

Růžičková, Dana

De naturis rerum esibilium et potabilium : Regimen sanitatis in the Summa recreatorum compilation

Sborník prací Filozofické fakulty brněnské univerzity. N, Řada klasická. 2007, vol. 56, iss. N12, pp. [97]-124

ISBN 978-80-210-4388-6

ISSN 1211-6335

Stable URL (handle): <https://hdl.handle.net/11222.digilib/113988>

Access Date: 30. 11. 2024

Version: 20220831

Terms of use: Digital Library of the Faculty of Arts, Masaryk University provides access to digitized documents strictly for personal use, unless otherwise specified.

DANA RŮŽIČKOVÁ

DE NATURIS RERUM ESIBILIUM ET POTABILIMUM
Regimen sanitatis in the Summa recreatorum compilation*

The *Summa recreatorum* is an anonymous piece of work preserved in four manuscripts from the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries stored in Prague, Vienna, Nelahozeves and Leipzig at present. The *Summa*'s place and date of origin have not yet been determined – the *terminus post quem non* is settled by a manuscript from Roudnice that was most probably written between 1360–1380. Since most surviving manuscripts of the *Summa* are of Czech provenance, it is believed to have been written in Prague for the court of Charles IV. Nothing is known about the author or his nationality. A critical edition of the *Summa* along with an analysis of its models will shed more light on the general background of the treatise, or at least on the date of its origin. If any of the models of the *Summa* are proven to date back to the fourteenth century, this will help us date the *Summa* itself more precisely.¹

The title *Summa recreatorum* can be interpreted as a collection or a handbook for those who refresh themselves in both physical and mental senses. The author announces his aim in a prologue where he claims his intention to provide interesting material for the *noble men and educated prelates* that they could discuss at feasts refreshing their minds. A reference to the first book of Macrobius' *Saturnalia* is made here, namely that for an inquiring mind nothing can be more pleasant, rewarding and entertaining than talking about joyous, refined and interesting questions in a dignified manner.² The author had the amusement of contemporary

* This article was written as part of the long-term research program *Research Centre for the History of Central Europe: Sources, Historical Lands, Culture* (MSM0021622426) at the Masaryk University in Brno, and is partly also based on the unpublished dissertation of the author: *Summa recreatorum. Středověký sborník intelektuální zábavy* (FF MU Brno, 2004).

¹ The first three tracts of the *Summa* have been edited in the above mentioned dissertation. The fourth and the fifth tracts are being edited by Anežka Vidmanová, who summarizes basic literature on the *Summa recreatorum* in her article VIDMANOVÁ 2001, 169–179.

² *De summa refeccione, karissimi, refert Macrobius primo libro Saturnalium, quod studioso animo nichil est iocundius, utilius et delectabilius, quam honeste colloqui de letis, subtili-*

intellectuals in mind, to whom he offered a handbook with instructions how to spend quality time at feasts. Readers get to know various facts concerning foods and drinks that could be used in real life as well as discussed at feasts. In addition, several stories and poems can be found here that also provide attractive topics for debates with prospective messmates. The *Summa* therefore demonstrates that medieval intellectuals represented a special group with different, that is, more sophisticated demands for entertainment. Its readers must have been found among the circle of university graduates since the specialized vocabulary of the first three tracts would have hindered people with inadequate education.

As the prologue indicates (see note 2), the *Summa* consists of five tracts, out of which the last two are better known in scholarly literature. These are certainly more attractive for historians of literature because they contain various exempla, stories, poems, and songs, both religious and secular, as well as moral quotations on the four basic virtues (*iusticia, prudentia, fortitudo, temperancia*). This paper will limit itself to the first three tracts, which deal with dietetic matters, and will attempt to analyze their genre. For this purpose, their contents will have to be examined, as they all differ in form but cover similar themes. The first tract is composed in a form of questions and brief answers, and addresses essential human needs such as eating, drinking, breathing, sleeping and moving (chapter 1), as well as basic types of foods and drinks (chapter 2). It also deals with things harmful to human health (chapter 3). The reader can learn, for example, whether eating or drinking is more important, what is healthier after eating – moving or sleeping, whether it is healthy to get drunk once a month, why a mixed wine causes worse headaches in the morning than a pure one, and the like. The second tract describes in fourteen chapters the basic characteristics, qualities and effects of various types of foods and beverages. It describes bread, different types of meat, butter, eggs, fruit, vegetables, milk, wine and mead. In contrast to the first tract, the text is coherent and pays special attention to herbs and spices. The third tract consists of five chapters and contains mostly verses – there are 450 in total. Advice on human health and regimen can be read here and most of its themes correspond to the second tract. In addition, topics other than about food and drinks are introduced here, such as culture of dining and medical treatment; one whole

bus ac curiosis questionibus. Unde omnino videtur expediens nobilibus dominis et prelati literatis, quod ipsorum convivialis collatio, ymmo gratiosa refeccionis deduccio aut fit de curiosis questionibus, quibus in conviviis subtiliter exercitantur, aut de naturis rerum esibilium et potabilium, quibus in conviviis delectabiliter recreantur, aut de hiis, que ad honestum convivium generaliter requiruntur, aut de letis historiis et iocundis carminibus, quibus studiosi hylariter delectantur, aut de virtuosis exemplis, quibus regentes fideliter instruunt. Idcirco hoc opusculum, quod intitulatur Summa recreatorum, in quinque tractatus est distinguendum: Nam primus tractatus agit de curiosis conviviorum questionibus, 2^{us} de esibilium et potabilium naturis et qualitatibus, 3^{us} de requisitorum ad convivium variis proprietatibus et 4^{us} de iocundis hystoriis et carminibus, 5^{us} de virtuosis exemplis et legibus. (The transcription of the prologue is based on a manuscript from the National Library of the Czech Republic, Prague, sign. I E 22, f. 51v).

chapter deals with venepuncture, followed by verses about the anatomy of man, about secretion, bathing and so on. All these have not been mentioned in the preceding tracts.³

Before we venture to analyze the authorities on which the first three tracts are based, it is necessary to point out that all the information from the first three tracts of the *Summa* were taken over and copied from older treatises. A number of scholarly texts are quoted that were supposedly used by the author. It is more probable, however, that the author did not have the original sources at hand and copied most of the passages from later works, as a chapter on herbs shows. When alphabetically listing the herbs there, the author explicitly says that he was unable to find any information in his alleged sources about herbs starting with certain letters.⁴ A brief consultation of the quoted sources, however, prove him guilty because these do contain information about the given herbs. This means that the author of the *Summa* must have used another source with an already abridged list of herbs. Another anonymous treatise written in Central Europe only some time after the *Summa*, entitled *Mensa philosophica*,⁵ makes this fact even more apparent. Almost half of the *Mensa philosophica* consists of a text that appears in the first and the second tract of the *Summa*. Their comparison positively proves that both authors drew on the same model. Even if a linguistic and stylistic analysis of the *Summa* does not reveal anything about its author, its comparison to the *Mensa* will at least help us understand the *modus operandi* the author used for compiling his treatise.⁶

The compiler quotes mostly medical authorities, more specifically dietetic literature, including authors writing in Latin, Greek, Hebrew and Arabic, spanning from the fifth century BC to the thirteenth century AD: Hippocrates, Aristotle, Pliny the Elder, Galen, Macrobius, Pseudo-Aristotelian *Problemata*, Isidor of Seville, ar-Râzî, Isaac Iudaeus, Haly Abbas, Avicenna, Alî Ibn Ridwân, Constantinus Africanus, Averroes, Odo Magdunensis, *Circa instans* (Pseudo-Platearius), *Dyascorides alphabeticus*, Nicolaus Salernitanus, Petrus Hispanus medi-

³ Since the *Summa recreatorum* has not been published yet, a complete table of contents of its first three tracts is transcribed in an appendix, taken from the above mentioned dissertation. In order to facilitate orientation in the multi-layered text, chapters and subchapters are numbered.

⁴ *Sexta decima pars est de hiis, que incipiunt a Q, de quibus inter simplicia nichil invenio, ideo ad composita recurro...* (*Summa recreatorum* II.11.16., National Library of the Czech Republic, Prague, sign. I E 22, f. 66v^a); *Vicesima prima pars est de hiis, que incipiunt ab Y, quia de X nichil invenio...* (*Summa recreatorum* II.11.21., *ibid.*, f. 67v^a); *Vicesima secunda pars est de hiis, que incipiunt a Z, et habet tantum unam particulam, que est de zeduario, quia nullum olus invenitur, quod principietur a Z...* (*Summa recreatorum* II.11.21., *ibid.*, f. 67v^b).

⁵ A facsimile edition of the print from Antwerp or Louvain from 1487 is available – *Mensa philosophica* 1995, in which readings of two other old prints are supplied.

⁶ This question has been discussed elsewhere (RŮŽIČKOVÁ 2006², 67–69).

cus, *Quaestiones Salernitanae*, Pseudo-Serapion's *Aggregator*, Albert the Great, *Regimen sanitatis Salernitanum*, and Arnaldus de Villa Nova. The list shows that most of the treatises are of specialized character and in the *Summa* they served a purpose different from the original and were aimed at a different public, namely at a public with no expertise in the specialized questions discussed in the *Summa*.⁷ Thus the *Summa* is an example of how medieval university literature penetrated treatises aimed at the general public.

As the first three tracts are mostly of dietetic character (the term *recreatio* itself is taken from medical literature),⁸ the question arises whether all of them or only certain parts can be regarded as examples of the *regimen sanitatis* genre. The *regimen sanitatis* is generally defined as an educational medical text about the proper way of life for the laity,⁹ composed in prose, verses or a combination of both. A distinctive feature of this genre is its formal variety – its immense popularity gave rise to a number of varied treatises quite different in form and scheme.

