

**APICIUS**



# APICHIUS

A CRITICAL EDITION  
WITH AN INTRODUCTION AND  
AN ENGLISH TRANSLATION OF  
THE LATIN RECIPE TEXT *APICHIUS*

CHRISTOPHER GROCOCK and SALLY GRAINGER

with illustrations  
by  
Dan Shadrake



PROSPECT BOOKS  
2006

First published in Great Britain in 2006 by Prospect Books, Allaleigh House,  
Blackawton, Totnes, Devon, TQ9 7DL.

© 2006 edition, text and commentary Christopher Grocock & Sally Grainger.  
© 2006 illustrations Dan Shadrake.

The authors and editors assert their moral right to be identified as authors and editors in accordance with the Copyright, Designs & Patents Act 1988. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form of by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright holders.

ISBN 1-903018-13-7

Designed and typeset in Times Roman by Tom Jaine.  
Printed and bound in Great Britain by The Cromwell Press, Trowbridge.

WINSTONI

FIDELISSIMO

COMITI ET IVDICI



# PREFACE

Among the many enduring myths about ancient Rome is the view that much of the food consumed at high-status dinner-parties was overwhelmingly corrupt, rotten, over-seasoned and most definitely ‘not to our taste’.<sup>1</sup> The simpler Hellenistic style of cooking, depicted in Archestratus and in some of the fragmentary plays cited in Athenaeus, has been thought of as the original Mediterranean cuisine.<sup>2</sup> By contrast, the recipes in *Apicius*<sup>3</sup> have been regarded as a corruption or adulteration of this ‘ideal’, standing for a ‘silver’ or even ‘base metal’ culinary tradition inferior to the ‘golden age’ which preceded it. Such a view might be supported by the grotesque tastes of emperors such as Vitellius or Heliogabalus, but we do not think it can be sustained from a careful reading of the *Apicius* recipes, and owes more to a Gibbon-esque idea that ‘things got worse after the Republic’. It is true that, at first glance, the recipes in *Apicius* may appear all too complex and overpowering in their use of seasonings, and contrast with the

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Bober’s comment that ‘a perennial criticism from food writers is an alleged welter of ingredients of contrasting and self-defeating tastes’ (P. P. Bober, *Art, Culture, and Cuisine. Ancient and Medieval Gastronomy* (Chicago, 1999), p. 156; and Wilkins and Hill, ‘the predominant flavour we have found in ancient Greek food . . . is a rank, slightly rotting quality’, J. Wilkins and S. Hill, *The Life of Luxury: Archestratus* (Totnes, 1994), p. 23; most recently Wilkins and Hill speak of ‘the heavy spicing of Apicius’ (*Food in the Ancient World*, Malden MA and Oxford, 2006, p. 29). The function of elaborate dining as a social ritual is explored by K. M. D. Dunbabin, *The Roman Banquet: Images of Conviviality* (Cambridge, 2003).

<sup>2</sup> Bober, op. cit., p. 146.

<sup>3</sup> Except in the *explicits* to each book, throughout this work we use ‘Apicius’ to refer to the individual of that name, and *Apicius* to refer to the eponymous recipe text. See pp. 35ff. below.

allegedly more palatable image portrayed in literature of the Greek cuisine which preceded the Roman. However, Greek and Roman food were largely indistinguishable in the imperial period, above a certain economic class, and *Apicius* shows that the essence of this international Mediterranean cuisine lay in the enhancing of natural flavours with complex compound sauces – a fashion which already existed in the Greek cuisine of Archestratus’ day (the fourth century BC), for it is the origin of his protests.<sup>1</sup> Archestratus recommended serving foods simply, with the minimum of seasonings, and allowing the natural flavours of the food to shine through. This is an admirable style of cooking, but it does not satisfy an imaginative and experimental palate. As with literary tastes, surprise and complexity of expression came to dominate cuisine.

We fully accept that to turn the recipes in *Apicius* into successful dishes is a tricky business. Their very subtlety is easy to misinterpret, and the results of such misinterpretation would support a ‘myth of corruption’; but with care, the flavours of the various ingredients can be balanced (*temperas* is a recurring instruction) and the results can be stunning. *Apicius* has often been defined as a high-status cookery book intended for the cooks of only a small élite in society but, in our opinion, it contains a more egalitarian selection of recipes reflecting the culinary expectations of a wider group in the Roman world who might be defined as financially secure, urban and cosmopolitan.<sup>2</sup>

This is *not* a book of recipes to use in a modern kitchen: if you are looking for adapted recipes, use those in *Cooking Apicius* or *The Classical Cookbook*.<sup>3</sup> Here, we have rather attempted to solve the major problems of the text that in the past made reconstructing the recipes so difficult, and also to illustrate the cooking techniques and procedures that are unique to this cuisine. We have assumed that the recipes were once perfectly understandable to the cooks who wrote and used them, and our aim has therefore been to translate the text into functional recipes, where at all possible, and to give suggestions where the Latin is obscure. We have tried to make the edition accessible to all who are interested in Roman food, whatever their background, by translating all references to ancient sources

<sup>1</sup> Archestratus, fragment 45 (Athenaeus 311a). See also below, p. 40.

<sup>2</sup> As Brandt recognized: E. Brandt, *Untersuchungen zum Römischen Kochbuche. Philologus*, Supplementband XIX, Heft III (Leipzig, 1927), p. 30; see also Wilkins & Hill, *Food in the Ancient World*, p. 208.

<sup>3</sup> Sally Grainger, *Cooking Apicius* (Totnes, 2006); A. Dalby and S. Grainger, *The Classical Cookbook* (London and Los Angeles, 1996).

