparrini 2009, 191-2.
verb that conveys the idea of boiling or stewing. 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* or ‘broth’. As Klein points out, 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 Grant 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 *bread*, all meaning ‘bread’, which Grant argues could be supported by the variant readings *bredo*, *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 *i*, its pronunciation may well have been closer to e by Anthimus’ time, 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” (= ‘a type of pot’), without being more specific, and suggest an etymological connection to OHG *brahan* ‘to roast’, arguing that the *i* is a Gothic closed *ē*. Grant 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*. 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

---

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.
The 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*, 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. Souter offers ‘roasting-jack’, although he neglects to provide an explanation for his translation, and follows it by a ‘(? ’, which suggests he is merely guessing. However, taking into consideration several other translations, Souter might be close to the most reasonable option, a skewer. Klein agrees with Souter, and proposes an etymology where Souter failed to do so: the word would be related to MHD *riden*, OHG *ridan*, 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, 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.”

**cractio** 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\textsuperscript{145}

In Romance OPr. creac, creat, MFr. creac, greac (with a number of similar regional variations), NFr. crat\textsuperscript{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,\textsuperscript{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 creigio ‘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,\textsuperscript{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,\textsuperscript{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,\textsuperscript{150} where we see the loss of the intervocalic c, undoubtedly through lenition of /k/ to /g/, and then loss of /g/.\textsuperscript{151}

Fartalia n. 20, f231

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

fertalia A farta talia l fartalio g

Meaning most likely either a type of cooking utensil, or very finely chopped food (herbs?)

Attestations no other attestations known

\textsuperscript{145} FEW II, 1266; Walde-Hofmann 284; Ernout-Meillet 147.

\textsuperscript{146} FEW II, 1266.

\textsuperscript{147} Schuchardt 1907, 653.

\textsuperscript{148} Milani 1973, 391.

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

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

\textsuperscript{151} Alkire & Roosen 2010, 35, 45-7; Rohls 1968, 89.
Origin unknown
In Romance possibly (but very uncertain) Lang. *fartiāio* (“menues herbes potagères”), Prov. *Fartaio*, 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 Scott\(^{161}\) 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 Caparrini mentions, one added difficulty in the case of the Cod.Vind. gloss is that it occurs in a list of foodstuffs (*De commestibilibus*). 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*). 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. Deroux 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. As for *faritalia*, he provides no solution.

The FEW 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* suffices or some such unproven scenario. The suffix is therefore a problem to this hypothesis.

---

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 l feneam B fenea g*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>a dish made of barley, probably barley soup[^170]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attestations</td>
<td>no other attestations known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Origin</td>
<td>Germanic: Gothic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Romance</td>
<td>no reflexes known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other reflexes</td>
<td>no reflexes known</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.
the possibility that barley soup is a Gothic delicacy, the Greeks had been making it as well, and for a long time, 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’. Orel proposes a proto-Germanic form *fenjo, from which to derive unattested Gothic *finja. From this hypothetical *finja*, Lat. *fenea* might well arise, especially in a time when e and i were not distinguished easily or at all. For a foodstuff as important as barley, which Dalby 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 I mez P medo p;

medus B g H medis A medium I mezo P

(76, f253) medus G B g medium A l

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>mead</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attestations</td>
<td>no other attestations known (controversial – see discussion)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Origin</td>
<td>Germanic: possibly Frankish, through proto-Gmc. *medus, from PIE *médhu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Romance</td>
<td>only known in dialects of northern France: Zarp hathic mez, OFr/MFr variously attested as mies, miez, meuz, mierre, mì, mis’, mi— the other Romance languages refer to mead with reflexes of hydromel(i), the more frequently found Latin word for mead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other reflexes</td>
<td>En. *mead, Ge Met, Du. mede, Sw. mjöd, Da. mjød, No. mjød, Ic. mjödur, ON. mjödr, OE. meodo, OHG. metu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

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.


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, *fingia*, 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 nectar.\(^{182}\) 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 FEW\(^{187}\) 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. Souter 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) muls(a)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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>lamprey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attestations</td>
<td>Pol.Sil.Lat. 10.9 “naupreda”, Vita S. Hermelandi [...] part. 1. pag. 393. naupreda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Origin</td>
<td>possibly Celtic, but unconfirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Romance</td>
<td>OFr. lomproie, MFr. lomproise, lampraye, Fr. lamproie, OPr. lampreda, lamprea, It. lampreda, Piem. lampré, Cat. llamprea, OCat. lampresa, Wall. dial. amproye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other reflexes</td>
<td>OHG lampreta, Ge. lampreite, ON. lampreda, OE. lamprete, MDu. lamprei</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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. Thomas states that “les langues romanes [...] n’offrent aucun trace d’un premier élément lam – au lieu de nau – .” Schuchardt 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.
One etymology that has been proposed,\textsuperscript{196} is that \textit{lampreda} is a metathesised form of \textit{lam-petra}, or ‘stonelicker’ (\textit{lambere} ‘to lick’ and \textit{petra} ‘stone’). The name is undoubtedly connected to the animal’s habit of attaching itself, with its mouth, to rocks.\textsuperscript{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 \textit{naupreda}, not \textit{lampreda}.\textsuperscript{198} Thomas, in addition, argues that the Romance forms prove that the normal ending was -\textit{preda}, not -\textit{petra}.

