Recipes, Their Authors, and Their Names

Andrea Borghini [†]
andrea.borghini@unimi.it

Matteo Gandolini [†]
matteo.gandolini@studenti.unimi.it

ABSTRACT

In this paper we suggest that discussions about the identity of recipes should be based on a distinction between four categories of recipes. The central feature that we use to single out a category is the type of relationship that a recipe bears to its author. The first category comprises "open recipes" like wine, pizza, or salad, which come in taxonomic layers and are structurally open for new authors to reshape them. The second category comprises "institutional recipes," namely those whose authors typically form consortium-like institutions, such as Champagne wines or Quebec maple syrup. The third category comprises "brand recipes" like Coca-Cola, Nutella, or Big Mac, whose names connote rather than denote recipes. Finally, the fourth category comprises "flagship recipes," which include all the personal renditions of a recipe whose identity is strongly bound to individual authors. Besides its theoretical value, the classification we put forward is offered as a ground for settling legal disputes about recipes, evaluating charges of cultural appropriation that concern recipes, and guiding consumers, producers, and policy makers when they think about foods and diets.

1. Recipes, Their Authors, and Their Names

The discourse about recipes has developed over the centuries without the aid of any systematic theory. As Borghini (2015) argues, such a theory is desirable because it offers a common ground for addressing legal disputes about recipes, evaluating charges of cultural appropriation that concern recipes, and guiding consumers, producers, and policy makers when they think about foods and diets. In this paper, we aim to move the theoretical debate on the metaphysics and ontology of recipes a step forward by outlining a fourfold distinction between

[†] Università degli Studi di Milano, Italy.

kinds of recipes that is at once promising for the purposes of theoretical explanation and in keeping with social practices involving recipes. In particular, we show that the identity of recipes fundamentally depends on the social and legal norms that guide their naming, which we frame in terms of the *authoriality* relationship.

Names of recipes comprise a wide variety of types of linguistic expressions, linked to culturally and historically complex arrays of practices, including linguistic practices. Some recipes owe their name to a place (e.g. Champagne wine) or to a person (e.g. fettuccine Alfredo); other recipe names express metaphors (e.g. spaghetti alla puttanesca) and others are deceptively descriptive (e.g. summer rolls or General Tso's chicken). Throughout the paper, we consider different semantic and axiological properties of recipe names, mostly concerning social and legal norms that constrain their usage. We draw upon such properties to carve the recipe domain into four ontological categories—open recipes, institutional recipes, brand recipes, and signature recipes. These categories are part and parcel of what it is otherwise referred to as social ontology. The categories are not mutually exclusive, as it is occasionally possible for a recipe to fall within more than one of them simultaneously. We devote one section to each of these categories.

The four types of recipes we propose crucially depend on specific kinds of *authors*. We employ this term—and the cognate expression "authoriality"—in a technical sense. Generally speaking, anybody who is entitled (it is yet to assess what does "entitled" mean in different cases) to play a role in the process of defining of a recipe counts as an author of that recipe. However, not every maker of a dish is a recipe author.[1] This is easy to see if we think of a restaurant kitchen,

---

[1] We write under the assumption that recipes and dishes are ontologically different objects, following Borghini (2015): "In a nutshell, a dish is the stuff, a recipe is the idea. More precisely, a dish is a specific concoction of (typically perishable) edible stuff, such as those specific actions that led to this slice of pizza sitting on my kitchen. On the other hand, a recipe—in first approximation—comprises the array of repeatable aspects of a dish whose replication would deliver a dish of the same sort" (pp. 721–722). The interdependence of recipes and dishes is a complex topic, on which we hope to cast some light throughout the paper. The interaction between the two levels can occur top-down (from recipes to dishes), bottom-up (from dishes to recipes), or both ways, due to the different normative and descriptive needs at stake in a particular situation. Authoriality can provide insights on these dynamics too. For additional discussion of the topic, see also Borghini & Engisch (2021).

in which dozens of people produce dishes under the direction of a few people in charge.

Authoriality is often displayed in terms of semantic authority over recipe names. Since recipes are cultural entities, there is no belief-independent ontological ground that we can sharply separate from the ways in which we conceive and speak of them. For this reason, we suggest that authoriality is the *trait d'union* between the ontology and the semantics of recipes.

Exploring recipes in terms of authoriality seems plausible because recipes are items within culinary cultures and it may seem natural to think that their identity depends to a large extent on the *fiat* of agents. As Borghini (2015) argues, the question of semantic and linguistic authority is central to a theory of recipes because in every instance in which a recipe gets executed we have new material constituents, new cooks, diners, and a novel context of consumption: getting clear on who has the authority to decide on the recipe name is crucial to address any dispute about its identity.

2. Open Recipes

The first ontological category of recipes comprises those whose names, instead of denoting a recipe in a narrow sense, denote clusters of several recipes and variants, which can (greatly) differ from one another. We call them "open recipes."