Important antecedents of *regimina* can be found in Arabic and Jewish culture, where rules on proper regimen existed either independently (Maimonides)¹⁰ or were a part of larger medical compendia, such as Haly Abbas (*Kitâb al-Malakî – Liber totius medicinae* or *Liber regalis* or *Pantegni*), Rhazes (*Kitâb al-Mansûrî – Liber de medicina ad Almansorem* or shortly *Liber Almansoris*), Avicenna (*Qânûn fî t-tibb – Canon medicinae*), and Averroes (*Kitâb al-kulliyât – Colliget*).¹¹ The real upswing of *regimina*, however, came in Medieval Latin literature due to the reception of Arabic medical works from the eleventh century on.¹² Two texts by Isaac Judaeus, *Liber diaetarum particularium* and *Liber diaetarum universalium*

⁷ On how the commentary of Aristotle's *De animalibus* by Albert the Great written for university purposes was used in the *Summa recreatorum*, see RŮŽIČKOVÁ 2006¹, 281–289.

⁸ This fact has been pointed out already by WACHINGER 2001, 23, who is of the opinion that the *Summa* is the very first compact treatise entitled *recreatio*.

⁹ For the characteristics of this genre and its medieval tradition, see SCHMITT 1995, 575–577. For more detailed information on the subject, see SCHMITT 1976, 17–35 and 1982, 51–63.

¹⁰ His *regimen* was originally written in Arabic (in the twelfth century) and then translated into Hebrew. There are two versions in Latin – one translated from the Arabic, the other one from the Hebrew text.

¹¹ *Pantegni* (as well as the *Liber diaetarum universalium* mentioned later and the *Liber diaetarum particularium*) was translated into Latin by Constantinus Africanus in the eleventh century, the *Liber Almansoris* and the *Canon medicinae* were known in the Middle Ages through a Latin translation of Gerhardus of Cremona from the second half of the twelfth century, and Averroes' medical encyclopaedia *Colliget* was translated by Bonacossa in 1255.

¹² There are two pieces of evidence that this genre existed in Europe already in the early Middle Ages, in the period of the so called monastic medicine, based solely on the Hippocratic and Galenic tradition. These shorter treatises, however, did not exert influence on the development of the genre (see SCHMITT 1976, 21 and GIL-SOTRES 1996, 319–320).

(from the first half of the tenth century), became especially influential and parts of them were adopted by many *regimina* without any alternation.¹³

Among the authors of *regimina* we can find university professors at first (Arnaldus de Villa Nova, Petrus Hispanus medicus, and others), later on also general practitioners who were not connected with the universities (Konrad von Eichstätt).¹⁴ The high number of *regimina* and translations into national languages (sometimes they were composed in them) attest to a great popularity of the genre, which was growing from the second half of the fourteenth century and culminated in the following one, when *regimina* stirred interest among townsfolk. The period from the thirteenth to the fifteenth centuries is regarded as the golden age of *regimina*,¹⁵ and the genre survived during the Renaissance as well. The form ceased to exist only in the Baroque when it became part of other genres (for instance the so called *Hausväterliteratur*).¹⁶ This long tradition of *regimina* as a literary genre was interrupted only by the orientation toward natural sciences that medicine took on from the middle of the nineteenth century onwards.¹⁷ Up until that time, medicine was a science that encompassed both treatment and health care together with the prevention of diseases. Each person was responsible for their own health and the *regimina* helped them take care of it. In the mid-nineteenth century, medicine became regarded as a discipline dealing with diseases and their treatment, and all ordinary matters, such as breathing, eating, sleeping, excretion and the like were eliminated from it as non-scientific.¹⁸

The content of *regimina* is defined by the *sex res non naturales*,¹⁹ a concept of six basic factors that to a large extent influence health and illnesses in human organisms and therefore must be taken care of:

1. *aer* (the quality of air, temperature, humidity, odour, hygiene, influence of climate changes, impact of seasons, certain geographical zones and others),
2. *cibus et potus* (everything that concerns nutrition),

¹³ GIL-SOTRES 1996, 322.

¹⁴ SCHMITT 1979, 31.

¹⁵ Several significant authors are listed by SCHIPPERGES 1990, 64–65, for a detailed summary, see SCHMITT 1976, 22ff.

¹⁶ SCHMITT 1979, 32; 1982, 52.

¹⁷ SCHIPPERGES 1976, 12–13.

¹⁸ SCHIPPERGES 1985, 156.

¹⁹ As opposed to these, the *res naturales* were defined as four basic elements and qualities, their various *commixtiones*, four humours, body organs, *virtutes* and *spiritus*; *res contra naturam* (*praeter naturam*) – illnesses, their causes and symptoms. For the *sex res non naturales* definition, see RATHER 1968, 338 (several explanations of modern doctors and lexicographers as to why these *res* are seemingly wrongly characterized as *non naturales* are presented here).

3. *motus et quies* (how movement effects human body, active and passive movement, movement at sport and work activities, quality, quantity and speed of movement),
4. *somnus et vigilia* (how to correctly regulate periods of sleeping and when being awake),
5. *repletio et evacuatio* (digestion and excretion, sexual life, sperm, menses, saliva, together with bathing that deprives human body of redundant *humores*)
6. *accidentia animae* (emotions – joy, grief and others).

Regimina can be classified in many different ways. According to the target group of their readers, general (for all types of people), special, or individual *regimina* can be distinguished. The special *regimina* are intended for a group of people of the same age, of certain physical proportions, or who happen to be in a special situation or under specific circumstances (such as *regimina* for travellers – *regimen iter agentium*, specifically for travellers by sea – *regimen mare intransantium*, for pregnant women – *regimen praegnantium*, for sucklings – *regimen lactationis*, for children – *regimen infantium*, for elderly people – *regimen senum*, for convalescents – *regimen convalescentium*, for the ill – *regimen infirmi* and so on). This group comprises also *regimina* that focus only on a certain illness (e.g. plague *regimina*). The individual *regimen* is aimed at a particular person, usually of high social standing, and is similar to the so called *consilia*.²⁰ The above types of *regimina* were to be used in practical life. Milada Řihová points out the frequently overlooked fact²¹ that there were *regimina* connected to university lessons (therefore called educational *regimina*) – their authors were both teachers who wrote the model *regimina* for their students, and the students themselves who thus practised how to produce such texts.²²

Regimina can be categorized according to other criteria, too. Considering their main objective, *regimen conservativum*, *regimen praeservativum* and *regimen curativum* can be distinguished.²³ Because the *conservatio sanitatis* was often

²⁰ Concrete examples of individual *regimina* are presented by SCHMITT 1982, 56–57, their main features are listed by GIL-SOTRES 1996, 327. The difference between *regimina* and *consilia* is rather complicated. *Consilia* are always aimed at an individual. Individual *regimina*, unlike *consilia*, are only concerned with keeping good health with the help of right dietetics, whereas *consilia* bring a diagnosis for a certain person, present symptoms of illnesses and recommend therapy (the therapy may then contain a true *regimen*, i.e. hygienic and dietetic advice to enhance the treatment). It is often hard to classify a particular sample if it is not preserved in a pure form. The original title – a *regimen* or a *consilium* – may be misleading, because the term *regimen* is sometime used for a *consilium* and vice versa. More on this problem, see AGRIMI – CRISCIANI 1994.

²¹ As mentioned before, the genre of *regimina* is often connected with lay public only.

²² ŘIHOVÁ 1995, 13; 1999, 97; 2000, 229–230; 2004¹, 328; 2004², 57, 60.

²³ SCHMITT 1976, 20.

the main goal of *regimina*, the *regimen conservativum* is by far the most frequent type. Many *regimina* served to prevent diseases and were aimed at therapy, within which various surgical procedures were described, mostly venepuncture.

Last but not least, *regimina* can be differentiated by their division, that is, according to their internal structure. The most common division is in accordance with the *sex res non naturales*. Nevertheless, not all of the *sex res non naturales* were of the same importance and not every *regimen* had to deal with all these topics.²⁴ The *regimina* concerned with food only were the popular ones, because with the help of food people can pursue the everyday “restoration” of their organs. The importance of foods and drinks is further testified by the fact that even the *regimina* dealing with all of the *res non naturales* pay great attention to food²⁵ which often stands at the top of their list of contents. Commentaries on foods and drinks are usually divided into two main parts that discuss the matter first *in generali* and then *in speciali*. The *in generali* part discusses general rules of nutrition, effects of food on the human body and its importance for physiological processes, types of foods with regard to their nutritional values and digestibility, where and how often to eat, and it also talks about movement, sleeping and bathing after food. The *in speciali* part then lists concrete foods and drinks (mainly wine and water) and their effects. However, *regimina* widely differ in length and number of their themes, some of them address general questions only briefly.

The *sex res non naturales* are not the only point of departure that could be used for the text division. Some *regimina* concentrate on certain parts of organisms and the care of them – in such cases the explanation usually advances *a capite ad calcem*. Texts entitled in the manuscripts as *de conferentibus et nocentibus* can be ranked here as well. A special group of *regimina* arranged according to the seasons – *regimen temporum* – or months – *regimen duodecim mensium* – are so distinctive in character that they are often classified as a special genre closely associated with calendar literature.²⁶

There are a number of other criteria used in the *regimina* and the presented enumeration does not claim to be complete. One text can naturally classify for more categories, for example the plague *regimen* is a special *regimen* (for people who might meet or have already encountered the plague epidemic), but at the same time it belongs to the category of the *regimen praeservativum* (explaining how people should protect themselves against plague) and also the *regimen curativum* (offering treatment for those who are already infected). Yet, the categories

²⁴ See ŘÍHOVÁ 2004², 62.