If not \textit{lampetra}, what could the etymology be? Rose\textsuperscript{199} suggests a connection to Celtic. He connects \textit{nau-} to Gaulish \textit{naw} (also Irish \textit{nóí} and Breton \textit{nao}), ‘nine’, and \textit{brith} (Ir. \textit{brit}, We. \textit{brith}, Gael. \textit{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 \textit{brith} would have fortified in Latin. Dottin\textsuperscript{200} points to another French name of the lamprey, “\textit{sept-yeux}” (‘seven-eye’) and “\textit{bête a septe trous}” or ‘seven-holed beast’ – see also Geerman Neunaugen, Dutch negerogen, both names for the lamprey meaning ‘nine-eye’. Whilst the connection to \textit{sept-yeux} and Neunaugen/negerogen 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 \textit{naupredas}/\textit{-pridas} may easily be explained as scribal error. \textit{e} and \textit{i} merged in later Latin, which might well have led to confusion regarding the correct pronunciation of the word (see also \textit{bridos} above).\textsuperscript{201} Finally, an interesting note on the above-mentioned Walloon variation \textit{amproye} is that this form looks like the initial \textit{l} was, at some point, wrongly interpreted as an elided article: *\textit{l’amproye} instead of \textit{lamproye}.\textsuperscript{202}

\textbf{Platensis} n. 42, f241

\textit{de platense} (rubr) – “concerning plaice”

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

\textit{platensis G placensis A platinis B platensi P}

\textbf{Meaning} a fish, most likely the plaice

\textbf{Attestations} Aus. Ep. XIV.60, 4\textsuperscript{th} century\textsuperscript{203} “\textit{platessae}”

\textbf{Origin} Possibly Greek \textit{πλατύς}, ‘flat or broad’,\textsuperscript{204} but Schuchardt\textsuperscript{205} proposes a

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{196} Diez 1887, 187.
\textsuperscript{197} Köhler 1906, 52.
\textsuperscript{198} See also Murray \& Bradley 1908, vol 6 part 1, 43.
\textsuperscript{199} Rose 1870, 55. See also Dottin 1920, 274, who proposes Ir. \textit{nóí}, Gaul. \textit{naw}, and Bret. \textit{nao}.
\textsuperscript{200} Dottin 1920, 274; he refers to Rolland 1881, vol 3, 97.
\textsuperscript{201} Alkire \& Roosen 2010, 13ff; Rohlfs 1968, 88.
\textsuperscript{202} See also Thomas 1902, 21.
\textsuperscript{203} Evelyn-White 1919, 48.
\textsuperscript{204} Walde-Hofmann 1938, vol II, 319; Ernout \& Meillet 1985, 513.
\end{flushleft}
Celtic root with a Lat. suffix – see discussion of the lemma below

In Romance

OFr. MFr. plaïs, MFr. playe, plaïz, pleïz ploiis, pleïze, Fr pleie, It. platessa, Cat. platussa, Sp. platuja, platija, Po. patruça

Other reflexes

MHG. plattîse and blätise, NHG. platteise, MDu. Fl. pladijs, En. plaice, Serb. platusã, Bas. platuxa.

Based on the term’s various reflexes, which all mean ‘plaice’, 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. 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 Gaul. 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, 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. This adjective means ‘flat’ or ‘broad’, and was apparently adopted into Latin no later than Pliny. Von Wartburg, after Thomas (1906), suggests that the oldest French forms, plaïs and plaïz, cannot have been derived from platessa, as the word-ending (i.e. the vowel and the gender) do not match. 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. 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, varyingingly 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. platîse, 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.
\[213\] 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. 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’etymologie française, the former of which asserts that the etymology is unclear, whilst the latter proposes *pladix, as discussed above. 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. Schuchardt rejects the notion of a form *pladice on the grounds that there are no other cases of nouns derived from adjectives with a suffix -ice. He adds that Romanian platica cannot be put forward as evidence, as it comes from Slavic (see Russ. plotva, plotica; Slov. platica, platnica et cetera). 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 *litissa or *littissa, 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. 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’. It seems unlikely to me that a Latin suffix, especially one that Schuchardt deems ‘unlateinisch’, 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, we read, in an enumeration of types of fish, “platesia, et platissa”, with the

---

215 Schuchardt 1901, 349, and 1902, 423ff.
217 Schuchardt 1902, 423-4.
218 Schuchardt 1902, 423. Note that Thomas does not mention Rom. platica in his argument.
219 Schuchardt 1902, 424.
220 Liddell & Scott 1940, entry στῦλιτης.
221 Schuchardt 1902, 423.
222 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, plaïse* (which must have undergone syncope in the meantime, although Schuchardt does not specify this), then lost their auslaut consonant, yielding Middle French *plaï* and *pleï*.