(all translations are our own) and by keeping academic jargon in its place; all Greek terms have been transliterated. The translation of the text is expanded in parentheses where necessary, to make clear the sense of a text which is often very compacted, and which uses technical phraseology in an idiomatic way. Many of the technical terms are simply untranslatable: no single English word could possibly convey the complexity of meaning found in terms unique to ancient cuisine. We have left these terms in italics, and recommend that the reader use the detailed glossary. We accept that some sections of our introduction (on the Latinity of *Apicius*, for example) may be of less interest to food historians than to others, but we have addressed these linguistic issues in order to inform and illuminate our arguments about the genre of culinary literature which the text represents.

Some have asked why it is necessary to have another edition and translation of *Apicius*. There are numerous works still available, which are discussed in the introduction. Previous editions have been edited and translated either by scholars whose understanding of the technology and processes of the kitchen was limited to varying degrees, or (in one instance) by a chef whose understanding of Latin was sometimes questionable. It would be rare indeed to find a single scholar who possessed the requisite skills in both areas. We trust that between us we have effectively brought our respective skills to bear on the problems posed by the *Apicius* text.

The text, translation and commentary contained in this volume are the result of studies and activities undertaken over the past 15 years in a broad range of fields, embracing philology, social history, and archaeology – the latter including practical experiments. Each of these has informed the other on a continuous basis in an iterative process which we believe has been well worth the effort involved. In particular, over a decade of experimental archaeology using replica equipment and trials of the cooking techniques using charcoal and wood has enabled us to understand the recipes to a much greater depth than we did at the start. We trust that our conclusions, which we do not claim to be the final word on *Apicius*, may prompt further research.

Finally, we have to confess that we are to some extent motivated by a concern for the long-dead individuals whose skills and talents have been too often overlooked or misunderstood. Previous editions and translations have concluded, following Brandt's work of 1927, that a late redactor was responsible for the Latin in the text and therefore to some extent for the recipes themselves. As this

## APICIUS

volume makes clear, we beg to differ. We conclude that *Apicius* originates not in any redactor or man of letters, but with cooks whose practical skills were perhaps better honed than their linguistic ones. Their care and thought for their trade, like the Faliscans who ‘spent their life producing sumptuous dishes for pleasant living’,<sup>1</sup> is infused in this legacy of the ancient world which they have left behind, though they themselves are unnamed in history and long forgotten. A key justification for the new edition is to raise their profile and return credit for the recipes to these ancient cooks.

We are deeply indebted for their generosity and assistance to Dr Andrew Dalby, Professor Alan Davison, Susan Weingarten, Larry G. Simpson, Miriam Mandelbaum and Arlene Shaner of the New York Academy of Medicine, and to Chris Lydamore of Harlow Museum. Particular gratitude is due to our publisher Tom Jaine for his limitless patience and unceasing encouragement, and to Dan Shadrake for the splendid illustrations. We would also like to express our thanks for their patience and professional support to the library staff of the Institute of Classical Studies, the Warburg Institute, the Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris, and the British Library. We beg any others whose assistance has gone unmentioned here to forgive us; we acknowledge our debt to numerous individuals with whom conversation and debate has borne fruit. Needless to say, we accept full responsibility for any errors or omissions which remain.

CHRISTOPHER GROCOCK

SALLY GRAINGER

<sup>1</sup> See Introduction, p. 67.

# CONTENTS

## INTRODUCTION

1. <i>APICIUS</i> AND ITS CONTEXT	13
What is <i>Apicius</i> ?	13
For whom was <i>Apicius</i> intended?	23
The <i>Apicius</i> text – an overview	25
The Vinidarius collection	32
<i>Apicius</i> in its context	35
2. COOKS AND ANCIENT COOKERY BOOKS	39
The Greek tradition	39
Greek culinary writing in the Roman period	44
Cookery books – the Roman tradition	46
Marcus Gavius Apicius – history and legend	54
Greek and Roman medical writing	58
Veterinary texts	61
Roman cooks and their recipes	63
Conclusion	71
3. COOKING TECHNIQUES IN THE ANCIENT WORLD	73
4. ROMAN WEIGHTS AND MEASURES	83
5. THE LANGUAGE OF <i>APICIUS</i>	86
The vocabulary of cooking techniques	86
The style and grammar of <i>Apicius</i> .	95
6. EDITORIAL PRINCIPLES AND METHODS	107
7. DESCRIPTION OF THE MANUSCRIPTS AND STEMMA	116
8. PREVIOUS EDITIONS AND STUDIES	120
THE LATIN AND ENGLISH TEXTS OF <i>APICIUS</i>	125
THE LATIN AND ENGLISH TEXTS OF VINIDARIUS	309
APPENDICES	327
1. A glossary to <i>Apicius</i>	329
2. Original sources on Apicius	363

## APICIUS

3. Named recipes in <i>Apicius</i>	369
4. Excursus on <i>garum</i> and <i>liquamen</i>	373
5. Concordance of recipes with earlier editions	389
 SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY	405
 INDEX	409

## ILLUSTRATIONS

1. An artist's reconstruction of the kitchen in the 'House of the Two Atria' of Modestus and Sabinus (VI.28,29) Herculaneum	74
2. An artist's impression of the ceramic hearths of Pompeii	76
3. An artist's impression of the metal fire boxes from Pompeii	76
4. A <i>patina</i> buried in the hot embers	78
5. A <i>patina</i> with hot embers on the top of the lid as well as below	78
6. A <i>patina</i> used on a trivet above the fire with a lid that functions as a <i>testum</i>	78
7. A <i>testum</i> with a loaf of bread inside	80
8. A <i>testum</i> being used as an oven to cook meat	80

# INTRODUCTION

## 1. *APICIUS* AND ITS CONTEXT

### *What is Apicius?*

The recipe text known as *Apicius* is the sole survivor of a process of collecting recipes which began long before it reached the form in which we know it, and which certainly continued for a long time afterwards. It is certainly not the work of one author, whether he be gourmet, cook or editor, but a rather haphazard collection assembled over many centuries. From the text as it survives, it is impossible to know who created the particular format, order and titles of *Apicius*, and when they did it. We can however be sure that the recipes were initially and primarily the work of cooks. The majority of the recipes are written in a style and with a vocabulary that belongs to cooks alone: *Apicius* is a ‘special literature’, and ‘presupposes readers with a certain “technical” knowledge and appropriate skills’.<sup>1</sup> In order both to create and to understand the kind of recipes that survive in *Apicius*, hands-on culinary skills are a prerequisite. It is simply not possible to theorize a recipe without testing it, and this needs skill and experience.