²⁵ See WEISS ADAMSON 1995, 9, 21, 192. Weiss Adamson analyzed altogether 23 *regimina* written between the ninth and the fourteenth centuries, and found out that on average the *cibus et potus* section takes up more than half of the whole contents of *regimina* (IBID., 193).

²⁶ For literature on the *regimina* of twelve months and calendars, see KEIL 1987, 238.

and terminology listed above are fully sufficient for the analysis of the first three tracts of the *Summa recreatorum*.

The content of the first three tracts of the *Summa* has been already outlined and it was apparent that many themes recur throughout the tracts. The criteria selected for dividing the text was form – in case of the first tract, there appear questions and answers, the second one is made up by a coherent text, and the third tract consists of verses. It was also mentioned above that the forms of *regimina* are highly varied and the genre is better defined by the content. Therefore, the totally different structure and composition of each of the tracts does not prevent from classifying the *Summa* as a *regimen sanitatis*.

The first tract seems to represent the so called *problemata* literature²⁷, named after the Pseudo-Aristotelian *Problemata*, which were also one of the concealed sources of the *Summa*.²⁸ Questions and brief answers are characteristic of this genre that lacks all literary ambitions and presents a dry and succinct explanation in accord with the specialized content of the subject matter. This form proved to be very suitable for didactic purposes and was soon employed as an introduction for students of medicine, as a collection of the so called *Salernitan questions* shows.²⁹ The *problemata* questions are arranged in a form of a simple catalogue without any linking text that would contextualize them or characterise their speakers (therefore they lack any connection with classical symposiac literature). They differ to a great extent from the scholastic *quaestiones* as well, although they do have something in common – namely that the scholastic questions took over their themes from the *problemata* literature and elaborated on them; or vice versa, the scholastic questions under the influence of the *problemata* were often abridged to appear in the anthologies.³⁰

²⁷ The fundamental study on *problemata* literature is still LAWN 1963; more recently, see VENTURA 2006, who records new literature on the subject.

²⁸ The *Problemata* (as we know them today) came into being in the first century BC at the earliest, their core dates back to the middle of the third century BC (see a study that completes the German edition of the *Problemata Physica* 1962, 356–358). Nevertheless, a much later date of origin is accepted nowadays – as late as the fifth or sixth centuries AD. The compilation includes both real (but lost) Aristotle's *Problemata*, and material from Hippocratic works of Theophrastos and Diokles. The *Problemata* were first translated into Latin by Bartholomew of Messina between 1258 and 1266. His translation was usually printed together with a commentary by Peter Abanus. A modern edition of only the first book of the *Problemata* is available (*Die Übersetzung* 1934). The translation of the *Problemata* by Bartholomew of Messina will be reedited as the twenty second volume of the *Aristoteles Latinus* series under preparation by P. De Leemans and M. Fredriksson.

²⁹ *The Prose Salernitan Questions* 1979.

³⁰ The basic study on scholastic questions is GRABMANN 1961. For types of scholastic questions, see HOYE 1997, 155–178. For the beginnings of this method, see MAKDISI 1974, 640–661; for the use of the *quaestiones disputatae* for instruction in natural sciences, see LAWN 1993. For a general discourse on the types of questions that were used for instruction at the Faculties of

The material that appears in the first tract of the *Summa* is rather heterogeneous where its dating is concerned, but is quite compact as to its content.³¹ It lacks the broad nature-oriented range of the usual *problemata* literature³² and its questions fall into a category of an ordinary *regimen*. They are mostly oriented towards *cibus et potus* that are treated within the first and the third chapter *in generali*, and in the second chapter *in speciali*. However, the first chapter also reflects on *aer, motus* and *somnus*, that is, on topics pertaining to the *sex res non naturales*. It was mentioned before that one type of *regimina*, specializing in certain parts of organisms and their care, is called *de conferentibus et nocentibus*. Thematically, chapter three (*de nocentibus*) falls to this category, where four questions concerning patients and their convalescence appear. Both the specialized focus of the first tract and dietetic terminology used in *regimina* attest to the fact that the *Summa* can be better understood as an example of *regimen sanitatis* than a representative of the *problemata* literature. A question-form appears rather rarely in *regimina*, however, it is found in *regimina* aimed at university lectures.³³ After all, most of the questions of the *Summa* have their origins in university medical commentaries.³⁴ Even though the first tract is influenced by the *problemata* literature, its questions served a concrete purpose, namely to put forward dietetic *problemata* that would provide themes suitable for academic discussions at feasts. Therefore, it is well justified to regard the *Summa* as an example of the *regimen sanitatis*. Eventually, with certain reservations, the first tract can be seen as a text combining the two genres – that is, the *problemata* literature, from which it took its form, and the *regimen sanitatis*, which supplied the subject matter. It should be regarded as a general *regimen*. The *Summa* is composed for educated banqueters, nevertheless, its first tract gives universal advice suitable for all people.

The content and the form of the second tract clearly represent a classical example of a second part of the *regimen* on *cibus et potus* where it *specialiter* examines concrete foods and drinks. More than twenty known medieval *regimina sanitatis* were subject to a minute analysis by Melitta Weiss Adamson who studied their contents and the authorities quoted (see note 25). If the second tract of the *Summa* is confronted with these texts, it is apparent that it fits in with both its content and

Medicine, see JACQUART 1985, 281–315 (where further literature for the study of the subject can be found).

³¹ See Appendix.

³² Questions of the *problemata* literature are often connected to anthropology, medicine and zoology, less often to meteorology, botany and physics (COMPAGNONE 1998, 143).

³³ GIL-SOTRES 1996, 328. Outside the university environment, they appear only rarely, for example in Anthimus' letter *De observatione ciborum* where questions are put in the course of a compact text (*Anthimi De observatione ciborum* 1963).

³⁴ Out of the one hundred and three questions of the first tract of the *Summa*, more than sixty were copied from commentaries of Albert the Great (*Alberti Magni* 1955) and Petrus Hispanus (unfortunately, most of his commentaries are still accessible only in medieval manuscripts; their use in the *Summa recreatorum* will be discussed elsewhere).

authorities, but at the same time it shows various peculiarities, too. These are, in my opinion, of such a nature that the second tract cannot be regarded as a *regimen sanitatis*. In this respect, the eleventh chapter of the second tract should be mentioned, entitled *de oleribus*. Two authorities are quoted throughout this chapter, not surprisingly considering its content, but they are nevertheless not typical for *regimina* – that is, these authorities do not appear in the texts analyzed by Weiss Adamson. They are the so called “Platearius”, or more accurately a herbarium *Circa instans* attributed to Platearius in the Middle Ages, and Dioskurides, both very prestigious herbaria in the Middle Ages.³⁵ The *Summa* quotes both of them very often. Another curiosity is that the *de oleribus* chapter of the *Summa* is very rich in comparison to other *regimina*. It consists of 52 items and is thus the largest one, most of the *regimina* do not come near this number. The third difference is an appliance of alphabetical or semi-alphabetical order in this chapter, which does not very often appear in *regimina*. This was undoubtedly inspired by the herbaria³⁶ where the alphabetical order became a standard feature due to the influence of glossaries. As a matter of fact, the pharmacographical literature³⁷ started to use alphabetical order owing to the influence of the two above mentioned authorities – the so called *Dyascorides alphabeticus* (Salernian compilation of the original herbarium by Dioskurides from the eleventh or the twelfth century that comprised some Arabic sources as well) and the *Circa instans* herbarium from the mid-twelfth century.³⁸ Both of these treatises used semi-alphabetical order and became very influential. Their influence on the *Summa* does not lie in the alphabetization alone, but the style in which individual entries in the herbaria were composed also found its way to the *Summa*.³⁹ Apart from practical dietetic information, there is

³⁵ It is necessary to mention that Weiss Adamson does not study all sources of the examined *regimina* but analyzes only the most significant ones. In the case of Dioskurides, it has been proved that both Avicenna and Rhazes used his treatises (cf. MEYERHOF 1932, 79).

³⁶ Nevertheless, not in a direct consequence – the author of the *Summa* did not use directly herbaria, but had the *Speculum naturale* by Vincent of Beauvais at hand. The influence of the *Speculum naturale* as one of *Summa*'s important sources will be discussed elsewhere.

³⁷ The term pharmacography refers to the scholarly genre which describes pharmaceuticals of different origins and their specific use (cf. KEIL 2002, 347).

³⁸ KEIL 2002, 351–352, 357–358. For the emergence of alphabetical order, see GOLTZ 1976, 42–43.