Open recipes are usually the consequence of centuries-long histories of development and contamination of practices, like in the case of *skibaj*, the Persian ancestor of today's fish and chips (Jurafsky, 2014). Differences may be caused by the subsumption of many unrelated dishes under the same name, too. This is for instance the case of Barolo, Champagne, and Palm Toddy, all being referred to with the name "wine" because of some vague similarities (crucially, they are all drinks produced through alcoholic fermentation).

Open recipes are open in virtue of the specific form of authoriality that determines the width and heterogeneity of the edible items clustered under them. In fact, the referent of the name of an open recipe is always subject to a process of bargaining. As the culinary and linguistic practices within a certain community change, the set of dishes the name refers to changes its boundaries. Some dishes move from the outside to the inside of the referent's scope (e.g. when a vegan version of *pasta alla carbonara* is regarded as legitimate) and, vice

versa, some translations and analogies become forbidden (e.g. when margarine is no longer considered a plausible substitute of butter in a and butter sandwich).

The referential ductility of open recipes depends on the fact that it is quite pointless to identify their author in order to fix their identity, besides being often practically impossible. It is sometimes possible to link an open recipe to a (mythical) "traditional" past, which consists of a very rough assignment of authoriality on a regional basis and legitimates the (re)construction of a "national" gastronomic *repertoire*.[2]

Open authoriality has ontological implications. A constructivist theory of recipes like the one put forward by Borghini (2015) shows how every single cook's effort redefines the relation between the dishes they make and the recipes they wish to instantiate. The redefinition process is complex and requires the participation of different actors, like the table companions. But, the possibility for anybody to put themselves as an author into the genesis of the recipe and redefine it through their *fiat* is the crucial aspect of the whole negotiation process. For example, people refer to traditional recipes through the names of open recipes. Confronting a contemporary Italian recipe for *sugo di pomodoro* with the one written in Pellegrino Artusi's famous cookbook it is easy to find several differences. Nonetheless, the referential use of "*sugo di pomodoro*" is not controversial, today, due to the "democratic" openness of the recipe's authoriality: the actual culinary practice of countless anonymous cooks reshaped the referent despite a single famous author fixed it in his seminal cookbooks one hundred and fifty years ago.

Open authoriality grounds most culinary traditions. Thanks to it, traditional recipes are not doomed to be reproposed forever in the same fashion portrayed by documents of a past often mythologized as "original." Instead, they belong to a space of continuity between past and future, in a structural tension which allows a quite stable lexicon to stay for a referent which is plural, constantly developing and always conditioned by the historical evolution of gastronomic practices.

It is important to point out that within the domain of the name of an open recipe's referent we are likely to find subcategories and variants of that recipe that are bound to their authors in a more strict way. This suggests that open recipes come in taxonomic layers. An illustration would be handy here.

---

[2] One may wonder what the relation between open and traditional recipes is. Are all open recipes traditional? Is it the other way around? Is it neither of the two alternatives? We live this issue for another occasion.

In 2018, Carlo Cracco put on the menu of his bistrot in Milan a very peculiar rendition of Pizza Margherita. Cracco's menu item was smaller than traditional Pizza Margherita, it had raw mozzarella and tomato on the top, and it was cooked from a dough made of a variety of cereals. Cracco's culinary proposal aroused controversy in no time, especially within social media. One side of the public opinion held that Cracco's recipe was disrespectful to the tradition of Pizza Margherita. On the other side, some people sympathized with the attempt at innovation, like Gino Sorbillo, a renowned Neapolitan pizzaiolo running some pizzerias in Milan, who defended Cracco's choice as a personal and *gourmet* variant of a culinary classic.[3] So, if we regard Cracco's Pizza Margherita as a legitimate variant of Pizza Margherita, we would regard it, from a taxonomic point of view, as a subcategory of the open recipe.

Pizza is an especially suitable case to showcase the multiple taxonomic layers of open recipes. Under the scope of the referent "pizza" stand several styles that depart considerably from the most famous Neapolitan-style pizza, which probably established itself as the most iconic one (e.g. it is recognized as a Traditional Specialty Guarantee and it has been registered in the Unesco world heritage list).[4] *Pizza romana* (Rome-style pizza), *Pizza siciliana* (Sicilian-style pizza), and a host of different American styles of pizza are pretty famous across the world nowadays. But, it is possible to discover even more pizza variants if we step back just a few decades. In 1950s cookbooks, it was common to find *Swedish pizza*, *Civitavecchia sweet pizza*, *Campofranco pizza*, and so on.[5] Thus, in a pizza taxonomy we arguably have multiple layers, linked based on their history, style, choice of ingredients, size, shape, and so on. It is without question a daunting task to order them, a task that we cannot take on further here.

The astonishing difference between the mentioned variants of pizza poses urgently the question: what does one refer to with an open recipe's name? Sorbillo's words suggest a plausible answer: with the name of an open

---

[3] "Gino Sorbillo difende la pizza di Cracco: "A me è piaciuta. Le critiche? Solo invidia," *Huffington Post*, March 12 2018; <https://www.huffingtonpost.it/2018/03/12/gino-sorbillo-difende-la-pizza-di-cracco-a-me-e-piaciuta-le-critiche-solo-invidia_a_23383117/>, retrieved on 24 May 2020.
[4] UNESCO (2017).
[5] For these and other similar examples, see Schuler (1955) and Boni (1929).

recipe you denote a class of recipes whose borders are hardly ever closed or set once and forever, a tradition on which nobody can claim intellectual property rights and which, for the very same reason, can always be enriched by anybody who poses as the author of a new variant of the recipe, provided that the claim of authorship is recognized as fair by the other actors in a negotiation process.