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 Germanic225 - the FEW suggests it is Italic and not a loanword |
| In Romance | Fr. dial. *sidrē, sērē, siurē,sērē, sētru* and various other variations226 |
| Other reflexes | OHG, MGe. *sitterwurz*, OE. *settergrasse* and *setterwort*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.

---

226 Ibidem; FEW XI, 661.  
227 FEW XI, 661; Adams 2007, 334.  
228 Chapter 27 section 1, “Nemo venenum temperat felle et elleboro (...)”
The FEW\textsuperscript{229} is helpful in examining the situation of the hellebore plant in Latin. There were multiple words in Latin for the same plant, to wit \textit{helleborus}, \textit{veratrum}, and apparently \textit{sit(e)}\textit{rus}. (\textit{h})\textit{elleborus} is a Greek loanword, whilst the pure Latin form was \textit{veratrum} (this also explains the variant reading in \textit{P}). This latter form, says the FEW, still lives on in many Romance languages (It. \textit{veratro}, Cat. \textit{veladre}, Fr. \textit{vératre}). The former term, (\textit{h})\textit{elleborus}, was passed on through scholarly Latin, known by physicians and apothecaries, but managed to penetrate into common parlance, leaving us Fr. \textit{ellebre}.\textsuperscript{230}

The FEW\textsuperscript{231} suggests that \textit{sitri} is, as Anthimus states, a perfectly normal Latin (albeit syncopated) form, \textit{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,\textsuperscript{232} on the other hand, insists that the origins of the word are Germanic, and that the Old English reflexes are evidence of this.\textsuperscript{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 \textit{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 \textit{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 \textit{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 “\textit{elleborum erham que latine dicitur sitri}”, Anthimus merely recognises the word’s Italic origin.

\textbf{Sodinga} n. 3, f222

\textit{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]”

\textit{saudinga A haut igne l setinga gp seodinga P sodingas H}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{229} FEW IV, 399.
\item \textsuperscript{230} Ibidem, 400.
\item \textsuperscript{231} FEW XI, 661.
\item \textsuperscript{232} Adams 2007, 334.
\item \textsuperscript{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 \textit{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 \textit{saturgresse} (sinon. barthol., 18, 14\textsuperscript{th}c) and \textit{satyr grysse} (cath. angl. 331-2, 15\textsuperscript{th}c), 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 \textit{setterwort} (“To Setter; to cut the Dewlap of an Ox or Cow, into which they put Helleboraster, which we call Setterwort.”, Ray 1691).
\end{itemize}
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 *sauþ-?)
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.

Rose\textsuperscript{234} is among those who adhere to the hypothesis that sodinga is a pot or pan. He quotes Du Cange\textsuperscript{235}, 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 sodingan”. 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,\textsuperscript{236} who proposes ‘casserole’, and Grant,\textsuperscript{237} who translates ‘dish’. Flobert\textsuperscript{238} only makes mention of sodinga in a footnote, where he translates it as ‘cooking pot’ and links it to German ‘sieden’. Rose\textsuperscript{239} further suggests the word might be related to Germanic ‘stuiden’, ‘to boil’ or ‘to cook’.

On the other hand, there are those who see in sodinga not a utensil but and ingredient in which the meat is to be cooked. Klein\textsuperscript{240} 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 sjôda and Gothic saups, both ‘sacrificial animal’, and with umlaut Old Norse seþp, ‘boiling water’. Klein points also to the zero-grade form, *suþ, from which derives

\textsuperscript{234} Rose 1877, 57.
\textsuperscript{235} Du Cange 1954, VII, 508.
\textsuperscript{236} Weber 1924, 72.
\textsuperscript{237} Grant 1996, 51.
\textsuperscript{238} Flobert 2002, 428.
\textsuperscript{239} Rose 1877, 57.
\textsuperscript{240} Klein, 1953, 124-5.
Old Norse soþ, “siedendes Wasser, in dem man Fleisch gekocht hat; Fleischzuppe”. Caparrini\cite{caparrini2009} 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). ‘prue’ 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 concludes 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 *saþp or its zero-grade *suh, 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.\cite{philippa2009}

**Tecunis n. 45, f242**

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

**teccuris A tecones 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. tecco\cite{thomas1906} (5th c) |
| Origin | probably Celtic: Gaulish\cite{few} |
| In Romance | MFr. NFr. tacon “jeune saumon” plus regional variations including |