<sup>1</sup> See N. Vasilieva, ‘Semiological notes on the *De Arte Coquinaria* by Apicius’, in *Latin Vulgaire, Latin Tardif: Actes du colloque internationale sur le latin vulgaire et tardif* (Pécs, 2-5 Septembre 1985) (Tübingen, 1987), 199-205, at p. 199.

The phenomenon of the amateur cook is a familiar one today: we all dabble in the kitchen and have a basic understanding of the science behind cooking, even if we have varying degrees of success with the outcome. But in the Roman world, the slave economy governed all areas of domestic labour. High-status cooking was very labour-intensive and simply not to be contemplated by the *gourmet* who was interested in food. Cicero defined all occupations that were involved with producing physical pleasure for others as disgraceful.<sup>1</sup> It is not impossible to imagine that a high-status gourmet might have broken through that barrier and learned how to cook for the sake of his interest, but it is not likely to have been thought socially acceptable and would have surely resulted in public condemnation. In *Satire* 2.4, Horace elevates culinary lore to a philosophical theory in order to ridicule gourmets, but this discussion of the *minutiae* of gastronomy nevertheless reflects precisely the kind of literary form we find and should expect from a gourmet genuinely interested in food.<sup>2</sup> The gourmet is interested in the theoretical, not practical, aspect of food before it reaches his table, and is more concerned with selecting produce, thinking up ways to enrich meat before slaughter, knowing where to get the best of everything, and eating the results.<sup>3</sup> The activity which takes place between selection and consumption, and which is carried out in the sooty, greasy kitchen, is simply not part of his world.

The majority of surviving (or reported) literature about food in the ancient world appears to be narrative-based: the various attributes of the foods are discussed in general and the recipes are interspersed. *Apicius* consists almost entirely of lists of recipes without a voice.<sup>4</sup> Such a narrative-free collection is much more suited to the use of cooks and cookery schools than to that of gourmets, and it is unlikely to have been ‘published’ in the way in which, say, histories were. Its literary merit is small, and such a collection is hardly likely to have satisfied trivia-hungry gourmets. It is perfectly possible, as we will argue,

<sup>1</sup> Cicero, *De officiis* 1.150.

<sup>2</sup> See the section ‘Cooks and Ancient Cookery books’, pp. 39ff., below. The passage is quoted in full in Appendix 4.

<sup>3</sup> This is precisely the kind of culinary knowledge that is firmly attributed to Marcus Gavius Apicius. See Pliny, *HN*. 8.209, 9.66, 10.133.

<sup>4</sup> There are two small indistinct voices in the recipes: at 1.13, ‘you will be amazed at the flavour in your food’ i.e. *laser*; and 4.2.12, ‘no-one will know what they are eating’. Either of these remarks may have been directed to another cook or to a wider audience such as a gourmet selecting a menu.

## INTRODUCTION

that a collection of recipes without narrative could have been ‘informally’ copied and distributed for many years among cooks and cookery schools before possibly being appropriated by the literary establishment, either in part or in full, for use in general cookery books compiled and distributed by the literary élite. Recipes could have started their life in collections created and held by cooks and ended up as part of a named cookery book such as that written by Matius.<sup>1</sup>

An interesting question to ask at this point might be: whose recipes were they? Were recipes included in a literary work by a named author such as Matius regarded as his, or as belonging to others?<sup>2</sup> We would argue in any case that the recipes in *Apicius* are the cooks’ recipes, and that the text as it has come down to us bears no evidence of shaping or tampering by a high-status compiler and/or collator.<sup>3</sup> To use an image from a later period, it is a text from ‘below stairs’.

We know that other collections of recipes existed in the empire with the same title, as is demonstrated by the existence of the *Excerpta Vinidarii*, a small selection of recipes with a spice and ingredient list at the beginning. The identity of Vinidarius is obscure but, as his title indicates, he may have been a high-status functionary in the Roman regime of the late empire. While some of the recipes in the *Excerpta* are very similar to those in *Apicius*, others differ markedly in the terms they use and in the spices included. The Latin in the *Excerpta* is often of a considerably poorer quality than that of *Apicius*. The phonetic spelling and lack of case agreement suggest a ‘Late Latin’ text, in marked contrast to *Apicius* itself, which may have recipes in it of a much earlier period.<sup>4</sup>

Some of the recipes in *Apicius* probably date from at least the first century AD. At 1.16 and 7.1.1, we find reference to Cyrenaican *laser* which, according to Pliny the Elder, was extinct by c. AD 50.<sup>5</sup> At 1.10, the instruction to infuse pine nuts in *laser* may be an indication that the latter was in short supply. Parthian *laser* does not seem to have been particularly scarce in the later empire, though it was expensive. We find three recipes associated with Vitellius (*d.* AD 70), who

<sup>1</sup> See ‘Cooks and ancient cookery books’, p. 53, below.

<sup>2</sup> We find evidence that cooks could hold rights over their recipes as early as the fifth century BC. The Sybarites in the Gulf of Tarentum enacted a law allowing no one else but the cook-inventor to have sole use of his successful recipe for a year. See Athenaeus, 521d, A. Dalby, *Empire of Pleasure: Luxury and Indulgence in the Roman World* (London 2000), p. 68.