In order to avoid misunderstandings or strumentalizations of the term, few words must be spent about the role that tradition plays in this paper's account. In popular culture, a mainstream view sees tradition and innovation in contraposition. According to this antagonistic view, tradition guards important lessons from the past against the perils of an impulse to innovation that sweeps under a progressive mask of unreflective and uncaring attitudes. So, tradition becomes the ideological ground for the legitimation of every conservative or even reactionary cultural account.

The antagonism between tradition and innovation is strongly rooted in common sense about recipes. Yet, we believe that it rests on a misguided conception of tradition. Not only tradition, when it comes to foods, is most often an invention (Montanari, 2006; Hobsbawm & Ranger, 1983). Most importantly, tradition provides cogency to societal practices and, as such, it always belongs to the present as well as the actual. Culinary traditions should comprise those practices that embed or help develop those values a community wishes to carry forward into its future. Most often than not, such values are best reflected in innovative practices. In fact, not only there is no innovation without a pre-existing tradition, but also there is no tradition without the normative projection towards the future that rules everyday social practices. Without endorsing this account on the nature of tradition, it is not possible to understand in which sense the referent of the name of an open recipe is shaped after a tradition.

What we have been ascribing to open recipes does not carry for every kind of recipe. In the next sections we are going to explain how firmer links between a recipe and its (individual or collective) authors correspond to different onological categories.

3.   Institutional Recipes

Within a culinary tradition there are not only open recipes. Celebrated items within a corpus of traditional recipes also include what we call "institutional

recipes." This category most notably includes so-called Geographical Indications (from now on, GIs), which are managed through a consortium of producers. But, we should clarify that the category includes any other recipe whose authoriality crucially depends on institutional actors. In fact, it is possible that apparent open recipes like *tortello cremasco* in Crema, Italy, which do not have any consortium, are better regarded as institutional recipes due to the relation of typicality that they entertain with the tradition of a certain region and the existence of some kind of institution (the "*tortello cremasco* brotherhood") responsible for the drawing of a document that provides the identity criteria of the authentic recipe.

To illustrate our proposal, we shall rely on the example of Parmigiano Reggiano. This is particularly fitting. because of its fame and the amount of bibliographical scholarly work on it. Ever since the Middle Ages Italian speakers were accustomed to use the word "parmigiano" as a name for a well known cheese produced nearby the city of Parma (hence the name). For centuries, the boundaries to the class of authors and to the specific rules for the production method were not regulated through a centralized governmental authority, so that we can plausibly regard the recipe for parmigiano as open in its initial stage. The institutional status of the recipe was achieved when the collective author loosely identified through the typicality criterion entered a process of institutionalization. In 1934 Italian artisans formed the Consorzio Volontario Interprovinciale Grana Tipico, which twenty years later got its actual name and in 1996 had its recipes included within the list of DOP products within the European Union.[6]

The identity of Parmigiano is modeled through an institutional recipe's peculiar form of authoriality, namely via a producer's consortium. This is the institution whose prerogative is the drafting of a so-called disciplinary of production, namely the document reporting the product's "recipe," a precise set of characteristics that one must meet in order to count as a member of the consortium, and the list of essential properties which a dish has to display in order to be identified with the institutional name of the recipes (see Borghini

---

[6] Even though the Stresa international Convention had granted a geographical indication to producers in Italy already in 1951. Consorzio Parmigiano Reggiano. *Il Consorzio e la storia*. https://www.parmigiano-reggiano.it/consorzio/consorzio_storia/default.aspx.   For   more about Parmigiano Reggiano's geographical indication, see also Donnelly (2016) and O'Connor (2004).

2014a). It is trivial to remind that consortia perform many other important tasks, including marketing the images of their products and checking the standards; however, these other duties depend logically on the existence of a disciplinary of production and do not play a crucial role for the understanding of the model of authoriality of institutional recipes.

The main purpose of a disciplinary of production is to introduce a normative distinction within the referent of the name of an open recipe between all the possible variants of the recipe. In particular, the disciplinary purports to tell apart so-called "typical," "authentic" or "original" executions of the recipe from the generic, fake, or counterfeit ones. Such distinction does not have any sense before the institutional fiat, as open recipes do not allow any exclusive authoriality claim.