³⁹ For the sake of comparison, an entry *de origano* from the *Circa instans* can be cited here, whose original composition is well-preserved in the *Summa* (II.11.14., National Library of the Czech Republic, Prague, sign. I E 22, f. 66^r). Passages copied into the *Summa* are marked in bold: ***Origanum calidum est et siccum in tertio gradu. Cuius duplex est maneries scilicet origanum silvestre quod latiora habet folia et fortius operatur. Aliud est domesticum quod in ortis reperitur et colitur et habet minuta folia et suavius operatur. Hoc in medicinis est ponendum. Colligitur autem in tempore florum et cum floribus in umbra suspenditur et exsiccat. Folia cum floribus abiectis stipitibus in medicinis debent poni, per annum servatur singulis annis renovetur. Virtutem habet dissolvendi, attrahendi et relaxandi. § Contra frigidum reuma flores cum foliis in testa sine liquore calefacta bene in sacello ponantur et sacellus capiti superponatur. Caput etiam bene cohoperiatur pannis ut sudet. Vin. decoct. eius gargarizatum gingivorum et faucium consumit humositate(m); pulv. eius superpositus uve humositate(m) consumit.***

sometimes data on the shape and provenance of a plant in the *Summa* (chapters II.11.19.2., II.11.20.2., II.11.21. and others). In chapter II.11.18.6. there is surprisingly no information about dietetic effect but only about countries of origins. Throughout the Middle Ages, a form of entry used by Dioskurides in the first century prevailed – that is, a name of a plant, synonym, place of origin, botanical description, medical qualities and effects, preparation and use, sometimes even reference to harmful side-effects, dosage, advice for picking, processing and storing, how to fake the effects of a herb and how to disclose such deceitful use.⁴⁰ Such an elaborated structure occurs in larger medical compendia, such as Avicenna's *Canon medicinae*, but in ordinary *regimina* these detailed data seldom appear (for example the time for picking or the way of storing the medicaments). On the other hand, herbaria usually do not deal with nutrition values or the digestibility of herbs in a detailed manner. Nevertheless, most of the data appear both in herbaria and *regimina* because broadly focused dietetic treatises occasionally describe synonyms, give a brief explanation of a shape of a plant and how to distinguish it (i. e. a garden plant from a wild plant), the scales of its effects – *gradus*, and usually a detailed list of the possible uses of a given food or plant in medicine, be it prevention or therapy. Therefore, the chapter *de oleribus* can be regarded as a part of a *regimen sanitatis*. Moreover, the presented comparison dealt only with the *regimina* analyzed by Weiss Adamson and due to the great number of still unknown *regimina*, it is impossible to draw any definite conclusions as to what is characteristic of the genre of *regimina*.

Let us have a closer look at the third tract now. Each of its five chapters begins with a short prosaic introduction, followed by verses whose number greatly differs in each chapter.⁴¹ Some of the verses have been widely known in the Middle Ages and survive in many manuscripts (among them the so called *Regimina* of the Salernian School and those by Odo Magdunensis),⁴² some of them have so far been found only in the *Summa*. The prosaic parts discuss regularity of eating, frequency of meals, suitable locations, time and order of dishes, that is, themes that belong to the general part (*in generali*) of the *cibus et potus* section usually placed

§ *Contra frigidum asma detur vin. decoct. eius et ficuum siccarum vel pulv. eius cum melle confectus detur cum calida vel etiam detur cum caricis. Vin. decoct. eius digestionem confortat, dolorem stomachi et intestinorum excludit. Fasciculi formati ex herba decocta in vino et superposita renibus stranguriam et dissuriam dissolvunt. § Contra thenasmon ex frigida causa, cum adhuc est extra, pulv. eius superpositus stupe vel panno ano superponatur: **Herba ipsa in vino et oleo decocta et vulve cataplasmata eius duriciem solvit. Fomentum factum ex aqua decoct. eius matricem mundificat, sed melius est si teneritas ipsius herbe supponatur.** (Text taken from the edition *Das Arzneidrogenbuch* 1939, 88.)*

⁴⁰ For more, see SCHMITZ 1998, 185.

⁴¹ Shorter samples of the verses from this tract have already been published: TRUHLÁŘ 1898, 47; HILKA 1931, 98–99.

⁴² *Regimen sanitatis Salerni* 1790; *Collectio Salernitana* [1967]. Odo de Meung's poem was accessible to me only in an old print – *Aemilii Macri De herbarum virtutibus* [1527] since the text still lacks a modern critical edition.

at the very beginning of *regimina*. Regarding the verses, those from the first chapter comprise several different topics. There is a short *regimen* on the seasons (*regimen temporum*, III.1.2.), a *regimen duodecim mensium* (III.1.3.), accompanied by verses on the *de conferentibus et nocentibus* subject matter and we are also informed how excessive quantity of each of the four basic humours negatively affects the body (*ad humores peccantes*, III.1.7.). The well-known verses about table etiquette with an incipit *Dum manducatis mensa recte sedeatis* (III.1.4.)⁴³ can be found in this chapter, too. The second and largest chapter comprises a *regimen in speciali*, structured according to particular foods and drinks. Within the section dealing with herbs and spices, there are several verses on *de conferentibus et nocentibus*, namely *pro oculis* and *contra oculos* (III.2.1.8.13.–14.). The third chapter brings only eight verses *de dieta*. The fourth chapter explains when and how often to eat and is closed by a quotation from Averroes' commentary on Avicenna's *Cantica*. It informs us when the so called *tertia digestio* happens, that is, when food gets from the stomach into other organs and is finally digested. The author of the *Summa* loosely adds a sentence to this passage where he argues that the beginning of digestion takes place in the mouth by the teeth. With the help of a rather perfunctory parallel, he attaches four verses on human anatomy here, which start with the very number of teeth. Similarly, the introductory text of the fifth chapter (on the order of meals and suitable places for eating) was not befittingly chosen with regard to the theme of its verses (how to remedy an unbalanced state of organism caused by an inappropriate regimen). The inapt composition of the topics in the fifth chapter, however, does not change the fact that all verses of this chapter thematically fit in the *sex res non naturales*, namely to the *repletio et evacuatio* section. They deal with the purgation of the stomach, venepuncture, and the means of ridding the body of poison. It was pointed out earlier that therapy and, from among the surgical methods, venepuncture are sometime parts of a *regimen*.

As for the third tract, only the section on wine (III.2.2.1.) gives an inappropriate impression within the context of its other rhymed recommendations. It does not address the dietetic effects of wine but presents humorous versicles that often appear in goliardic poetry. The whole section is made up of short poems and proverbs that were transmitted on their own as well.⁴⁴ Thus these verses disturb to a certain extent the concept of the third tract that otherwise represents with its content a typical collection of rhymed *regimina*. Considering the broad scope of the author's intention, these verses are nevertheless an integral part of the *Summa* that was intended to provide subjects for amusement at feasts. It would have been

⁴³ Both Latin and Czech versions of this treatise preserved in the Czech manuscript collections, including the text preserved in the Prague manuscript of the *Summa*, sign. I E 22, were edited by Pavel Špunar (SPUNAR 1982, 77–90).

⁴⁴ The well-known piece *In cratero meo* by Hugo Primas is the longest one among these, preserved also in the *Carmina Burana* collection (*Die Oxforder Gedichte* 1907, 149).

much more appropriate however, if these verses had been included among the poems of the fourth tract.

The verses on wine and the illogical connection of themes in several chapters sharply contrast with the previous two tracts, whose subject matter seems to be better organized. It has already been mentioned that the *Summa* was modelled on the same treatise as the so called *Mensa philosophica* (see note 5). The comparison of these texts demonstrated that particularly the first and the second tracts of the *Summa* must have been copied together from a common lost model. In the case of the third tract, there is no evidence of a common model (it shares with the *Mensa* only short prosaic introductions to chapters 3–5), and no other direct source has been identified so far. Therefore it can be assumed that out of the three tracts, it is the third one that best shows the author's invention and his own concept. This nevertheless does not mean that the author exploited the numerous sources on his own and that he himself put together the distiches and quatrains that he had found into longer chunks. It is more probable that he took over also these longer parts from elsewhere.

If we disregard the inaptly inserted humorous verses about wine in the third tract, all of the three tracts can be seen as a true *regimen sanitatis*. As it has been demonstrated, there are almost all of the *sex res non naturales*, namely their first five topics. The sixth one – the *accidentia animae* – is represented only by several particulars: wine brings about good temper (II.2.), saffron can cheer up a person either in itself (III.2.1.8.3.) or added to wine (II.13.9.), excess of black bile causes fear, sad dreams (III.1.7.4.), a person can get rid of his fear with the help of a pig's heart (III.2.1.2.4.) and so on. With respect to the general purpose of the *Summa*, it is not surprising that its author put the main emphasis on *cibus et potus* and treated the other *sex res non naturales* only marginally, usually in connection with food. We are told, for example, which meal or herb causes good or bad sleep, how well or badly they are digested and excreted, if it is healthy to sleep (I.1.8.) or move (I.1.9.) after eating and the like. However, it was also stated at the beginning that *regimina sanitatis* do not necessarily cover all of the *res non naturales* or that they do not deal with each of them at the same length.

Such a conclusion is certainly applicable as far as the content of the examined tracts is concerned, however, if the intention of their author is taken into account, the seemingly unequivocal conclusion must be challenged. The author did not intend to present his readers with a mere *regimen sanitatis*, which would instruct them in healthy lifestyle. First and foremost, he wanted to supply his readers with topics closely connected to feasts where they were to be discussed. However strange this might seem today, all of the tracts of the *Summa* were intended to provide subject for sophisticated discussions, as its prologue shows (... *videtur expediens ... quod ... convivialis collatio ... aut fit de curiosis questionibus ... aut*

de naturis rerum esibilium et potabilium... and so on),⁴⁵ and not only the first tract that talks *de curiosis questionibus, quibus in convivii subtiliter exercitantur* [i.e. noble men and educated prelates], but also the second tract (*de ciborum et potuum naturis et proprietatibus*)⁴⁶ as well as the third one (*de requisitorum ad plena convivia variis condicionibus*).⁴⁷ The author of the *Mensa* had a similar goal in mind, who writes in his prologue: *Videtur omnino expediens, ut sermo mensalis vel sit de natura rerum, quibus vescimur et potamur, vel de questionibus mensalibus, quibus in mensa exercitatur ... Ideo presens opusculum ... in quatuor tractatus partiales distinxi: Primus erit de harum rerum natura, quas per modum cibi vel potus in mensa sumimus, ... tercius de questionibus mensalibus, quibus in mensa philosophice exercitatur...*⁴⁸ As can be seen, even he did not offer only interesting questions and answers for discussions, but considered further dietetic information a suitable topic for table-talks. Although the primary intention of the *Summa* was to provide topics for a conversation, it is probable that the prosaic dietetic passages copied to both the *Summa* and the *Mensa* from a common source were originally parts of some *regimen sanitatis* (or eventually of several different *regimina*) that in its afterlife was adjusted for a different type of literature.⁴⁹ Certain similarities in the prologues of both surviving treatises – the *Summa* and the *Mensa* – indicate that already their lost original might have used this *regimen* for “recreational” purposes.