<sup>3</sup> Brandt identified a ‘reviser’ who put the collection together, but we disagree with this conclusion: see below, pp. 18ff.

<sup>4</sup> On Vinidarius, see p. 32.

<sup>5</sup> See Pliny, *HN*. 19.38-35, 22.100-6, and the Glossary, *silphium*.

was notorious for his appetite, and we can plausibly date them to his lifetime or soon after. Recipes attributed to Trajan (early second century AD) and Commodus (before c. AD 180) can be dated to that era.<sup>1</sup> We might also attribute the recipes given the title *Apicana* to the various men known to have born that name, who all date to the first and second centuries AD.<sup>2</sup> It is perhaps unsurprising that the majority of the recipes have no evidence within them that could indicate a date of origin. However, given that a small but significant number seem to be early in date, there is no reason to suppose that many more recipes were not also of early date.

Some other recipes may hint at an early origin: *lucanicae* (2.4) were particular sausages that came from *Magna Graecia* and were introduced to Rome by the soldiers after the first conquests in the second century BC, though the name persists to this day. In addition, any recipe which survives may have had a long history; for example, the *patina* as a meal is attested in the mid-first century BC in Roman menus, and has its origins in a Greek term for a dish or vessel. A similar meal known as a *patella tyrotaricha* is also attested in the mid-first century BC.<sup>3</sup> *Apicius* also includes many recipes which are attributed to various apparently historical figures whose precise identity is obscure.<sup>4</sup> Dating these recipes with any precision is therefore impossible. We can only say that the names with which these recipes are associated may be linked with individuals identified in the historical record over a long period, spanning the second and third (and occasionally the fourth) centuries.

Because the collection seems to have been developed over a long period of time, the unclassical stylistic features and spellings preserved in the MSS cannot be used as evidence for dating the recipes as first devised, though they may indicate the period at which the recipe collection stopped growing. In any case, many of these unclassical Latin features are not definitely time-specific, and might be better considered the kind of vulgar Latin spoken and written by the lower classes throughout the Roman era.<sup>5</sup>

It might be more useful, therefore, to try to define the collection in terms of its origins. The recipes with a strong link to Apicius, the *Apicana*, would seem

<sup>1</sup> See 8.7.16; 5.4.2.

<sup>2</sup> *Apicana* recipes: 4.1.2, 4.2.14, 4.3.3, 5.4.2, 6.7, 7.4.2, 8.7.6.

<sup>3</sup> *Patina*: Macrobius 3.13.13; *Patella*: Cicero, *Ad fam.* 9.16.9.

<sup>4</sup> See Appendix 4 on these named recipes.

<sup>5</sup> See below, ‘The language of *Apicius*’, p. 95.

## INTRODUCTION

to be the most logical place to look. These recipes (there are only seven) may well have come from a single source. We know that a work ‘On the luxury of Apicius’, written in Greek in the first century AD by a man called Apion, existed, and it is possible that these recipes originated there.<sup>1</sup> An alternative view would be that all the *Apiciana* recipes are labelled thus because they are considered luxury or sophisticated and they have no direct link with the Apicius legend. The individual titles to the books in our text are in Greek; a great many of the recipes and their culinary concepts are also of Greek origin. It seems very likely that the order and chapter titles of *Apicius* were taken from an original Greek recipe book, given the prominence of that language, and that they were devised at an early stage in the evolution of the collection, though it is impossible to prove this.<sup>2</sup> However, the fact that Greek culinary tradition was predominant in the early empire makes it likely that many of the original recipes which formed the basis of the *Apicius* text were originally written in Greek. At that time there was no independent, truly Roman, culinary tradition in high-status Roman society: all available recipe books or general cookery books in the public domain in the late republic and early empire were Greek in origin, if not in language.<sup>3</sup> *Apicius* may be a Roman recipe book written (mainly) in Latin, but it was probably a Hellenistic collection of recipes at its inception, and continued to be one.

The Greek cuisine which arrived in Rome in the second century BC was not static; it was adapted to Roman tastes, disseminated and perfected (or not, according to your point of view) under the Roman empire. Thus, during the middle and late empire, the *Apicius* collection seems to have evolved, with the addition of many new recipes. Large sections in some books may have been added, particularly in Book 1, which contains some non-domestic recipes for preserving goods in bulk that we might not expect in the original recipe book. The version of *Apicius* from which the *Excerpta Vinidarii* was made also appears to have contained simple lists of supplies which a household should keep in stock. It is possible that recipe collections such as these were periodically

<sup>1</sup> See below, p. 37.

<sup>2</sup> See below, p. 47, on cooks and ancient cookery books.

<sup>3</sup> We are not suggesting that Greek and Roman food at every level was the same: there might be huge regional differences and specialities from one community to the next depending on local produce and tradition. However for the ‘middle class’ and above, and even at a domestic level, *patinae* and *minutalia* were cooked and served all over the empire; piglets were boned, stuffed and boiled, and fish served with rich fruity sauces.

rearranged when they were re-copied. In fact, recipe books throughout the ages rarely remain the same size. Early versions of the first French cookery book, from the fourteenth century, which is later known as the *Viandier of Taillevant*, are considerably smaller than the final versions.<sup>1</sup> A similar situation also occurs with the first Italian recipe book of the Renaissance: *The Art of Cooking composed by the eminent Maestro Martino of Como*. One of the three manuscripts has been greatly enlarged by a scribe or gourmet.<sup>2</sup>

As each new version of the collection was copied, new recipes could be added, written or dictated by cooks who were Greek or Roman, slave or freedman, imbued with the same ‘classical’ Greek cooking principles as their forebears. They continued to use the same Greek concepts and vocabulary, even though they did not necessarily recognize them as un-Roman; by this stage everything in the recipes could be termed ‘Roman’.<sup>3</sup> One might equate this situation to that of the culinary climate of Europe 40 years ago: above a certain status, good food was based on the precepts of ‘classical’ French techniques. A chef in Britain created recipes that were basically French in style. Ancient Greece might usefully be compared to France in this scenario, while the rest of Europe including Rome maintains the same position in both eras. During this process the Latin used by the cooks may not have changed very much: they were skilled people and clearly not illiterate, but working men who wrote in a form of Latin that was spoken on the streets and among slaves and labourers, and was always considered inferior to literary Latin by their betters.