Parmigiano offers a neat illustration of the normative distinction underlying institutional recipes. As the official consortium's website states, the institutionalization process sped up in the aftermath of the first World War in order to face the market entry of Reggianito, a grana-like cheese produced in Argentina by Italian immigrants that was cheaper although similar to Parmigiano. The process served the purpose of putting forward a putative axiological distinction between a high-quality, original subset of typical recipes (the ones executed nearby Parma) and the other generic, less valuable competing variants (such as the Argentinians). Yet, why should one think that Reggianito is an inauthentic reproduction of its Italian counterparts? Why not regarding it as a local Argentinian variant? Furthermore, since authors of recipes do not always need to form a consortium in order to distinguish their products from similar ones, what grounds the legitimacy of consortia?

According to the actual protectionist policies for institutional recipes, the answer to these questions rests on the legal tool of GIs. These are legal devices developed to guarantee the intellectual property rights of a community over institutional recipes by binding the use of the recipe's name to the production of food within a certain geographical region. Well-known examples include wines (e.g. Champagne, Porto, Tokaj, or Chianti), spirits (e.g. Bourbon or Tequila), cheeses (e.g. Parmigiano, Roquefort, Swiss Gruyere), and meat products (e.g. Prosciutto di Parma or Lardo di Colonnata); but instances also include rice (e.g. Basmati), tea (e.g. Dharjeeling), cocoa (e.g. Porcelana), and non-edible items.   .

Borghini (2012) criticised GI policies for fixing the identity of wines (and potentially any food within the scope of what we call here institutional recipes)

from a metaphysical standpoint. Since neither the terroir nor the physical and chemical properties of a wine can provide satisfactory identity criteria, he suggests giving up on GIs. He then proposes that the identity of institutional recipes be fixed by "judgements of authenticity," formulated by committees of experts.

Both the proposal and the analysis carried out in the aforementioned work may be useful in establishing what the actual referent of the names of institutional recipes is. Do we in our everyday discourse about institutional recipes refer to a class of dishes or products that are identified by the strict rules of the disciplinaries of production? Do we mean to pick out food which has a particular chemical and physical structure? These suggestions seem quite implausible, as most of the speakers talking about food do not need to have a clue about these erudite issues to be competent speakers (and most of us know little about these topics, actually). Rather, everyday linguistic practice relies upon a "division of linguistic labour" that looks very similar to the famous one described by Putnam (1975). We may know little (or nothing at all) about what are the criteria that allow the distinction between Grana Padano, Parmigiano Reggiano, Reggianito and parmesan, about the history or the physical properties of these products; what we refer to is what certain "experts" judge as authentic "Grana Padano," "Parmigiano Reggiano," and "Reggianito."

But, who are the "Parmigiano Reggiano experts"? And what conditions must one meet in order to be one of them? Enforcing GI policies means answering that the relevant "Parmigiano Reggiano experts" are the Parmigiano Reggiano producers, and that to be one of these experts you have to be a member of the Parmigiano Reggiano consortium, thus you must produce grana cheese within a certain geographic area and follow the disciplinary.

Such an answer raises many metaphysical and political issues, as Borghini (2012) has already shown. GIs focus more on the geographical regions in which food is produced rather than on the identity of the actual authors, whose intellectual property rights such policy is meant to protect, or on the actual properties of the food. Grandi (2018, pp. 83-89) argues that Parmigiano Reggiano has changed drastically over the last four decades and, thus, nowadays US versions of parmesan look more like the "original" one. GIs only links the identity of an institutional recipe to its geographical context, without providing satisfactory bonds to the cultural milieu (the practices and traditions of the people living in the area, their savoir faire, the symbolic value of food within a community, and so on) it originates from.

Endorsing this proposal does not mean dismissing consortia. Their task is "to protect the products"[7] in ways that may not be just the protection of the economical interests of the makers actually involved in the production of food. Thus, opening them to the inclusion of independent expert judges along producers would just be a further step in the direction of achieving a goal that current GI policing already aims for. We must conceive such an operation as the recognition that the authors of an institutional recipe are not just the food producers, rather they are all the agents entitled to shape the boundaries of the recipe: food makers, experts, and (to some extent) consumers.

In conclusion, a satisfactory account of the identity of institutional recipes should not oversimplify its role by focusing on merely conventional or purely naturalistic features; rather, it should aim to represent the complex relationship that a traditional product may carry to people, places, and times.

4.   Brand Recipes

Brands are central to contemporary marketing strategies of consumer goods and they have held a key place in the gastronomic discourse for many decades. Our aim in this section is to illustrate the specific problems that the elusive nature of brands poses to the ontology of recipes and that connect to broader issues already highlighted in the literature (Moore, 2003; Manning, 2010; Nakassis, 2012). Our take is that branded recipes should be regarded as a *sui generis* category of recipes.