Such compilations usually had an intricate text tradition, where existing texts served as models for completely new treatises that had often entirely different goals and were aimed at a different target group of readers. At the same time, only a few connecting links of the whole chain came down to us. A critical edition of the *Summa recreatorum* will facilitate our understanding of these connecting links and will help us unravel the complicated issue of text traditions of sources used in it. What was then to be the end result of the efforts of the *Summa*’s compiler? A definite answer could be given only upon thoroughly analysing all of the five tracts of the *Summa*. The examination of the first three tracts revealed that the author paid special attention to the conscientious structuring of his text into several layers and to numbering of all its parts. At the beginning of each tract or longer chapter, the so called *capitulatio* summarizes the arrangement of the following text, informs us how many sections there are and what their content is.⁵⁰ Such an overview of content commonly appears in medieval encyclopaedias, where ac-

45 For the entire text of the prologue, see note 2.

46 National Library of the Czech Republic, Prague, sign. I E 22, f. 60r^a.

47 Ibid., f. 69v^b–70r^a.

48 *Mensa philosophica* 1995, s. 9–10. The description of only those tracts that appear both in the *Mensa* and the *Summa* was selected here.

49 With reference to the *Summa*, Erwin Rauner talks about the so called *Rekreationsliteratur* (RAUNER 1995, 505).

50 Owing to the comparison with the *Mensa philosophica*, it was proved that these summaries

cessibility, clarity and searchability of information are essential to the readers.⁵¹ The systematic classification of material is typical of medieval encyclopaedias but their authors or later copyists counted on the pragmatic use of the encyclopaedias – that is, they did not assume that a person should read them from the beginning to the end as a coherent literary work. On the contrary, encyclopaedias were meant to be leafed through and searched in order to find a particular piece of information and to fill in a gap in the reader's knowledge. Therefore, encyclopaedias were in the course of time furnished with the necessary aids to enhance their practical use. The first three tracts of the *Summa* do not particularly require a coherent reading either. If a reader wants to find an entertaining topic for conversation, he can open the *Summa* at any page as the entries are understandable by themselves and do not need to be grasped within the context of previous readings. Nevertheless, the *Summa* lacks any kind of indexing tools as is the habit of all late medieval encyclopaedias.⁵² Apart from the *capitulationes* summarizing the content, the only aid for better orientation in the text of the surviving codices are marginal entries of lemmas and some of their initials, executed in coloured ink. Marginal notes often appear in passages where various types of foods, fruits, vegetables or spices are listed in a quick sequence. A semi-alphabetical order of lemmas is used in the *de oleribus* chapter, as was explained above. Another feature characteristic of medieval encyclopaedias is that the person of the author is to a large extent suppressed. The author strives to present opinions of reliable authorities as he gleaned them from his sources and to organize them according to a certain concept. It is not his aim to present his own ideas or to cope with opposing attitudes of the quoted authorities concerning a given scholarly problem. The encyclopaedias are compilations of already existing and registered pieces of knowledge. Likewise, the author of the *Summa* treated his material with this “encyclopaedic” approach. If we consider the purpose of the author as reflected in the first three tracts of the *Summa*, it can be tentatively proposed that he wanted to furnish his readers with an encyclopaedia for entertainment at feasts that exploited different types of sources, among them also *regimina sanitatis*. It was an encyclopaedia with a specialized subject matter, very different from the famous medieval encyclopaedic treatises that reflected the medieval world in all its width and demonstrated the perfection of God's creation. However, it can still be regarded as an encyclopaedia. The *Summa* did not present a *speculum mundi* to its readers, nevertheless it is a kind of a mirror for us at present, for it shows what themes were deemed by its author suitable for intellectual conversations.

(Translated by Petra Mutlová)

were supplied by the author of the *Summa* himself and that he did not take them over from his model (cf. RŮŽIČKOVÁ 2006², 68).

51 The literature on medieval encyclopaedias is by now vast. For characteristic of the genre, see MEIER 1984, 1997.

52 For the *statim invenire* aids, see MEYER 2000.

SOURCES

- Aemilii Macri De herbarum virtutibus*. Basileae : [Joannes Faber Emmeus Juliacensis], [1527].
- Alberti Magni Liber de natura et origine animae, Liber de principiis motus processivi, Quaestiones super De animalibus*. Ed. Bernhardus Geyer – Ephrem Filthaut. Monasterii Westfalorum, 1955. (Alberti Magni Opera omnia XII.)
- Anthimi De observatione ciborum ad Theodoricum regem Francorum epistula*. Iteratis curis edidit et in linguam germanicam transtulit Eduard Liechtenhau. Berolini, 1963.
- Das Arzneidrogenbuch Circa instans in einer Fassung des 13. Jahrhunderts aus der Universitätsbibliothek Erlangen*. Hg. von Hans Wölfel. Diss. Berlin, 1939.
- Collectio Salernitana ossia documenti inediti e trattati di medicina appartenenti alla scuola medica Salernitana*. Tom. 1–5. Ed. Salvatore de Renzi. Napoli, 1852–1859. Reprint Bologna [1967].
- Mensa philosophica. Faksimile und Kommentar*. Hg. von Erwin Rauner und Burghart Wachinger. Tübingen 1995. (Fortuna vitrea. Arbeiten zur literarischen Tradition zwischen dem 13. und 16. Jahrhundert. Bd. 13.)
- Die Oxforder Gedichte des Primas*. Hg. von Wilhelm Meyer. In *Nachrichten aus Göttingen*. Phil.-hist. Klasse. Göttingen, 1907, 89–175.
- Problemata Physica*. Hg. von Ernst Grumach. Übers. von Hellmut Flashar. Darmstadt, 1962.
- The Prose Salernitan Questions. Edited from a Bodleian Manuscript (Auct. F. 3. 10). An Anonymous Collection dealing with Science and Medicine written by an Englishman c. 1200. With an Appendix of ten related Collections*. Ed. by Brian Lawn. London, 1979. (Auctores Britannici Medii Aevi V.)
- Regimen sanitatis Salerni sive Scholae Salernitanae de conservanda bona valetudine praecepta*. Ed. Johann Christian Gottlieb Ackermann. Stendaliae, 1790.
- Summa recreatorum*. Praha Národní knihovna (Prague, National Library), sign. I E 22, f. 51v–116r; Nelahozeves Roudnická lobkovická knihovna (Lobkovic Library of Roudnice), sign. VI Fc 34; Wien Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, sign. 5371, f. 185r–234r; Leipzig Universitätsbibliothek, 1224, f. 255r–312v.
- Die Übersetzung der ps.-aristotelischen Problemata durch Bartholomaeus von Messina. Text und kritische Untersuchungen zum ersten Buch*. Hg. von R. Seligsohn. Diss. Berlin, 1934.
- VINCENTIUS BELLOVACENSIS. *Speculum quadruplex sive Speculum maius: naturale, doctrinale, morale, historiale*. 1–4. Duaci : Baltazar Beller, 1624. Reprint Graz, 1964–1965.

LITERATURE

- AGRIMI, JOLE – CRISCIANI, CHIARA (1994). *Les »consilia« médicaux*. Traduit de l'italien par Caroline Viola. Turnhout, 1994. (Typologie des sources du moyen âge occidental 69)
- COMPAGNONE, ADRIANA (1998). *I quesiti salernitani*. In *La Scuola Medica Salernitana. Storia, immagini, manoscritti dall'XI al XIII secolo*. A cura di Maria Pasca. Napoli, 1998, 143–146.
- GIL-SOTRES, PEDRO (1996). *Regeln für eine gesunde Lebensweise*. In *Die Geschichte des medizinischen Denkens. Antike und Mittelalter*. Hg. von Mirko D. Grmek. München, 1996, 312–355. [Orig. *Le regole della salute*. In *Storia del pensiero medico occidentale*. 1. *Antichità e medioevo*. A cura di Mirko D. Grmek. Roma – Bari, 1993, 399–438.]
- GOLTZ, DIETLINDE (1976). *Mittelalterliche Pharmazie und Medizin, dargestellt an der Geschichte und Inhalt des Antidotarium Nicolai. Mit einem Nachdruck der Druckfassung von 1471*. Stuttgart, 1976. (Veröffentlichungen der Internationalen Gesellschaft für Geschichte der Pharmazie e. V., Neue Folge 44)
- GRABMANN, MARTIN (1961). *Die Geschichte der scholastischen Methode*. 1–2. Freiburg 1909–1911. [Nachdruck: Darmstadt, 1961]