Brandt’s extensive study published in 1927 concluded that the recipe collection was gathered into its current format at some time during the fourth century AD by a ‘reviser’ who took recipes from a number of different literary sources including some early Imperial culinary, dietetic and agricultural works.<sup>4</sup> Brandt’s study is limited by his treatment of the recipes purely as text, and he gave no

<sup>1</sup> D.E. Scully, T. Scully, *Early French Cookery: Sources, History, Original Recipes and Modern Adaptations* (University of Michigan 1995), p. 9.

<sup>2</sup> Luigi Ballerini, *The Art of Cookery, the First Modern Cookery Book* (Berkeley CA, 2005).

<sup>3</sup> J. Herman, *Vulgar Latin* (trans. R. Wright, University Park PA, 2000) reflects that ‘it is interesting to realize that the names of simple utensils and common dishes, were Latin, whereas more complicated utensils and less common but more luxurious dishes have Greek names; thus *puls* (porridge) and *farcimen* (sausage meat) are native Latin words, while *isictium* (a kind of rissole), *embamma* (a kind of strong sauce or acidic condiment), and others are taken from Greek’ (p. 106).

<sup>4</sup> Brandt, *Untersuchungen*, pp. 30, 36, 130-3.

## INTRODUCTION

consideration to the practicalities of the food they reflect. Recipes are not like poems, fixed in their structure, but are far more likely to be fluid and constantly evolving. He took it for granted that all the recipes had a specific known literary source rather than being gathered in a random *ad hoc* fashion. Such a mechanical approach was bound to lead to false conclusions. Brandt wished to identify the original sources for the various recipes in the collection, and so he analyzed their form and content according to vocabulary, Greek terminology, and specifically by their use (or not) of precise quantities. The digestive remedies that occur in *Apicius* all contain precise quantities: this led Brandt to compare 1.13 with a recipe for a similar digestive remedy found in Marcellus Medicus 30.51. Though they are vaguely similar, it is not necessary to claim, as he did, that Marcellus was therefore the source of this recipe.<sup>1</sup> Brandt also attributed the other remedies in *Apicius* at 3.18.2 and 3 to Marcellus, using the principle that if one was derived from that work, they all must have been. He then concluded that recipes which use precise quantities must also be from a medical work, even though they give no other indication to support such an origin. Those recipes which use Greek terms were also attributed to a Greek dietetic cookbook.<sup>2</sup>

As we have already suggested, we think that the use of Greek terms denotes the primary and original source for the recipes, rather than late additions to an already-existing collection. The use of quantities in itself does not necessarily indicate medical recipes, and their inclusion seems to be more about the choice and habit of the cook, rather than an indication of a specific source.<sup>3</sup>

Brandt also suggested that recipes from Book 1 (and some in Book 3) came from agricultural manuals, which is a perfectly sound theory; the recipes in Book 1 clearly reflect a different strand of culinary writing. The Latin is more complex and polished, and the recipes themselves, he suggested, are more concerned with the cellarman than the cook, and seem out of place in a recipe book.<sup>4</sup> It is possible that a specific agricultural treatise was the source for those recipes

<sup>1</sup> Brandt, *Untersuchungen*, pp. 41-2.

<sup>2</sup> Brandt, *Untersuchungen*, pp. 38, 132-3.

<sup>3</sup> The recipes which Brandt links together here, 4.2.4/5/8/9/31/33/36, are *patinae* (see the Glossary). They all use precise quantities, while other recipes of a similar nature do not. They also use the Greek term *thermospodium* for ‘hot ashes’ in the cooking technique (see the Glossary). Such Greek words indicate a particular ‘higher-status’ culinary language: see above, p. 18 n. 3; Brandt, *Untersuchungen*, p. 38. See also ‘Roman weights and measures’, p. 83, below.

<sup>4</sup> Brandt, *Untersuchungen*, p. 37.

&lt;III, IIII, V, VI DESVNT &gt;

## &lt;VII. IN ANSERE.&gt;

**anserem elixum calidum ex iure frigido Apiciano:** teres piper ligusticum

coriandri semen mentam rutam; refundis liquamen et oleum modice, temperas.

5 anserem elixum feruentem sabano mundo exsiccabis, ius perfundis et inferes.

**VIII. IN PULLO.**[6.8.1] **elixo ius crudum:** adicies in mortarium aneti semen mentam sicciam laseris radicem; suffundis acetum; adicies careotam, refundis liquamen senapis modicum et oleum, defrito temperas et sic mittis.10 [6.8.2] **pullum anetatum:** mellis modice, liquamine temperabis. leuas pullum coctum et sabano mundo siccias; caraxas et ius scissuris infundis ut conuiuat, et cum conuiuerit assabis et suo sibi iure pinnis tangis. piper aspersum inferes.[6.8.3] **pullum Particum:** pullum aperies a naui et in quadrato ornas. teres piper ligusticum carei modicum, suffunde liquamen, uino temperas. conponis 15 in cumana pullum et conditaram super pullum facies. laser uiuum in tepida dissoluis, et in pullum mittis simul et quoques. piper aspersum inferes.[6.8.4] **pullum oxizomum:** olei acetabulum maiorem, <uini> satis modice, liquaminis acetabulum minorem, aceti acetabulum perquam minorem, piperis scripulos sex, petrosilenum scripulum, porros fasciculum.20 [6.8.5] **pullum Numidicum:** pullum curas, elixas, leuas, laser ac piper <aspergis> et assas. teres piper cuminum coriandri semen laseris radicem rutam careotam nucleos; suffundis acetum mel liquamen et oleum; temperabis. cum ferbuerit, amulo obligas, pullum perfundis, piper aspergis et inferes.