The relationship between a brand and its recipes is peculiar. In some cases, a brand designates a very specific recipe. That is the case of *Baci Perugina*, the name given by Giovanni Buitoni to the famous chocolate confections he marketed in 1924.[8] However, in some other instances, the very same branded product is actually linked to a variety of recipes. Consider, for instance, products like Nutella and Coca-Cola. Each of these products is linked to a wide class of recipes, which vary across countries in terms of their ingredients and method of production, while the brand stays the same. This fact is often unknown to consumers, who may actually express surprise at it or—as it happened in 2017

---

[7] Ministero delle politiche agricole, alimentari e forestali. *Ruolo dei consorzi.* http://www.dop-igp.eu/flex/cm/pages/ServeBLOB.php/L/IT/IDPagina/10.
[8] Baci® Perugina®. *Baci® Perugina®: our story since 1922.* <url=https://www.baciperugina.com/intl/world/our-story#the-history-of-baci-perugina>.

with Nutella—even protest that they have been misguided to think that what looked like the same product was not in fact such.[9]

The one to many link between certain brands and their recipes gives rise to specific semantic complications. Consider again "Nutella." Two jars of Nutella, one produced in Italy, the other in the US, contain hazelnut cream which is prepared following two different recipes; moreover, Nutella's recipe (for simplicity, let's now assume that we are dealing only with Italian Nutella) may change across time—for instance, Ferrero may decide at any moment to replace palm oil with a more ecologically sustainable ingredient. Now suppose that Italian Nutella starts being exported into the US food market, without a notice to consumers. This clearly generates a semantic ambiguity for the market, where "Nutella" can now stand for two recipes.

Another semantic issue affecting brands regards their specific form of authoriality. A clear example is Coca-Cola. The American brand has grown so popular that today's Italian speakers are accustomed to the practice of ordering a "*coca*" instead of a glass, can, or bottle of cola at the bar, even if the only cola available is Pepsi. Using a brand's name to denote a generic set of recipes is a phenomenon known as "brand vulgarization," and it does not regard foods specifically.

These problems may suggest that brand names such as "Nutella" work similarly to open recipes. But, upon closer consideration, their main similarity is an underlying semantic ambiguity, while their authoriality functions quite differently and can be used to highlight the different social norms guiding the use of the expressions involving them. In the case of brand recipes, referential variations do not occur spontaneously based on the development of gastronomic and linguistic practices; rather, they mainly depend on the *fiat* of the brand's owners. Thus, while in appearance the identification of recipe and brand is really strong, *de facto* it is not. First of all, the recipe can be replaced across time and place without the consumers being involved in the process or informed of the change (except, of course, for the information displayed on the product label). Secondly, the authors of brand recipes can exert great power in shaping the

---

[9] See for instance "Nutella Quietly Changes Its Recipe in Europe, Canada, Fans Reacts" <url=https://globalnews.ca/news/3849914/nutella-quietly-changes-its-recipe-in-europe-can ada/>.

identity of a brand through semantic authority, image managing, and marketing narratives while bringing little or no modification to the recipe itself.[10]

Instead of referring to any particular object, brands seem to connote in a certain way the products (no matter what they are) they appear onto, giving them value. In this sense, we may think about brands as autoreferential symbols (Beebe, 2004). In order to understand more about the auto-referentiality of brands and their connotative semantic properties, it may be useful to make a little detour and spend some words about Supreme's bricks. In 2016 Supreme, a fashion brand which is very popular amongst teens, put on the market clay bricks imprinted with the company's brand, whose resale value quickly sprung to hundreds of dollars. If considered separately, both the brick and the brand's image are common and invaluable entities. But, the union of these two produces a (brand) new object, whose value consists of nothing but being authentically Supreme.

The example of Supreme bricks suggests that the object may fade in the background of the branding process: objects, no matter if they are sweatshirts, bricks or hammers, get a certain value only due to the brand's desirability. Instead of being the brand's referent, the object is just the material support of a brand, whose meaning (which is more connotative than denotative) is object-independent. This process has been widely studied in the literature on consumers' perceptions over brands in a large variety of contexts. Even remaining within the sphere of food and beverage brands, we can find evidence that features like brand equity (which is the estimated value of a brand according to its popularity) can be promoted through a careful management of a product's image regardless of the underlying recipe that is used to produce the branded item (Vranešević´ & Stančec, 2003; Lu et al., 2015).

As Manning (2010) points out, approaching brand semantics is a hard task, as there is no accepted analytic definition of the phenomenon. Still, there is no doubt that many of the aforementioned problems are due to the fact that brands define themselves in opposition to material products, thus becoming de-materialized personas that never fully identify with the items we refer to via their names. At the same time, they strongly depend upon specific stakeholders, who maintain authoriality over them. For this reason, brand recipes resemble the

---

[10] Guinness beer may be another famous case in point here, see Oliver (2007).

multifarious nature of open recipes, while retaining a strong dependence from specific actors, as in the case of GIs and other institutional recipes.

Although the use of brand names in everyday discourse about food may in fact be referential, the discussion of branding dynamics we've outlined above suggests that it could be fruitful to develop a *connotative* rather than *denotative* account of brand recipes. Talking about Nutella is different than talking about any other hazelnut cream because the brand bonds the product with immaterial features, such as that Nutella is a better spread or that it is more "authentic." Such features may well be pure invention, but they have undeniable real effects on our actual practices involving the food, including the way consumers represent it in terms of quality and desirability as well as the price they are willing to pay for it.