- HILKA, ALFONS (1931). *Zur Summa recreatorum. Liste der poetischen Stücke und Abdruck von vier Marienliedern*. In *Studien zur lateinischen Dichtung des Mittelalters*. Ehrengabe für Karl Strecker zum 4. September 1931. Hg. von W. Stach und H. Walther. Dresden, 1931, 97–116.
- HOYE, WILLIAM J. (1997). *Die mittelalterliche Methode der Quaestio*. In *Philosophie. Studium, Text und Argument*. Hg. von Norbert Herold, Bodo Kensmann u. Sibille Mischer. Münster, 1997, 155–178.
- JACQUART, DANIELLE (1985). *La question disputée dans les facultés de médecine*. In *Les questions disputées et les questions quodlibétiques dans les Facultés de théologie, de droit et de médecine*. Ed. by B. C. Bazán, G. Franssen, D. Jacquart, and J. Wippel. Turnhout 1985, part IV, 281–315.
- KEIL, GUNDOLF (1987). *Organisationsformen medizinischen Wissens*. In *Wissensorganisierende und wissensvermittelnde Literatur im Mittelalter. Perspektive ihrer Forschung*. Kolloquium 5.-7. Dezember 1985. Hg. von Norbert Richard Wolf. Wiesbaden, 1987, 221–245.
- (2002). *Standardwerke mittelalterlicher Drogenkunde und ihre Repräsentation in der Enzyklopädie*. In *Die Enzyklopädie im Wandel vom Hochmittelalter bis zur frühen Neuzeit*. Hg. von Christel Meier. Akten des Kolloquiums des Projekts D im Sonderforschungsbereich 231 (29. 11.-1. 12. 1996). München, 2002, 343–390.
- LAWN, BRIAN (1993). *The Rise and Decline of the Scholastic 'Quaestio disputata'. With Special Emphasis on its Use in the Teaching of Medicine and Science*. Leiden – New York – Köln, 1993. (Education and Society in the Middle Ages and Renaissance 2)
- (1963). *The Salernitan Questions. An Introduction to the History of Medieval and Renaissance Problem Literature*. Oxford 1963.
- MAKDISI, GEORGE (1974). The Scholastic Method in Medieval Education. An Inquiry into Its Origins in Law and Theology. *Speculum. A Journal for Medieval Studies*, 1974, 49, 640–661.
- MEIER, CHRISTEL (1984). *Grundzüge der mittelalterlichen Enzyklopädie. Zu Inhalten, Formen und Funktionen einer problematischen Gattung*. In *Literatur und Laienbildung im Spätmittelalter und in der Reformationszeit*. Symposium Wolfenbüttel 1981. Hg. von Ludger Grenzmann und Karl Stackmann. Stuttgart 1984, s. 467–500.
- (1997). *Organisation of Knowledge and Encyclopaedic Ordo: Functions and Purposes of a Universal Literary Genre*. In *Pre-modern Encyclopaedic Texts*. Proceedings of the Second COMERS Congress, Groningen, 1–4 July 1996. Ed. by Peter Binkley. Leiden – New York – Köln 1997, 103–126.
- MEYER, HEINZ (2000). *Die Enzyklopädie des Bartholomäus Anglicus. Untersuchungen zur Überlieferungs- und Rezeptionsgeschichte von ‚De proprietatibus rerum‘*. München 2000.
- MEYERHOF, MAX (1932). Die Materia Medica des Dioskurides bei den Arabern. *Quellen und Studien zur Geschichte der Naturwissenschaften und der Medizin*, 1932, 3 (33), 72–84.
- RATHER, LELLAND J. (1968). The „Six Things Non-Natural“. A Note on the Origins and Fate of a Doctrine and a Phrase. *Clio Medica*, 1968, 3, 337–347.
- RAUNER, ERWIN (1995). *Summa recreatorum*. In *Die deutsche Literatur des Mittelalters. Verfasserlexikon*. Bd. 9. Berlin – New York, 1995, 503–506.
- RŮŽIČKOVÁ, DANA (2006)¹. *Albert Veliký v prvním traktátu Summy recreatorum*. In *Querite primum regnum Dei. Sborník příspěvků k počtě Jany Nechutové*. K vydání připravili Helena Krmíčková, Anna Pumprová, Dana Růžičková a Libor Švanda. Brno, 2006, 281–289.
- (2004). *Summa recreatorum. Středověký sborník intelektuální zábavy*. FF MU Brno, 2004, unpublished dissertation.
- (2006)². Where to Seek the Meeting Point of the Treatises Summa recreatorum, Mensa philosophica and Responsorium curiosorum. A Query into the History of their Origin. *SPFFBU. Graeco-latina Brunensia*, 2006, N 11, 61–77.
- ŘÍHOVÁ, MILADA (1999). *Dvorní lékař posledních Lucemburků*. Praha, 1999.
- (2004)¹. Královští lékaři. Lékaři na dvoře posledních Lucemburků. *Documenta Pragensia*, 2004, 22, 327–334.

- (2000). *Na okraj latinské středověké lékařské literatury (Poznámky k latinské lékařské literatuře pražského okruhu XIV. a XV. věku)*. In *Septuaginta Paulo Spunar oblata (70+2)*. Ed. Jiří K. Kroupa. Praha, 2000, 221–234.
- (1995). *Regimen sanitatis pro krále Václava*. *Acta Universitatis Carolinae – Historia Universitatis Carolinae Pragensis*, 1995, 35, 13–28.
- (2004)². *Sanitatem conservare (K typologii jednoho druhu středověké lékařské literatury)*. *Listy filologické*, 2004, 127, 54–65.
- SCHIPPERGES, HEINRICH (1985). *Der Garten der Gesundheit. Medizin im Mittelalter*. München – Zürich, 1985.
- (1990). *Heilkunst als Lebenskunde oder die Kunst, vernünftig zu leben. Zur Theorie der Lebensordnung und Praxis der Lebensführung*. Heidelberg, 1990. (Gesundheit 3)
- (1976). *Die Kunst zu leben*. In *Tacuinum sanitatis. Das Buch der Gesundheit*. Hg. von Luisa Cogliati Arano. München, 1976, 9–15.
- SCHMITT, WOLFRAM (1976). *Geist und Überlieferung der Regimina Sanitatis*. In *Tacuinum sanitatis. Das Buch der Gesundheit*. Hg. von Luisa Cogliati Arano. München, 1976, 17–35.
- (1979). *Gesundheitstheorien in Antike und Mittelalter*. In *Medizinische Ökologie*. Hg. von Maria Blohmke, Heinrich Schipperges, Gustav Wagner. Heidelberg, 1979, 18–35.
- (1982). *Das Regimen sanitatis des Mittelalters*. In *Psychiatrische Therapie heute. Antike Diäta und moderne Therapeutik*. Hg. von Hubertus Tellenbach. Stuttgart, 1982, 51–63.
- (1995). *Regimina*. In *Lexikon des Mittelalters*. Bd. 7. München, 1995, 575–577.
- SCHMITZ, RUDOLF (1998). *Geschichte der Pharmazie*. Bd. 1. Eschborn, 1998.
- SPUNAR, PAVEL (1982). *Verše o stolování v Čechách. Sborník Národního muzea v Praze, Řada C*, 1982, 27, 77–90.
- TRUHLÁŘ, JOSEF (1898). *Paběrky z rukopisů Klementinských VI. Zábavný sborník vzdělanců středověkých: »Summa recreatorum«*. *Věstník České Akademie*, 1898, 7, 45–48.
- VENTURA, IOLANDA (2006). *Per modum quaestionis compilatum... The Collections of Natural Questions and their Development from the 13th to the 16th Century*. In *Allgemeinwissen und Gesellschaft*. Akten des internationalen Kongresses über Wissenstransfer und enzyklopädische Ordnungssysteme, vom 18. bis 21. September 2003 in Prangins. Hg. von Paul Michel und Madeleine Herren. www.enzyklopaedie.ch, 2006.
- VIDMANOVÁ, ANEŽKA (2001). *'Summa recreatorum'*. In *Deutsche Literatur des Mittelalters in Böhmen und über Böhmen*. Vorträge der internationalen Tagung, veranstaltet vom Institut für Germanistik der Pädagogischen Fakultät der Südböhmischen Universität České Budějovice. České Budějovice, 8. bis 11. September 1999. Hg. von Dominique Fliieger und Václav Bok. Wien, 2001, 169–179.
- WACHINGER, BURGHART (2001). *Erzählen für die Gesundheit, Diätetik und Literatur im Mittelalter*. Heidelberg, 2001. (Schriften der Philosophisch-historischen Klasse der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften 23)
- WEISS ADAMSON, MELITTA (1995). *Medieval Dietetics : Food and Drink in Regimen Sanitatis Literature from 800 to 1400*. Frankfurt am Main 1995.

RESUMÉ

Článek se pokouší o žánrové zařazení prvních tří traktátů *Summy recreatorum*, anonymního spisu českého původu, který byl napsán pro dvůr Karla IV. a poskytuje náměty pro intelektuální konverzaci účastníků hostin. Autorka se snaží ukázat, že první tři traktáty obsahují v podstatě *regimen sanitatis*, které je v každém z nich zpracováno jinou formou, v prvním traktátu má podobu otázek a stručných odpovědí (jako je tomu v tzv. problematové literatuře), druhý traktát představuje běžnou naučnou prózu a třetí je psán převážně ve verších. Autor *Summy* však neměl v úmyslu předložit „pouhé“ *regimen*, ale (jak vidíme v prologu) všechny traktáty měly být východiskem pro konver-

zaci. Prolog spisu *Mensa philosophica* (o něco mladšího, anonymního sborníku středoevropského původu, který měl s poměrně významnou částí *Summy* společnou předlohu) podporuje hypotézu, že jedno či více dnes neznámých *regimin sanitatis* se v pozdější tradici stalo součástí literatury jiného typu, která nemá primárně poučovat o správné životosprávě, nýbrž má nabídnout zajímavá témata z oblasti tzv. *sex res non naturales* k rozhovorům při hostinách.