2. <VII. IN ANSERE> *Hum*            3. ex *G*: et *VE*            4. liquamine *E1*            7. VIII  
*in l/h marg. V | IN PVLLO <in pullo> Hum*            8. sinapis *Hum*            9. defricto *V*  
10. <aliter> pullum anethatum *Bra2* | modico et *GiVo* | leuas *Sch*: lauas *VE*            11. combibat *Hum*  
12. cum conuiuerit *V*: cum uiuerit *E*: cum combiberit *Hum* | pinnis *VE*: penitus *Vo* | tangis *P*: tongis *V*:  
ton.gis *E*: pertangis *Hum*            13. particum *E*: partium *V*            14. componis *V*            15. pulum  
*E1* | laser uiuum *Vo*: laser et uinum *VE* | in tepida *Bas*: interidas *VE*: radas *Sch*            16. coques *E*  
17. oleum *E* | <uini> *CGSG*: <laseris> *Gi*: lacuna André            19. scripulis sex *V* | petrosilenum *E*  
| scripulum *MD*: scriptulum *VE*            20. NVMIDVM *V* | leuas *Bra2*: lauas *VE* | laser ac *André*:  
laseras *VE*: lasere ac *GiVo* | <aspergis> *GiVo*            22. ferbuerit *E2*: feruuerit *V, E1*

---

<sup>1</sup> *temperas* is normally translated as ‘blend’ but it can also mean to balance the flavours of a dish with *liquamen* or some form of Roman wine. *Temperas* here stands alone; the *liquamen* and a little

(Sections 3, 4, 5, 6 are missing)

## 6.7. GOOSE.

**Hot boiled goose in a cold Apician sauce:** pound pepper, lovage, coriander seed, mint, rue; pour on *liquamen* and a little oil; balance the flavours.<sup>1</sup> Dry the hot boiled goose with a clean towel, pour the sauce on and serve.

## 6.8. CHICKEN.

6.8.1. **Uncooked sauce for boiled chicken:** put dill seed, dried mint, and *laser* root into a mortar, pour on vinegar, add date, pour on *liquamen*, a little mustard and oil, flavour with *defrutum* and use as it is.

6.8.2. **Chicken in dill sauce:** flavour (the above sauce) with a little honey and *liquamen*. Take the cooked chicken out of the pan and dry it with a clean towel. Make cuts in the flesh and pour the sauce into the cuts so that it absorbs it; and when it has absorbed it, roast it and baste it with the sauce using its feathers. Serve sprinkled with pepper.

6.8.3. **Parthian chicken:** draw the chicken from the rear and cut it into quarters. Pound pepper, lovage, a little caraway, pour on *liquamen*, flavour with wine. Arrange the chicken pieces in a ceramic dish, put the sauce over the chicken. Dissolve fresh *laser* in warm water<sup>2</sup> and put it straightaway on the chicken and cook it. Sprinkle with pepper and serve.

6.8.4. **Chicken in a sour sauce:** a generous cup of oil, just enough wine,<sup>3</sup> a small cup of *liquamen*, a very small cup of vinegar, 6 scruples of pepper, 1 scruple of parsley, and a bundle of leek.

6.8.5. **Numidian chicken:** prepare the chicken, (par-)boil it and lift it out; sprinkle with *laser* and pepper and roast it. Pound pepper, cumin, coriander seed, *laser* root, rue, date, pine nuts; pour on vinegar, honey, *liquamen* and oil; balance the flavours. When it comes to heat, thicken with starch, pour over the chicken, sprinkle with pepper and serve.

oil in the recipe are governed by *refundis* and so it appears to have been used in the simple sense of ‘blend’; however the sauce has no sweetness or sharpness at all, which is very odd in a Roman sauce. Consequently we have translated the word with the added meaning ‘balance the flavours’, i.e. with a sweet wine or sharp vinegar as required.

<sup>2</sup> See the Glossary, *laser*, for discussion of the term *uiuum*.

<sup>3</sup> *satis modice* is an odd combination of qualifying instructions, which we interpret as being ‘enough but a little’.

- [6.8.6] **pullum laseratum**: pullum aperies a nabi, lauabis, ornabis et in cumana ponis. teres piper ligisticum laser uiuum, suffundis liquamen, uino et liquamine temperabis, et mittis pullum. coctus si fuerit, piper aspersum inferes.
- 5 [6.8.7] **pullum paroptum**: laseris modicum, piperis scripulos sex, olei acetabulum, liquaminis acetabulum, petrosilene modice.
- [6.8.8] **pullum elixum ex iure suo**: teres piper cuminum timi modicum feniculi semen mentam rutam laseris radicem; suffundis acetum, adicies careotam et teres. melle aceto liquamine et oleo temperabis. pullum refrigeratum et mittis siccatum, quem perfusum inferes.
- 10 [6.8.9] **pullum elixum cum cucurbitis elixis**: iure supra scripto, addito sinape, perfundis et inferes.
- [6.8.10] **pullum elixum cum cologasiis elixis**: supra scripto iure perfundis et inferes. farcies inelixum etiam oliuus columbaribus, non ualde ita ut laxamentum habeat ne dissiliat dum quoquirit in ollam submissus in sportellam. cum bullierit, 15 frequenter leuas et ponis ne dissiliat.
- 20 [6.8.11] **pullus Vardanus**: pullum quoques iure hoc: liquamine oleo uino fasciculum porri coriandri satureiae; cum coctus fuerit teres piper; nucleos ciatos duos et ius de suo sibi subfundis et fasciculos proicies. lac temperas et reexinanies [in] mortarium supra pullum, ut ferueat. obligas eundem aluamentis ouorum tritis, ponis in lance et iure supra scripto perfundis. hoc ius candidum appellatur.
- [6.8.12] **pullum Frontonianum**: pullum praedura, condies liquamine oleo mixto, cui mittis fasciculum aneti porri satureiae et coriandri uiridis, et quoques. ubi coctus fuerit leuabis eum, in lance defrito perungues, piper aspargis et inferes.