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{241} Klein 1953, 124, after Kluge-Götze, 15e Aufl., 1951, 723.
  \item \textsuperscript{242} Caparrini 2009, 189ff.
  \item \textsuperscript{243} Philippa 2009, entry zooi, suggests as zero-grade form *suda, with the relevant reflexes OE ge-sod ‘dish, cooked food’; ON sod ‘brew’.
  \item \textsuperscript{244} See Thomas 1906, 194.
  \item \textsuperscript{245} FEW XIII.1, 149, Meyer-Lübke 711, 8608, Walde-Hofmann vol 2, 653 and Ernout-Meillet 678.
\end{itemize}
Chateauroux, Indre *tacon* “sorte de petite truite”\(^{246}\), Cat. *tacô*\(^{247}\)

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, salmons’ 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 Adams\(^{251}\) observes, it has not been confirmed by later scholarly research.

Other suggestions have been rejected. Thomas\(^{252}\) discusses in great detail *tecco* and some of its derivations, touching upon a suggestion by Littré\(^{253}\) 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*. Barbier\(^{254}\) 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 Jaubert\(^{255}\) that the *tacon* is in fact not a salmon at all, but a similar-looking fish that is inappropriately called by the same name. Thomas\(^{256}\) 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 *tocao*, Béarnese *touca*.  
\(^{247}\) Coromines et al. 1980, 198ff.  
\(^{248}\) Weber 1924, 33; Grant 1996, .  
\(^{249}\) Alkire & Roosen 2010, 44; Rohlf’s 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’. 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 remarks the following under têcou: “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 gudgeon²⁶⁰
Attestations no other attestations known
Origin possibly Celtic (Gaulish)²⁶¹
In Romance Gallo-Romance only, OPr. tregan (‘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).

Other reflexes no reflexes known

The word trucanti, yet another hapax exclusive to Anthimus, occurs in one of the sections on fish. Von Wartburg touches on Anthimus in his discussion of trucantus, and he is confident that it derives from a Gaulish word, 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-Lübke 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”. It certainly seems that the 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’). 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 Warburg 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 tructa (‘trout’, see below). The word trucanti is then, by association, interpreted as a diminutive or a derivation of tructa. 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 Souter, 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 FEW\textsuperscript{269} 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)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>trout</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attestations</td>
<td>C. Plinius Valerius 5.43\textsuperscript{270}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Origin</td>
<td>Probably Greek τρώκτης\textsuperscript{271}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other reflexes</td>
<td>Late OEn. <em>truht</em>, En. <em>trout</em>\textsuperscript{273}, Alb. <em>trofte</em>\textsuperscript{274}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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”\textsuperscript{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*,

\textsuperscript{269} FEW XIII.2, 325.
\textsuperscript{270} See Lewis and Short 1879, entry *tructa* – the source they refer to was unfortunately unavailable to me.
\textsuperscript{271} Walde-Hofmann 1938, LEW 710.
\textsuperscript{272} FEW XIII.2, 325.
\textsuperscript{273} Look up oed page.
\textsuperscript{274} LEW 710.
\textsuperscript{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 = ἄμια”. Andrews confirms this, citing an account describing how to fish for ἄμια, 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 ἄμια 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 *трота*, suggesting an oral borrowing from Greek, where ω > ọ. 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 ἄμια. The remnants of this root in Italian (*trota*) and some Italian dialects (e.g. Sic. *trötta*, Cal. *trötta*, Irp. *trötta*) point to Greek (with ọ 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 fo 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.
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 ū is normally expected to yield ō in both, whilst in reality we find ū.
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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Germanic</th>
<th>Celtic</th>
<th>Greek</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bradonis</td>
<td>cracatiu</td>
<td>alfita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bridos</td>
<td>naupridas</td>
<td>afratus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fenea</td>
<td>platensis*</td>
<td>aloxinum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>medus</td>
<td>tecunis</td>
<td>azimus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sitri</td>
<td>trucanti</td>
<td>platensis*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sodinga</td>
<td></td>
<td>tructa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 odds 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 *tructa*, 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. *truita* show that the reflex of *tructa* 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 *tructa* 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.

The specifics concerning the Gemanic origins of three words, *bridus*, *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 *meadus*, 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’. This looks more like interference (the incorrect imposing of one language upon the other, not unusual in Anthimus’ language) 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 βρόμος, ‘stench’. It was attested first in Apicius, which is admittedly a culinary context. This is undoubtedly the reason that Walde-Hofmann 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-Meillet 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. 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 butyiro), gabata (also gwattia), oxygala, melca, esox, carifofili, gingiber (also zingiber(i)), tisana (also ptisana), deiusum (see ieium), spleneticus (after spleen, 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 cracatu, 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 sphaera), 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.
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