Dana Růžičková
Ústav klasických studií
(ruzaruz@mail.muni.cz)

Appendix: List of contents of the first three tracts of the *Summa recreatorum*

Prologus

I. Tractatus primus de curiosis convivorum questionibus

I.1. Capitulum primum de rebus convivorum ad sanitatem conferentibus generaliter

- I.1.1. utrum aer sit magis necessarius ad vitam quam cibus
- I.1.2. utrum ad vitam sit magis necessarius cibus vel potus
- I.1.3. utrum plus noceat corpori malus cibus quam aer
- I.1.4. utrum sompnus plus perimet corpus aut cibus
- I.1.5. utrum aer plus cedat in nutrimentum spirituum quam cibus
- I.1.6. utrum ex malo cibo possit generari bonus thimus
- I.1.7. utrum cibus simplex sit magis digestibilis quam multiplex
- I.1.8. utrum post cibum sit statim deambulandum
- I.1.9. utrum post cibum statim conveniat sompnus
- I.1.10. quare in supergrediente horam comedendi deficit appetitus cibi
- I.1.11. utrum corpora sint calidiora ante cibum vel post
- I.1.12. utrum ieiunium plus ledat colericum vel fleumaticum
- I.1.13. quare aliqui ardent appetunt cibum et modico saciantur, alii vero econverso parum appetunt et cum comedere inceperunt, fortissime faciunt
- I.1.14. utrum habentes fortem calorem diucius tollerent famem quam habentes calorem debilem
- I.1.15. quare habentes poros strictos melius et diucius tollerent famem et ieiunium quam habentes poros raros
- I.1.16. utrum colera nutriat
- I.1.17. utrum infirmi melius tollerent ieiunium quam sani
- I.1.18. utrum virtus stomachi fortis melius tolleret ieiunium quam virtus debilis
- I.1.19. utrum consuetus multos cibos accipere melius sustineat ieiunium quam solitus parum comedere
- I.1.20. utrum plus molestat ieiunium in tempore calido vel frigido
- I.1.21. quare avidius vorantes cicius saciantur
- I.1.22. quare edulia calida facilius comprimimus ore, quam manu sustineamus
- I.1.23. quare si esuriens bibit, famem sublevat, si vero siciens comedit, sitis non sedatur
- I.1.24. quare ieiuni magis siciunt quam esuriunt
- I.1.25. quare maior est delectacio, cum sitis potu extinguitur, quam cum fames cibo relevatur
- I.1.26. utrum sicientibus stomachum siccum habentibus sufficiat paucus potus
- I.1.27. utrum stomachus siccus gravetur a potu ampliori
- I.1.28. quare stomachus humidus possit ferre multum potum
- I.1.29. utrum sitis quandoque proveniat ex parte pulmonis
- I.1.30. utrum sitis sit appetitus frigidi et humidi vel calidi et humidi
- I.1.31. utrum aqua plus extinguat sitim aut vinum

I.2. Capitulum secundum de quibusdam rebus ad sanitatem conferentibus specialiter

I.2.1. de pane sano

- I.2.1.1. quare panis triticeus est magis nutritivus quam panis ordeaceus
- I.2.1.2. quare panes frigidi videntur albiores calidis
- I.2.1.3. quare ceteris partibus panes saliti sunt saniores

- I.2.1.4. quare panes triticei non sunt duri, cum infrigidantur
- I.2.1.5. quare pasta triticea confecta sit maior, ordei vero minor
- I.2.1.6. quare pasta tritici confecta sit alba, ordei vero nigra
- I.2.1.7. quare cum mel sit conglomeratius quam aqua, farina, que conficitur cum mellicrato, fragilior est, quando coquitur, quam ea, que cum aqua
- I.2.1.8. quare panis factus ex novis granis est peyor quam ex antiquis

I.2.2. de vino

- I.2.2.1. utrum expediat semel inebriari in mense
- I.2.2.2. quare bibentes vinum lymphatum magis inebriantur quam bibentes non lymphatum
- I.2.2.3. quare de vino lymphato et temperato homines de mane magis dolent caput quam de intemperato
- I.2.2.4. quare pueri existentes calidi non sunt amatores vini, senes autem et viri fortes et calidi amant ipsum
- I.2.2.5. utrum vinum immoderate sumptum generet morbos calidos aut frigidos
- I.2.2.6. quis humor plus generetur a vino, utrum sanguis vel fleema
- I.2.2.7. utrum vinum forte plus generet paralysim et spasmos ac alios consimiles morbos aut vinum debile
- I.2.2.8. utrum vinum maxime noceat cerebro
- I.2.2.9. quare vinum forte nocet cerebro et confert stomacho, vinum vero debile econverso
- I.2.2.10. propter quid usus vini inducit oxireuma in stomacho plus quam aqua
- I.2.2.11. utrum vinum confortet calorem naturalem plus quam cibus
- I.2.2.12. si quando vinum dandum sit infirmis, plus expediat dare vinum novum vel vetus

I.2.3. de carnibus

- I.2.3.1. quare carnes validiores ciccius digerantur
- I.2.3.2. quare triture carnis sunt indigestibiliores quam carnes
- I.2.3.3. utrum carnes asse sunt humidiores quam carnes lixe
- I.2.3.4. quare lumen lunare plus putrefacit carnes animalium occisorum quam lumen solis

I.2.4. de ovorum varietatibus

- I.2.4.1. utrum vitellum sit calidius vel albumen
- I.2.4.2. quare vitellum ovi in aqua positum descendit, albumen vero supernat
- I.2.4.3. quare ova in avibus sunt maiora quantitate et paucitate quam in piscibus
- I.2.4.4. quare ova in avibus habent duram testam, in piscibus vero mollem
- I.2.4.5. quare ova in volatilibus sint diversi coloris, in piscibus autem non
- I.2.4.6. quare in piscibus sunt ova rotunda, in avibus vero oblonge figure
- I.2.4.7. quod rumpat testam in exclusione pulli
- I.2.4.8. quare vitellum ovi in plenilunio ovati sordes melius lavat a pannis
- I.2.4.9. quare quedam ova in igne posita strepunt et quedam non

I.2.5. de piscibus

- I.2.5.1. utrum pisces comedant pullos proprios
- I.2.5.2. utrum per pisces masticetur cibus
- I.2.5.3. quare pluvia valet piscibus et nocet avibus
- I.2.5.4. quare ova piscium plus in igne strepunt quam animalium

I.2.6. de leguminibus

- I.2.6.1. quare secundum Galienum podagra maxime accidit commedentibus legumina
- I.2.6.2. quare fabe, cum sint ventose, non amittant suam ventositatem per decoccionem sicut ordeum
- I.2.6.3. utrum lentes condite cum aceto possint dari in acutis febribus

I.2.7. de oleribus

- I.2.7.1. quare caulis solvit ebrietatem
- I.2.7.2. quare portulata dissolvit congelacionem dencium
- I.2.7.3. quare allea et cepe, quanto in sicciori loco plantantur, tanto meliora fiunt, alia vero deteriora
- I.2.7.4. quare allea vetera magis fetent quam nova
- I.2.7.5. quare ruta facit sudores fetidos
- I.2.7.6. quare origanum musto immissum facit dulce vinum

I.2.8. de fructibus

- I.2.8.1. quare comedentes ficus molles et dulces leduntur in dentibus
- I.2.8.2. quare comestio ficuum generat pediculos
- I.2.8.3. quare fructibus dulcibus cicius saciamur quam acetosis
- I.2.8.4. quare vinum dulce post putridos fructus bibitum variatur in amarum
- I.2.8.5. quare post stiptica, ut glandes etc., vinum videtur dulcius et quilibet alius potus
- I.2.8.6. quare pyra secundum Dyascoridem ieiunis sunt nociva

I.2.9. de salis effectibus

- I.2.9.1. que sit ratio diversorum effectuum, que in sale inveniuntur
- I.2.9.2. quare sal proiectum in ignem crepitat

I.2.10. de proprietatibus mellis

- I.2.10.1. quare mel recentissimum est melius quam antiquum et vinum vetustissimum est melius quam novum
- I.2.10.2. quare fex mellis natat in supmo, cum fex omnium aliorum humorum in ymo

I.2.11. de proprietatibus olei

- I.2.11.1. quare oleum in sumpmo et vinum in medio vel in ymo meliora reputantur
- I.2.11.2. quare oleum in vase semipleno diu tento emendatur
- I.2.11.3. quare oleum congelatur, vinum raro, acetum rarius

I.3. Capitulum tertium de nocentibus ad sanitatem

- I.3.1. unde causetur oxireuma, id est eructacio acetosa
- I.3.2. quare statim post cibum acceptum non sentitur in stomacho illa acetositas
- I.3.3. quare illa acetositas plus accidit in dormientibus quam in vigilantibus
- I.3.4. quare secundum Avicennam dulcia in stomacho plus acescunt, ut lac, sanguis et huiusmodi
- I.3.5. quare vinum in stomacho maxime acescit
- I.3.6. cum vinum sit calidum, quare non inducit morbos calidos, sed frigidos
- I.3.7. in quibus partibus corporis sint torsiones ventris
- I.3.8. utrum egri debeant sic comedere, sicut erant soliti, quando erant sani
- I.3.9. utrum debilibus convalescentibus plus noceat panis aut caro
- I.3.10. utrum quando convalescentibus exhibentur carnes, statim vinum debeat exhiberi

- I.3.11. utrum convalescens ab egritudine debeat per duos dies similiter regi sicut in morbo
- I.3.12. utrum convalescentibus valeat cibus grossus
- I.3.13. utrum plus noceat permutacio, que fit ex inanicione ad replecionem, vel que fit ex replecione ad inanicionem