1. RASSERATVM <i>V</i>   aperies <i>Hum</i> : asperges <i>VE</i>   in $\zeta$ . <i>om. VE</i>	5. petroselini <i>E</i>   modicę <i>E</i>
8. melle <i>VE</i> : mel <i>Hum</i>   et oleo <i>D</i> : ex oleo <i>VE</i>   siccatum mittis <i>Hum</i>	11. perfundis
<i>Hum</i> : piper fundis <i>VE</i>	12. cologasiis <i>VE</i> : colocasiis <i>TP</i>
etiam <i>CGSG</i> : facit et in elixam et in <i>VE</i> : facis et in elixa et in <i>Vo</i> : <i>lacuna after</i> et in <i>André</i> , with two recipes combined   columbaribus <i>V</i> : columbaribus <i>E</i> : columbadibus <i>Hum</i> : <i>lacuna after this word Vo</i>	13. farcies inelixum
14. coquitur <i>E</i>   olla <i>T</i>   sportella <i>GiVo</i>	15. leuas <i>Sch</i> : lauas <i>VE</i>
16. Varianus <i>Hum</i>   coques <i>E</i>	17. <cui mittis> fasciculum <i>GiVo</i>   satureiae <i>Hum</i> : satureia <i>VE</i>
18. suffundis <i>E</i>	19. in <i>del. Sch</i>
<i>EI</i>	21. appellatur <i>EI</i>
23. satureiae $\zeta$ satureia <i>VE</i>   coques <i>E</i>	22. Frotitonianum
	24. leuabis <i>Hum</i> : lauabis <i>VE</i>

<sup>1</sup> We have emended the MSS readings considerably here: the text is very corrupt. We assume that *columbaribus* is an odd spelling for *oliuae columbades*, ‘olives in brine’, hence ‘preserved olives’;

6.8.6. **Chicken in a *laser* sauce:** draw the chicken from the rear, wash it and dress it and arrange in a ceramic dish. Pound pepper, lovage, fresh *laser*, pour on *liquamen*, flavour with wine and *liquamen* and put over the chicken. When it is cooked, serve sprinkled with pepper.

6.8.7. **Roast chicken:** a little *laser*, 6 scruples of pepper, a cup of oil, a cup of *liquamen*, a little parsley.

6.8.8. **Chicken boiled in its own sauce:** pound pepper, cumin, a little thyme, fennel seed, mint, rue, *laser* root; pour on vinegar, add date and pound. Flavour with honey, vinegar, *liquamen* and oil. Cool and dry the chicken and serve in the sauce.

6.8.9. **Boiled chicken with boiled gourds:** pour the sauce written above, with the addition of mustard, over the chicken and serve.

6.8.10. **Boiled chicken with boiled taros:** pour over the sauce written above and serve. You can also stuff the un-boiled bird with preserved olives,<sup>1</sup> but not with too many, so that some space remains and it does not burst while it is cooking in the pot, lowered there in a basket. When it is boiling lift it out and replace it frequently so that it does not burst.<sup>2</sup>

6.8.11. **Vardanian chicken:**<sup>3</sup> cook the chicken with this sauce: a bundle of leek, coriander and savory, in *liquamen*, oil, wine; when it is cooked, pound pepper, two cups of pine nuts, and pour on the cooking liquor and discard the bundle. Blend with milk and pour the contents of the mortar over the chicken and bring it to heat. Thicken it with beaten white of egg. Place the chicken on a serving dish and pour the sauce written above over it. This is called a white sauce.

6.8.12. **Frontonian chicken:** sear the outside of the chicken, flavour with a mixture of *liquamen* and oil, to which you add a bundle of dill, leek, savory and green coriander and cook it. When it is cooked, lift it out, drizzle *defrutum* over it on the serving dish, sprinkle with pepper and serve.

from the Greek *kolumbades elaai*. See for example Athenaeus 56b; Dalby, *Food in the Ancient World*, p. 238.

<sup>2</sup> 6.8.10 has been interpreted as two recipes by FR and André. It is very poorly preserved, yet does make more sense gathered together as one recipe. It seems to be referring to a galantine rather than to a whole chicken. An un-boned chicken would not be in danger of bursting, while one completely free of bone and possibly stitched together would certainly need this special treatment. See recipe 6.8.15 of this chapter where there are obscure instructions at the end of the recipe to bone the capon or chicken required.

<sup>3</sup> Presumably named after a ‘Vardanus’; see Appendix 3.