5. Flagship Recipes

Finally, some recipe names refer to dishes (specific instances of the recipe) that only a certain person can make. We shall call them flagship recipes. An example is Massimo Bottura's *Camouflage*, a dish that the celebrated Italian chef invented *ex nihilo* and that only he can reasonably author. In the era of celebrity chefs and competitive fine dining, chef's recipes are regularly featured as *sui generis* entities that people talk about, discuss, and long for. But, well before this, we could count under flagship recipes also distinguished versions of pizza, dumplings, fried chicken, and home food. For instance, in the eyes of some grandchildren, *Grandma's lasagna* may have that unique touch that distinguishes the recipe from any other lasagna recipe and bestows upon it a special ontological category.

What is flagship recipes' specific form of authoriality? We can exploit here a much used analogy between flagship recipes and works of art, and suggest that authoriality does not depend necessarily on the subject's originality.[11] Instead, authoriality here consists entirely of the recognition of the author through the formal solutions they employed, or the peculiar direction towards which they chose to develop a pre-existent tradition.

Michel's Foucault address entitled *Authorship: What is an Author?* (1979) can help us develop the ontological category of flagship recipes further. Foucault points out that the notion of "author" is nothing but a modern category

---

[11] Conceiving signature recipes in analogy with works of art allow us to draw on Panofsky's work in Art History (1939) and say that authoriality derives these recipes' iconological features

that criticism has imposed over writing, which in itself would be indifferent to the author's historical individuality. This "author-function" is introduced by literary critics in order to identify relations between texts and suggest a certain way of approaching them. But, it has no foundational value with respect to the work. A proof of this thesis is the tendency to ascribe to mythical authors texts that are born from a collective and oral process of development, like Homer's Iliad.

Something similar can be said about flagship recipes. Gordon Ramsay is obviously not the person who created *ex nihilo* beef Wellington's recipe. Instead, *his* beef Wellington is a flagship recipe because people recognize some coherence relationship between a certain set of dishes (namely, the set of Ramsay's beef Wellingtons), which are meant to raise different expectations than other cooks' versions. Moreover, beef Wellington's name comes from an *a posteriori* legendary authorial attribution which does not differ much from the case of Homeric poems. In fact, the recipe is said to have been invented at the beginning of the nineteenth century by the Duke of Wellington's cooks, just like Iliad and Odyssey are said to have been written by Homer in the ninth century BC.[12]

In the same address, Foucault draws a distinction between authors in the usual sense of the term and "founders of discursivity." He then explains that this second category includes those authors that, like Marx and Freud, "did not only make possible a certain number of analogies [with their work]," (like every author does) "but they have made possible (in an equally complete way) a certain number of differences. They opened up the space for something other than themselves, which then belongs to what they have founded". The authoriality of some signature recipes, like fettuccine Alfredo's, is understandable as a foundation of discursivity. Since recipes (as a generic category) were never ascribed intellectual property rights, today the name "fettuccine Alfredo" refers to dishes that may differ much from the ones Di Lelio has cooked in Rome in 1914. Anyway, in the recipe's name there still is a reference to the original author

---

[12] This metropolitan legend is referred to in Ramsay restaurants' website (Gordon Ramsay Restaurants. *The History of Beef Wellington is well worth celebrating*). The real origins of the recipe are unclear (see Lovegren, 1995, p. 232 and Bunning Stevens, 1998, p. 95-96).

due to the fact that all of these dishes lay within the space of difference and analogy that the original recipe opened up.[13]

Now that something more has been said about the specific form of authoriality of these recipes, we can see a connection between authoriality and linguistic authority over the names of flagship recipes. Following what has been said until now, the main emerging model assumes that these recipes behave as "Kripkean" proper names: they are introduced within the community through a baptism operated by people that are known to be in a position of authority with respect to the recipe; in other words, the authors, which play the role that parents play in the examples of *Naming and Necessity*, are the ones who fix the referent of the names. Of course, this is not the case of recipes like grandma's lasagna, whose names consist of an open recipes' plus the specification of who is the author. Anyway, the preliminary enquiry carried out in this section should have made clear that there is a certain set of names of recipes whose role in the discourse is to refer to subclasses of dishes whose recipes are highly identified with their author.

6.   Implications

The categorization outlined in this paper stands the test of further developments and scrutiny. However, the terrain covered thus far suffices to check whether the fourfold distinction of recipes we suggested can provide a satisfactory theoretical framework for some common disputes about recipes. Here we limit ourselves to show that it can serve as a ground for settling conceptual issues and legal disputes about recipes, for evaluating charges of cultural appropriation that concern recipes, and for guiding consumers, producers, and policy makers when they think about foods and diets.