II. Tractatus secundus de ciborum et potuum naturis et proprietatibus

II.1. Capitulum primum de natura panis

II.2. Capitulum secundum de vino

II. 3. Capitulum tertium de medone

II.4. Capitulum quartum de carnibus

II.4.1. de carnibus animalium gressibilium domesticorum

II.4.1.1. ad carnes edulinas

II.4.1.2. ad carnes agnellinas

II.4.1.3. ad carnes arietinas

II.4.1.4. ad carnes vitulinas

II.4.1.5. ad carnes vaccinas

II.4.1.6. ad carnes porcinas

II.4.2. de carnibus animalium silvestrium

II.4.2.1. ad carnes cervinas

II.4.2.2. ad carnes leporinas

II.4.2.3. ad carnes ursinas

II.4.3. de carnibus volatilium

II.5. Capitulum quintum de ovis

II.6. Capitulum sextum de natura lactis

II.7. Capitulum septimum de butiro

II.8. Capitulum octavum de caseo

II.9. Capitulum nonum de natura piscium

II.10. Capitulum decimum de leguminibus

II.10.1. de risio

II.10.2. de fabis

II.10.3. de lenticula

II.10.4. de cycera

II.10.5. de pisa

II.11. Capitulum undecimum de oleribus

II.11.1. de hiis, que incipiunt ab A

II.11.1.1. de alleis

II.11.1.2. de aneto

II.11.1.3. de apio

II.11.1.4. de atriplice

- II.11.2. de hiis, que incipiunt a B
 - II.11.2.1. de brancia
 - II.11.2.2. de beta
 - II.11.2.3. de boragine

- II.11.3. de hiis, que incipiunt a C
 - II.11.3.1. de caule
 - II.11.3.2. de cepa
 - II.11.3.3. de cucurbita
 - II.11.3.4. de cimino

- II.11.4. de hiis, que incipiunt a D
 - II.11.4.1. de dauco
 - II.11.4.2. de dyptamno

- II.11.5. de hiis, que incipiunt ab E
 - II.11.5.1. de epatica
 - II.11.5.2. de esula

- II.11.6. de hiis, que incipiunt ab F
 - II.11.6.(1.) de feniculo

- II.11.7. de hiis, que incipiunt a G
 - II.11.7.1. de gladiola
 - II.11.7.2. de gariofilata

- II.11.8. de hiis, que incipiunt ab H
 - II.11.8.1. de harundine
 - II.11.8.2. de herba vitri

- II.11.9. de hiis, que incipiunt ab I
 - II.11.9.1. de ysopo
 - II.11.9.2. de iusquiamo

- II.11.10. de hiis, que incipiunt a K
 - II.11.10.(1.) de kameleonta

- II.11.11. de hiis, que incipiunt ab L
 - II.11.11.(1.) de lactuca ortensi

- II.11.12. de hiis, que incipiunt ab M
 - II.11.12.(1.) de menta

- II.11.13. de hiis, que incipiunt ab N
 - II.11.13.(1.) de nasturcio

- II.11.14. de hiis, que incipiunt ab O
 - II.11.14.(1.) de origano

- II.11.15. de hiis, que incipiunt a P
 - II.11.15.1. de papavere

II.11.15.2. de petrocilino

II.11.15.3. de porro

II.11.15.4. de portulata

II.11.16. de hiis, que incipiunt a Q

II.11.16.(1.)de quadrumeron

II.11.17. de hiis, que incipiunt ab R

II.11.17.1. de radice, id est raphano

II.11.17.2. de rapa

II.11.17.3. de ruta

II.11.18. de hiis, que incipiunt ab S

II.11.18.1. de salvia

II.11.18.2. de semperviva

II.11.18.3. de saxifraga

II.11.18.4. de squilla

II.11.18.5. de sambuco

II.11.18.6. de squinanco

II.11.18.7. de scabiosa

II.11.18.8. de scammonia

II.11.18.9. de scolopendina

II.11.19. de hiis, que incipiunt a T

II.11.19.1. de tapsia

II.11.19.2. de turbit

II.11.19.3. de tuberibus

II.11.20. de hiis, que incipiunt ab V

II.11.20.1. de verbena

II.11.20.2. de virga pastoralis

II.11.20.3. de viola

II.11.21. de hiis, que incipiunt ab Y

II.11.21.(1.) de yreos vel yris

II.11.22. de hiis, que incipiunt a Z

II.11.22.(1.) de zeduario

II.12. Capitulum duodecimum de fructibus

II.12.1. de ficibus

II.12.2. de dactylis

II.12.3. de uvis

II.12.4. de malgranatis

II.12.5. de cytoniis

II.12.6. de piris

II.12.7. de pomis

II.12.8. de pomo cytrino

II.12.9. de persicis

II.12.10. de mespilis

- II.12.11. de moris
- II.12.12. de prunis
- II.12.13. de cerusis
- II.12.14. de amigdalis
- II.12.15. de nucibus
- II.12.16. de avellanis
- II.12.17. de castaneis
- II.12.18. de glandibus

II.13. Capitulum tertium decimum de quibusdam speciebus aromaticis

- II.13.1. de pipere
- II.13.2. de zinzibere
- II.13.3. de zeduario
- II.13.4. de galanga
- II.13.5. de gariofilis
- II.13.6. de cynamomo
- II.13.7. de cubebis
- II.13.8. de muscatis
- II.13.9. de croco
- II.13.10. de carui
- II.13.11. de synapio

II.14. Capitulum quartum decimum de quibusdam condimentis

- II.14.1. de sale
- II.14.2. de aceto
- II.14.3. de oleo

III. Tractatus tertius de requisitorum ad plena convivia variis condicionibus

III.1. Capitulum primum de hiis, que requiruntur ad regimen universale

- III.1.1. ad precepta de regulis sanitatis data
- III.1.2. ad partes anni
- III.1.3. ad XII menses
- III.1.4. ad modum manducandi
- III.1.5. ad nociva
- III.1.6. ad nutritiva
- III.1.7. ad humores peccantes
 - III.1.7.1. sanguis
 - III.1.7.2. colera
 - III.1.7.3. flegma
 - III.1.7.4. melancholia

III.2. Capitulum secundum de esibiliis et potabilibus multiplicitate

- III.2.1. de esibiliis
 - III.2.1.1. de panibus
 - III.2.1.2. de carnibus
 - III.2.1.2.1. porcus
 - III.2.1.2.2. vitulus

- III.2.1.2.3. epar
- III.2.1.2.4. cor
- III.2.1.2.5. cerebrum
- III.2.1.2.6. auca
- III.2.1.2.7. avis
- III.2.1.2.8. volatilia

III.2.1.3. de piscibus

III.2.1.4. de lacticiniis

- III.2.1.4.1. ova
- III.2.1.4.2. lac
- III.2.1.4.3. serum
- III.2.1.4.4. butyrum
- III.2.1.4.5. caseus

III.2.1.5. de leguminibus

- III.2.1.5.1. pisa
- III.2.1.5.2. faba

III.2.1.6. de fructibus

- III.2.1.6.1. cerusa
- III.2.1.6.2. pruna
- III.2.1.6.3. mora
- III.2.1.6.4. mespula
- III.2.1.6.5. poma
- III.2.1.6.6. pirum
- III.2.1.6.7. persica
- III.2.1.6.8. nuces

III.2.1.7. de oleribus

- III.2.1.7.1. olus
- III.2.1.7.2. rapa
- III.2.1.7.3. bleta
- III.2.1.7.4. annetum
- III.2.1.7.5. portulata
- III.2.1.7.6. lactuca
- III.2.1.7.7. apium
- III.2.1.7.8. plantago
- III.2.1.7.9. alleum
- III.2.1.7.10. cepa
- III.2.1.7.11. salvia
- III.2.1.7.12. ruta
- III.2.1.7.13. abrotanum
- III.2.1.7.14. viola
- III.2.1.7.15. ysopus
- III.2.1.7.16. ennula
- III.2.1.7.17. pulegium
- III.2.1.7.18. liliium
- III.2.1.7.19. nasturcium
- III.2.1.7.20. pyonia

III.2.1.8.de speciebus aromaticis

- III.2.1.8.1. cimum
- III.2.1.8.2. anisum
- III.2.1.8.3. crocus
- III.2.1.8.4. cinamomum
- III.2.1.8.5. muscatum
- III.2.1.8.6. piper nigrum
- III.2.1.8.7. piper album
- III.2.1.8.8. zinziber
- III.2.1.8.9. gariofilus
- III.2.1.8.10. zeduar
- III.2.1.8.11. carui
- III.2.1.8.12. scabiosa
- III.2.1.8.13. camphora (pro oculis)
- III.2.1.7.14. contra oculos
- III.2.1.7.15. galanga

III.2.2. de potabilibus

- III.2.2.1. vinum
- III.2.2.2. pusca
- III.2.2.3. mulsum
- III.2.2.4. ydromel
- III.2.2.5. medo
- III.2.2.6. mustum
- III.2.2.7. de cervisia
- III.2.2.8. acetum

III.3. Capitulum tertium de dyete conservacione

III.4. Capitulum quartum de tempore comestionis et eius reiteracione

III.5. Capitulum quintum de ordine ferculorum et loco comestionis

III.5.1. ad solucionem ventris

III.5.2. ad minucionem sanguinis

- III.5.2.1. de tempore minucionis quoad lunam
- III.5.2.2. de effectu minucionis
- III.5.2.3. de regimine minorum
- III.5.2.4. de causis minucionis
- III.5.2.5. de effectu salvatelle
- III.5.2.6. de iudicio sanguinis

III.5.3. ad antidota