- [6.8.13] **pullus tractogalatus**: pullum quoques liquamine oleo uino, cui mittis fasciculum coriandri, cepam. deinde cum coctus fuerit leuabis eum de iure suo et mittis in caccabum nouum lac et salem modicum, mel et aquae minimum, id est tertiam partem. ponis ad ignem lentum ut tepescat; tractum confringis et  
5 mittis paulatim; assidue agitas ne uratur. pullum illic mittis integrum uel carptum, uersabis in lance, quem perfundis ius tale: piper ligisticum origanum; suffundis mel et defritum modicum et ius de suo sibi. temperas. in caccabulo facies ut bulliat. cum bullierit, amulo obligas et inferes.
- [6.8.14] **pullus farsilis**: pullum sicut in iure cuminato. a ceruice expedes. teres  
10 piper ligisticum gengiber pulpam cesam aliquam elixam, teres cerebellum ex iure coctum. oua confringis et commiscis ut unum corpus efficias. liquamine temperas et oleum modice; mittis piper integrum, nucleos abundantes. fac impensam et imples pullum uel porcellum ita ut laxamentum habeat. similiter in capo facies. ossibus ejectis coquies.
- 15 [6.8.15] **pullus leocozomus**: accipies pullum et ornas ut supra. aperies illum a pectore. †...accipiat aquam et oleum Spanum abundans. agitatur ut ex se amulet et humorem consumat...† postea, cum coctus fuerit, quodcumque porri remanserit inde leuas. piper aspargis et inferes.

## EXPLICIT TROPETES LIBER SEXTUS

- |   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
| 1. quoques <i>V</i> <i>EI</i> : coques <i>E2</i>   oleum <i>V</i>   | 2. leuabis <i>Hum</i> : lauabis <i>VE</i>   | 3. aque  |
| minimum <i>E</i> : aquam eminimum <i>V</i>  | 4. id est . . partem <i>del. Bra2</i>   | 5. adsiduę <i>E</i>                                  |
| carptum <i>Hum</i> : cariotum <i>VE</i>   | 7. defritum <i>Hum</i> : defrito <i>VE</i>  | 9. farsilis <i>Hum</i> :                             |
| fusilis <i>VE</i>   sicut in iure cuminato <i>CGSG</i> : sicut ilique cuminatum <i>VE</i> : sicuti liquaminatum <i>Bra3</i>   acer uice <i>VE</i> | 10. gingiber <i>E</i>   pulpam <i>P</i> : pulpe <i>V2,E</i> : pulpe <i>VI</i>   aliquam <i>VE</i> : | <i>fusilis VE</i>                                    |
| alicam $\zeta$  | 14. capo <i>Ven</i> : capso <i>VE</i>   | 15. <i>VE place</i> pullus leocozomus <i>after a</i> |
| 17. amulet <i>Bas</i> : ambulet <i>VE</i>   porro <i>P</i> , <i>GiVo</i>  | 18. leues <i>E</i>  | 16. spanus <i>E</i>                                  |
|   |   | 19. VI <i>E</i>                                      |

---

<sup>1</sup> The first sauce in this recipe seems to be rather thick: the suggestion that it might burn implies as much. The chicken and first sauce are poured out together in one go implying that it binds the chicken into one mass. The second sauce is also thickened with starch but would be relatively clear and cover the first one with a glossy sheen.

<sup>2</sup> Our conjecture here attempts to make some sense of the MSS reading *sicut ilique cuminatum*. The problem with the recipe is that neither cumin nor a sauce are indicated in the recipe itself, and if we try to imitate the pattern of instructions found in other recipes, a sauce is needed. *cuminatum* is also referred to in 1.29, 2.4.6, 3.21.3, 4.2.10. *FR*, André and Milham all follow Brandt, who

6.8.13. **Chicken cooked with milk and *tracta***: cook the chicken in *liquamen*, oil, and wine, to which you add a bundle of coriander, and onion. Then when it is cooked, lift it from the cooking liquor. Then put in a new pan milk, a little salt, honey and a little water: that is, a third of the volume. Put it on a gentle fire so that it warms through. Crumble *tracta* and sprinkle them in gradually, stir constantly so that it does not burn. Put the chicken in whole or jointed. Turn out on to a serving dish and pour on this kind of sauce:<sup>1</sup> pepper, lovage, oregano; pour on honey and a little *defrutum* and some of the cooking liquor. Balance the flavours. Bring to the boil in the pan. When it has boiled, thicken with starch and serve.

6.8.14. **Stuffed chicken**:<sup>2</sup> the chicken (is prepared) as if (served) with a cumin sauce. Draw the chicken from the neck, pound pepper, lovage, ginger, chopped meat, boiled *alica*, pounded brains cooked in stock; break eggs and stir them all to make a smooth mixture. Flavour with *liquamen* and a little oil, add whole peppercorns and plenty of pine nuts. Make the stuffing and fill the chicken or piglet in such a way that some space remains. You can do the same with a capon. Cook with the bones taken out.

6.8.15. **Chicken in a white sauce**:<sup>3</sup> take a chicken and dress as above. Open the bird at the breast. †...let it have water and plenty of Spanish oil,<sup>4</sup> shake it so that it thickens itself and takes away the humours....† Afterwards, when it is cooked, take out any leek that happens to remain. Sprinkle with pepper and serve.<sup>5</sup>

## HERE ENDS BOOK SIX, ‘FOWL’

also found the Latin here unintelligible and changed it to an otherwise unknown (and equally unintelligible) *liquamen* sauce. The offending phrase may be a gloss; certainly there seems no logical connection between cumin sauce and the way that the bird is prepared.

<sup>3</sup> From *leukos*, the Greek for ‘white’.

<sup>4</sup> *Spanus* is Late Latin for *Hispanus* (found in the sixth-century poet Dioscurides, 4.45) but the form is also found as a substitute for *Hispanus* in Greek as early as the second century AD (Plutarch, *Sertorius* 11, etc.).

<sup>5</sup> This recipe has lost its central section and is beyond retrieval. The title bears no relation to the method, which is itself fragmentary. *consumere* has the meaning of ‘use up’ and might make sense if the dressing of oil and water is thickened by being shaken together, but this hardly seems possible if it is inside the chicken! The MSS *ambulet* is either a Late Latin variant spelling for *amulet*, with –mb– formed after the manner of words such as *plumbum* or *columba*, or an unfortunate misreading. The chicken’s cavity was presumably stuffed with leek before cooking.