Our proposal helps to reframe conceptual issues concerning the identity of recipes. Carlo Cracco's Pizza Margherita controversy offers a neat illustration. We can now reframe the debate within our categories as follows. Opposers are probably inclined to think of Pizza Margherita as an institutional recipe, whose identity is (or, at least, should be) strictly fixed by an association by means of a

---

[13] One can find analogies with the case of recipes in cognate or foreign fields of inquiry; e.g., the idea of a grammar of food as in Levi-Strauss (1964/1983) or the idea of 'value' in de Saussure's linguistic theory (de Saussure, 1916/1998).

disciplinary of production;[14] supporters, instead, may think of Cracco's recipe as a flagship recipe that legitimately inscribes itself within the broader scope of Pizza Margherita as an open recipe. The controversy, which started out as a discord about Pizza Margherita's ingredients, seems now to rest on a fundamental ambiguity in the use of the term "Pizza Margherita". The two parties do not only have different intuitions about the physical criteria that a dish must meet in order to count as a specimen of a recipe, they implicitly dispute each other's intuition about authoriality and the related ontological, semantic, and normative issues.

Our theoretical proposal also has consequences in establishing how to protect the intellectual property rights of recipe authors. Recipes are notoriously hard to protect with ordinary legal devices such as copyright, patents, and trade secrets (Arons 2015). Obviously, developing an appropriate protection of intellectual property rights for recipes is a task for legal scholars and politicians, but what we are going to suggest is that the answers to such problems should be differentiated accordingly to each of the four kinds of recipes.

Scholars have been disputing whether food and recipes ought be protected by copyright (Reebs 2011), patent protection (Arons 2015), a special status such as the one granted to GIs, or nothing at all.[15] Often they draw mostly onto the new frontiers of gastronomy, such as molecular food and post-modern cuisine. This focus on individual authors suggests that, even if such scholars mean to think about recipes as a whole, their arguments concern only the domain of flagship recipes. Whether existing legal devices are effective in protecting flagship recipes and, if yes, which policing would be the most apt, are indeed interesting questions; still, it is important not to mention sporadic cases of flagship recipes that have been granted a certain kind of protections as relevant for settling them.

Brand recipes are probably the most challenging field for jurists to work into. Food is often seen as not patentable due to the "open source" nature of the repertoire of existing recipes, nor can it be protected by copyright, as its functional essence (nutrition) does not allow it to fall within the scope of legally

---

[14] In order to make the example clearer, let's assume as a model for such a disciplinary the "vera pizza napoletana" one: https://www.pizzanapoletana.org/public/pdf/Disciplinare_AVPN.pdf.
[15] For a recent review of the legal grounds to protect recipes with intellectual property rights see Bonadio & Weissenberger (2021).

protected intellectual work.[16] Nonetheless, patents and copyright have been granted to some industrial cooking methods and brand recipes. While trademark could be an alternative worth pondering, most brand recipes are nowadays protected by trade secret agreements (for instance, that is the case of Coca-Cola). Such arrangements have proved to be very effective in defending economic rights over the recipes, but they do nothing to protect moral rights and they do not allow consumers to be fully aware of what they are eating. New forms of legal protection should be enforced for brand recipes. On the one hand, secrecy does not allow the development of innovative recipes that devices like copyright explicitly aim to stimulate, while on the other, it does not provide any protection against reverse engineering or eventual leaks of information.

Finally, open recipes, which deserve a separate discussion. As we noted, these recipes' authors are an open set of individuals rather than a defined group. The kind of protection we are looking for in this case is not a legal one, nor the risks at stake involve forgery, unfair individual appropriation, or the loss of recognition for a cook's culinary work. What open recipes ask for is some form of cultural or educational protection: primarily, the consciousness of consumers and cookers can prevent them from crystalizing into a particular form, therefore losing the rich and common cultural heritage of different histories, possibilities and variants they convey.

The basis of our gastronomic vocabulary consists of open recipes, so anybody should try to understand better the nature of food like "bread," "wine," and so on, by tasting different versions of them, by learning their history, by experimenting on their own. In other words, if the value of gastronomic difference is not preserved, there is no way for what we called "open authoriality" to exist. The risk is that increased global cultural exchanges, rather than encouraging open authoriality, may lead to the standardization of culinary customs worldwide. It is important to never forget that "wine," as an open recipe, may be very different from the model of Italian and French wines we are most accustomed to, and similarly that the open recipe "pizza" refers to more than just the famous Neapolitan Pizza Margherita.

---

[16] For a parallel case, see the so-called doctrine of substantial equivalence (Borghini 2014b).

REFERENCES

Arons, M. P. (2015). A Chef's Guide to Patent Protections Available for Cooking Techniques and Recipes in the Era of Postmodern Cuisine and Molecular Gastronomy. *Journal of Business & Technology Law*, *10*(1), 137–156.

Artusi, P. (2018). *La scienza in cucina e l'arte di mangiar bene*. Giunti. (Original work published 1891).

Baci® Perugina®. *Baci® Perugina®: our story since 1922*. https://www.baciperugina.com/intl/world/our-story#the-history-of-baci-perugina.

Beebe, B. (2004). The semiotic analysis of trademark law. *UCLA Law Review*, *51*(3), 621–704.

Bonadio, E. & Weissenberger, N. (2021). Food Presentations and Recipes: Is There a Space for Copyright and Other Intellectual Property Rights? In Borghini & Engisch (2021).

Boni, A. (1959). *Il talismano della felicità*. Colombo. (Original work published in 1929).

Borghini, A. (2012). On Being the Same Wine. *Rivista di estetica*, *51*, 175–192. https://doi.org/10.4000/estetica.1408.

Borghini, A. (2014a). Geographical Indications, Food, and Culture, in Thompson P.B., Kaplan D.M. (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of food and agricultural ethics*, Springer, 1115–1120. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-0929-4.

Borghini, A. (2014b). Substantial Equivalence, in Thompson P.B., Kaplan D.M. (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of food and agricultural ethics*, Springer, 1669–1673. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-6167-4.

Borghini, A. (2015). What is a Recipe? *Journal of Agricultural & Environmental Ethics*, 28(4), 719–738. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10806-015-9556-9.

Borghini, A. & Engisch P. (2021) *Recipes and Philosophy. Taste, Value, Identity*. Bloomsbury.

Bunning Stevens, P. (1998). *Rare Bits: Unusual Origins of Popular Recipes*. Ohio University Press.

Coleman, T. (2009, April 13). The real Alfredo. An iconic pasta dish returns to its roots. *Saveur*. https://www.saveur.com/article/Kitchen/The-Real-Alfredo/

Commission of the European Communities v. Federal Republic of Germany. (2008, 26 February). Judgment of the Court (Great Chamber). https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/IT/TXT/?uri=CELEX:62005CJ0132

Consorzio Parmigiano Reggiano. Il Consorzio e la storia. https://www.parmigiano-reggiano.it/consorzio/consorzio_storia/default.aspx.

De Saussure, F. (1998). *Course in General Linguistics* (C. Bally, Ed.). Open Court. (Original work published in 1916).

Donnelly, C. (2016). *The Oxford Companion to Cheese*. Oxford University Press.

Foucault, M. (1979). Authorship: What is an Author? *Screen, 20*(1), 13–34.

Girard, W. (2015, June 5). Why You Need Know the Difference Between a Recipe and a Formula. *CuliNex*. https://www.culinex.biz/blog/culinex-news-events/blog/why-you-need-know-the-difference-between-a-recipe-and-a-formula.

Gordon Ramsay Restaurants. (2019, June 12). *The History of Beef Wellington is well worth celebrating.* https://www.gordonramsayrestaurants.com/inspiration/why-the-history-of-beef-wellington-is-well-worth-celebrating-beef-wellington-week/.

Grandi, A. (2018). *Denominazione di Origine Inventata*. Mondadori.

Hobsbawm, E. & Ranger, T. (1983). *The Invention of Tradition*. Cambridge University Press.

Jurafsky, D. (2014). *The Language of Food: A Linguist Reads the Menu.* W. W. Norton & Company.

Kripke, S. (1980). *Naming and Necessity*. Basil Blackwell.

Lévi-Strauss, C. (1983). *The Raw and the Cooked*. Chicago University Press. (Original work published in 1964)

Lovegren, S. (1995). *Fashionable Food: Seven Decades of Food Fads.* MacMillian.

Lu, A. C. C., Gursoy, D., & Lu, C. Y. (2015). Authenticity perceptions, brand equity and brand choice intention: The case of ethnic restaurants. *International Journal of Hospitality Management, 50*, 36–45. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2015.07.008.

Manning, P. (2010). The Semiotics of Brand. *Annual Review of Anthropology, 39*(1), 33–49

Ministero delle politiche agricole, alimentari e forestali. *Ruolo dei consorzi.* http://www.dop-igp.eu/flex/cm/pages/ServeBLOB.php/L/IT/IDPagina/10.

Montanari, M. (2006). *Food is Culture*. Columbia University press.

Moore, R. (2003). From genericide to viral marketing: on "brand". *Language & Communication, 23*(3), 331–357.

O'Connor, B. (2004) *The Law of Geographical Indications*, Cameron May Ltd.

Oliver, G. (2007) *Culinary arts: Talent and their development.* In S. D. Hales (Ed.), *Beer and Philosophy* (pp. 31–43). Blackwell Publishing ltd.

Panofsky, E. (1939) *Meaning in the Visual Arts*. Doubleday Anchor Books.

Putnam, H. (1975). The Meaning of "Meaning". *Minnesota Studies in the Philosophy of Science, 7*(3), 131–193.

Reebs, C. M. (2011). Sweet or Sour: Extending Copyright Protection to Food Art, *DePaul Journal of Art, Technology & Intellectual Proprty, 22*(1).

Sanburn, J. (2014, March 12). Europe's War on American Cheese. *Time.* https://time.com/22011/europes-war-on-american-cheese/.

Schuler, E. (1955). *German Cookery.* Crown Publishers.

Unesco. (2017). *Art of Neapolitan pizzaiuolo.* https://ich.unesco.org/en/RL/art-of-neapolitan-pizzaiuolo-00722

Varzi, A. (2009). On the Interplay between Logic and Metaphysics. *Linguistic and Philosophical Investigations, 8*, 13–36.

Vranešević´, T. & Stančec, R. (2003), "The effect of the brand on perceived quality of food products", *British Food Journal, 105*(11), 811–825. https://doi.org/10.1108/00070700310511609.